

# Peak District National Park Local Plan Review Regulation 18 *Issues and Options* Consultation Statement

Prepared 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025

## **Foreword**

*This Regulation 18 statement consists of:*

*a statement setting out—*

*(i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,*

*Included*

*(ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,*

*Included*

*(iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18,*

*Included*

*(iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;*

*Included*

*(v) if representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and*

*N/A*

*(vi) if no representations were made in regulation 20, that no such representations were made;*

*N/A*

*As this statement is at Regulation 18, any comments to Regulation 20 will follow in an updated statement paper.*

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                             |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <i>Foreword</i> .....                                                                       | 2  |
| Introduction .....                                                                          | 5  |
| The Consultation Approach .....                                                             | 6  |
| Advertisement .....                                                                         | 8  |
| Consultation events: .....                                                                  | 11 |
| Consultation questions .....                                                                | 12 |
| Consultation Event summaries: .....                                                         | 12 |
| Availability of planning documents.....                                                     | 14 |
| Feedback .....                                                                              | 14 |
| Comments from individuals and organisations .....                                           | 14 |
| Summary of Consultation responses by Issue and Question.....                                | 15 |
| 2.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives .....                                                 | 15 |
| 2.2 Delivering National Park Purposes.....                                                  | 17 |
| 2.3 Defining Special Quality Key Features .....                                             | 19 |
| 2.4 Settlement Tiers .....                                                                  | 22 |
| 2.5 Sites for Housing Development .....                                                     | 24 |
| 2.6 Development Boundaries .....                                                            | 27 |
| <b>2.7 Protected Open Space and Local Green Space (LGS)</b> .....                           | 30 |
| 2.8 Spatial Strategy - Sustainable Travel.....                                              | 32 |
| 3.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives for Landscape, Biodiversity and Nature Recovery ..... | 33 |
| 3.2 Landscape and Nature Recovery.....                                                      | 35 |
| 3.3 Biodiversity Net Gain .....                                                             | 37 |
| 3.4 Development in the Natural Zone .....                                                   | 38 |
| 3.5 Whole Estate Plans .....                                                                | 39 |
| 4.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives .....                                                 | 40 |
| 4.2 Heritage Assets .....                                                                   | 41 |
| 4.3 Local List.....                                                                         | 42 |
| 4.4 The Conversion of Isolated Traditional Buildings .....                                  | 44 |
| 5.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives .....                                                 | 46 |
| 5.2 Replacement Dwellings.....                                                              | 47 |
| 5.3 Avoiding Carbon Emissions in Development .....                                          | 49 |
| 5.4 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Development.....                                      | 51 |

|                                                                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.5 – Carbon Capture .....                                                                                    | 52  |
| 6.1 Recreation and Tourism - Objectives .....                                                                 | 54  |
| 6.2 Recreation and Tourism – Recreation attractions and hubs .....                                            | 57  |
| 6.3 Recreation and Tourism - Temporary camp sites .....                                                       | 60  |
| 6.4 Recreation and Tourism – Touring caravan and camping sites .....                                          | 64  |
| 6.5 Recreation and Tourism - Static Caravans, Lodges, and Other Permanent Structures .....                    | 65  |
| 7.1 Local Plan Spatial Objectives for Housing .....                                                           | 68  |
| 7.2 Local Plan Spatial Objectives - Holiday Homes and Permanent Homes .....                                   | 70  |
| 7.3 Affordable Housing Eligibility Criteria in the Peak District National Park .....                          | 73  |
| 7.4 Affordable Housing Eligibility - Local Connection .....                                                   | 75  |
| 7.5 Local Plan Affordable Housing – House Size .....                                                          | 78  |
| 8.1 – Challenges and Spatial Objectives.....                                                                  | 80  |
| 8.2 The Retention of Shops, Services, Community Facilities and Businesses.....                                | 82  |
| 9.1 Protection of Bakewell’s Special Character and Setting .....                                              | 84  |
| 10.1 Local Plan Spatial Approach to the Rural Economy .....                                                   | 85  |
| 10.2 Additional Tests to Control Piecemeal Expansion of Businesses in the National Park.....                  | 87  |
| 11.1 Conversion of Whole Farmsteads to New Uses.....                                                          | 89  |
| 11.2 Primary Business Ownership of Redundant Farm Buildings.....                                              | 91  |
| 12.1 Travel and Transport – Proposed Spatial Objectives .....                                                 | 92  |
| 12.2 Visitor Parking .....                                                                                    | 94  |
| 12.3 Safeguarding and protecting multi-user trails on former railway routes .....                             | 95  |
| 12.4 Travel and Transport - Road building schemes.....                                                        | 96  |
| 12.5 Travel and Transport - Overnight parking for campervans.....                                             | 97  |
| 12.6 Travel and Transport - Air transport .....                                                               | 98  |
| 13.1 Utilities - Proposed spatial objectives.....                                                             | 99  |
| 13.2 Utilities - The development of new or expanded reservoirs .....                                          | 102 |
| 14.1 Minerals and Waste Challenges and Spatial Objectives .....                                               | 104 |
| 14.2 Limestone Quarries – Extending Beyond the ‘End Date’ .....                                               | 105 |
| 14.3 Limestone Industrial Uses .....                                                                          | 106 |
| 14.4 The Future of Hope Cement Works .....                                                                    | 107 |
| 14.5 Stone for Building and Roofing .....                                                                     | 108 |
| 14.6 – Ancillary Mineral Development .....                                                                    | 110 |
| Issue 54: Restoration and Aftercare – Stronger Focus on Nature Recovery and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) ..... | 112 |
| Sustainability Appraisal.....                                                                                 | 113 |
| Appendix 1: Advertisement .....                                                                               | 116 |

|                                                              |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Appendix 2: Consultation Question set .....                  | 126 |
| Appendix 3: Full set of records from OK with summaries ..... | 138 |
| Appendix 4: In-person events .....                           | 138 |

## Introduction

- 1.1 The Peak District National Park Authority adopted its Local Plan, along with any relevant supporting documents, to guide development and conservation within the National Park. In line with current Government requirements, all policies within the adopted Local Plan must be reviewed at least every five years to assess whether they remain up to date. This review process ensures the Plan reflects any changes in national policy, environmental considerations, or local priorities, and identifies where policies may need to be updated, revised, or removed.
- 1.2 As part of this process, the Peak District National Park Authority carried out an Issues and Options Consultation between 7th October 2024 to 29th November 2024. This provided an opportunity for stakeholders, communities, and the public to comment on initial ideas for updating the Local Plan, in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.3 The consultation was supported by the Sustainability Appraisal Initial Report and an Equalities and Health Impact Assessment. Comments (representations) were invited on these documents as part of the consultation period.
- 1.4 The purpose of this Consultation Statement is to outline how the Authority conducted the consultation and to present the key findings that emerged. This document summarises the approach taken to engage with stakeholders, who was invited to make representations, the comments received, and how these have been considered and responded to as part of the Local Plan Review process.
- 1.5 The Peak District National Park Authority received 226 separate responses, resulting in a total of 2,880 individual representations during the Regulation 18 consultation. This statement provides a summary of the main issues raised and sets out the Authority's response to these comments as part of the ongoing Local Plan Review.

1.6 This report has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012. These regulations require the production of a Consultation Statement to demonstrate:

- Which bodies and individuals were invited to make representations under Regulation 18;
- How those bodies and individuals were invited to make representations under Regulation 18;
- A summary of the main issues raised through the representations;
- How any representations have been used to inform the Local Plan Review.

1.7 The Consultation Statement will assist the Inspector at the Examination in assessing whether the Peak District National Park Authority's Local Plan Review meets the requirements for public participation and government guidance. This report confirms that the consultation carried out by the Authority complies with the statutory requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulation 18). It also demonstrates that public engagement was conducted in line with the approach outlined in the Authority's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

1.8 All consultation and engagement activities have been undertaken in accordance with paragraph 16(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (September 2023), which states that plans should:

*"Be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators, and statutory consultees."*

## The Consultation Approach

2.1 Local Planning Authorities have significant flexibility in how they approach the early stages of plan preparation, as long as they meet the specific consultation requirements set out in Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and adhere to the commitments outlined in their Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) provides information

about how the council will engage with the public and relevant consultees in the preparation of Local Plan documents and in the assessment of planning applications. The Regulation 18 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the provisions set out in the Statement of Community Involvement.

2.2 The Authority is required to ensure that statutory consultees and relevant organisations are engaged during the preparation of the draft Local Plan. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, specific groups must be included in the consultation process when developing statutory planning documents.

2.3 Table 1 shows a summary of statutory and other consultees:

### Statutory and Other Consultees

- British Telecommunications plc
- National Gas Transmission
- United Utilities
- Yorkshire Water
- Severn Trent
- Mobile Operators Association
- HSE
- Fisher German (Oil pipeline)
- E. ON
- Electricity North West Ltd
- The Planning Inspectorate
- Department for Transport Rail Group
- Network Rail
- Historic England
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Highways England
- Natural England
- Homes & Communities Agency
- Sport England East Midlands Office

- Cheshire PCC
- Staffordshire Police
- Staffordshire PCC
- South Yorkshire PCC
- Derbyshire PCC
- Greater Manchester PCC
- West Yorkshire Police
- West Yorkshire PCC
- Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Staffordshire Fire and Rescue
- West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
- Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue
- NHS (Various CCGs and Trusts)
- The Coal Authority
- Ministry of Defence
- Transport for Greater Manchester
- Department for Transport
- Civil Aviation Authority
- DEFRA

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Authorities (Multiple Borough, District, and County Councils)</li> <li>• Combined Authorities (Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire, Sheffield City Region)</li> <li>• Peak Park Parishes Forum</li> <li>• Local MPs (Multiple)</li> <li>• Parish Councils (Numerous – e.g. Bakewell, Bradwell, Yougriev, etc.)</li> <li>• Community Groups &amp; Trusts</li> <li>• National and Local NGOs (e.g. CPRE, RSPB, National Trust)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility and Infrastructure Providers</li> <li>• National Parks (e.g. Lake District, Dartmoor, etc.)</li> <li>• Housing Associations (e.g. Sanctuary Group, Platform Housing)</li> <li>• Transport Operators (e.g. Stagecoach, TM Travel, Trent Barton)</li> <li>• Campaign Groups and Forums</li> <li>• Ramblers and Outdoor Recreation Groups</li> <li>• Professional Planning &amp; Architecture Firms</li> </ul> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

*Table 1 Consultees*

2.4 In addition, residents and interested parties registered on the Local Plan database were also notified of the Regulation-18 consultation.

## Advertisement

3.1 Consultation on the Local Plan Review Issues and Options (Regulation 18) document took place between 7th October 2024 to 29th November 2024. The Regulation 18 consultation was promoted through a variety of means:

### **Publicity and Engagement Methods:**

- Promotion via official social media channels
- Information published on the authority's website
- Letters sent to consultees, including Parish Councils, Libraries, and constituent authorities
- 'Duty to Cooperate' meetings held both online and in person
- Local events held across the National Park
- Posters advertising events and the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation
- Printed postcards distributed to raise awareness



- Flyers and banner advertisements displayed at Aldern House and during events
- Informational video(s) produced and shared
- Coverage via local social media outlets and Parish bulletins

### 3.2 The full list of venues consisted of:

- 10 October – Hathersage Memorial Hall, Hathersage
- 14 October – Parwich Memorial Hall, Parwich
- 15 October – Hope Sports Club, Hope (1pm–5pm)
- 17 October – Tideswell Community Hall, Tideswell
- 18 October – Youlgrave Village Hall, Youlgrave
- 21 October – The Burton Institute, Winster
- 22 October – Warslow Village Hall, Warslow
- 24 October – PDNPA Office, Aldern House, Bakewell
- 6 November – Medway Centre, Bakewell
- 8 November – Bradfield Village Hall, Low Bradfield (4pm–8pm)

### 3.3 The full list of libraries consisted of:

- Ashbourne Library, Compton Street, Ashbourne, Derbyshire, DE6 1DA
- Bakewell Library, Granby Road, Bakewell, Derbyshire, DE45 1ES
- Barnsley Central Library, Wellington House, 36 Wellington Street, Barnsley, S70 1WA
- Buxton Library, Kents Bank Road, Buxton, Derbyshire, SK17 9HW
- Chapel en le Frith Library, Town Hall, Chapel en le Frith, High Peak, SK23 0HP
- Chesterfield Library, New Beetwell Street, Chesterfield, S40 1QN
- Derby Central Library, The Wardwick, Derby, DE1 1HS
- Disley Library, Off Buxton Road, Disley, SK12 2BB
- Dronfield Library, Manor House, High Street, Donfield, SK18 1PY
- Glossop Library, Victoria Hall, Talbot Street, Glossop, SK13 7DQ
- Greenfield Library, Chew Vale, Greenfield, OL3 7EQ

- Hayfield Library, Kinder Road, Hayfield, SK22 2HS
- Holmfirth Library, 47 Huddersfield Road, Holmfirth, HD9 3JH
- Leek Library, Nicholson Institute, Stockwell Street, Leeds, ST13 6DW
- Macclesfield Library, Jordangate, Macclesfield, SK10 1EE
- Manchester Central Library, St. Peters Square, Manchester, M2 5PD
- Matlock Library, 8 Steep Turnpike, Matlock, DE4 3DP
- Meltham Library, Meltham Town Hall, 26 Huddersfield Road, Meltham, Holmfirth, HD9 4AG
- New Mills Library, Hall Street, New Mills, SK22 4AR
- Penistone Library, High Street, Penistone, Sheffield, S36 6BR
- Sheffield Central Library, Surrey Street, Sheffield, S1 1XZ
- Stocksbridge Library, Manchester Road, Sheffield, S36 1DH
- Tideswell Library, St Johns Road, Tideswell, SK17 8NE
- Uppermill Library, St. Chad's, High Street, Uppermill, Oldham, OL3 6AP
- Whaley Bridge Library, 21 Market Street, Whaley Bridge, SK23 7AA
- Wirksworth Library, 2 Coldwell Street, Wirksworth, DE4 4FB

3.4 See further details of advertisement in Appendix 1.

## Consultation events:

### 4.1 Consultees and the general public were invited to make comments on the proposed local plan review issues and options consultation. Extract below:

**Issues and Options**  
**Foreword**  
**Foreword**

If you live, work, visit or do business in the Peak District National Park, then this *Issues and Options* consultation on the new Local Plan is going to be important to you.

The Local Plan is a vital document that helps to shape everything in the National Park, from local housing and farming, through to transport and minerals. It must respond positively to socio-economic pressures and the growing challenges of climate change and biodiversity loss. At the same time, and at its core, it must uphold the purposes of a national park to conserve and enhance natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage for the benefit of the nation.

The new Local Plan will shape future development as we manage change in the National Park to 2045. It will set out planning policies that will be used to guide decisions on development proposals and planning applications.

This *Issues and Options* consultation is a way to get as many voices heard as possible. What matters most to individuals, families and business? To our constituent authorities and the many charities, organisations and groups that represent communities of place and interest?

**Ken Smith**  
Chair of Peak District National Park Authority

**How to get involved**

The public consultation will run from 7th October 2024 to 29th November 2024.

Visit the National Park Authority website for details of how to get involved, make comments and find out about drop-in events that are taking place.  
<https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/policies-and-guides/the-local-plan/regulation-18-consultation>

You can make comments at any time during this period:

- through the online portal via the above webpage
- by email to [localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk)
- in writing to The Policy and Communities Team, Peak District National Park Authority, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, DE45 1AE.



Figure 1 Foreword and consultation link

## Consultation questions

5.1 Topics were considered included the following:

- Climate Change & Sustainable Building
- Health & Well-Being
- Heritage & Built Conservation
- Housing
- Landscape, Biodiversity & Nature Recovery
- Minerals
- Recreation & Tourism
- Shops, Services & Community Facilities
- Spatial Strategy
- Economic Development
- Sustainable Transport & Infrastructure
- Utilities

5.2 These documents likely formed the basis of the 54 survey questions.

5.3 The full set of consultation questions can be found in Appendix 2.

## Consultation Event summaries:

6.1 The consultation process engaged 178 attendees through 11 events held across various National Park communities, including village halls, community centres, sports clubs, and at the Agricultural Business Centre in Bakewell. The events, which were held in locations such as Hathersage Memorial Hall, Parwich Memorial Hall, Hope Sports Club, and others, had a diverse range of participation with events taking place between 3-8 pm, and one market event from 8 am-12 pm for broader access. A total of 226 responders contributed 2,743 individual comments. Two staff members were present at each event to facilitate engagement. An additional event organized by the Great Longstone Parish Council drew 55 attendees using some of the same consultation materials.

6.2 The consultation gathered valuable insights across three key activity areas: tourism management, affordable housing, and holiday homes. A cumulative map of tourism pressures was created with participant feedback, identifying 46 hotspot locations, including areas most affected by tourism. Participants also provided feedback on topics such as parking issues, the impact of social media on visitor behaviour, and the pressures of recreational hubs.

### 6.3 Key responses summarised below in Table 2:

#### Summary of Key Consultation Themes – Peak District Local Plan Review

| Theme                         | Key Issues Raised                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Tourism and Recreation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of high-pressure tourism areas within the National Park</li> <li>- Concerns about the development of recreation hubs</li> <li>- Fears of over-tourism impacting local communities and the natural environment</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Affordable Housing</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Four consultation options on eligibility criteria were discussed</li> <li>- Feedback varied by location, but common themes included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand for more transparent housing policies</li> <li>• Need for family-sized homes and long-term affordability</li> <li>• Housing for elderly and disabled individuals</li> <li>• Prevention of conversion into holiday lets</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                                                                  |
| <b>Holiday Homes</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Widespread support for stronger regulation of holiday homes</li> <li>- Advocacy for <b>primary residency clauses</b>, especially in areas with high second-home ownership</li> <li>- Concerns over local housing shortages and damage to community cohesion</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Other General Feedback</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strain on local infrastructure: parking, public transport, public toilets</li> <li>- Support for improved <b>environmental sustainability</b>, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better energy efficiency in homes</li> <li>• Installation of EV charging stations</li> <li>• Promotion of renewable energy</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Calls to preserve heritage, biodiversity, and natural landscapes</li> <li>- Desire for more consistent and robust planning policies</li> </ul> |

*Table 2 Summary of key consultation themes from in person events.*

### 6.4 The events are fully documented in Appendix 4 of this document.

## Availability of planning documents

7.1 In line with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, draft Local Plan documents for the Peak District National Park were made available for public inspection at the National Park Authority offices during normal opening hours.

7.2 The draft Local Plan issues and options documents, accompanying policies map, interactive mapping tool, and all supporting evidence base documents were accessible on the Peak District National Park Authority's website. These documents are provided in PDF format, with an accessible HTML version of the Plan available via the online consultation platform.

## Feedback

8.1 Comments from all respondents could be provided in various ways, including:

- Comments through OK Platform on the local plan document (available both online and hard copy versions);
- Submission of letters and emails directly to the Policy Team

8.2 Help was also available by telephone at Aldern House and in person drop-in sessions.

## Comments from individuals and organisations

9.1 All comments received were processed, summarised and documented post consultation.

Duly made representations to the Local Plan were accepted in the following formats: through the digital consultation platform OK, by letter, email, and via written forms submitted during public information event sessions.

9.2 All comments received were collated through the online consultation platform where each submission was summarised and accompanied by an officer response. Following this, individual comments were categorised into topic-based summaries, taking into account the content and representations made. These topic summaries were then further refined and analysed to inform the development of the Authority's Preferred Approach document.

9.3 A number of duplicate comments were received during the consultation, such as identical responses submitted by the same individual via both letter and email. In these cases, duplicate submissions were identified and removed to ensure each respondent was represented only once in the analysis.

## Summary of Consultation responses by Issue and Question.

9.4 See consultation summaries below.

9.5 A full review of all comments as excel sheets is provided as Appendix 3.

9.6 A full list of consultation questions to be found in Appendix 4.

## 2.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue outlined proposed spatial objectives to guide sustainable development within a national park. The consultation sought public feedback on whether these objectives were appropriate.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Type Number of Responses

|              |           |
|--------------|-----------|
| Yes          | 35        |
| No           | 18        |
| Unsure       | 15        |
| Not Answered | 6         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>74</b> |

While a majority (35) agreed with the proposed objectives, there was no clear consensus. Over half of respondents either disagreed, were unsure, or did not answer.

**Key Concerns Raised:**

- The objectives do not sufficiently address the climate and nature emergencies.
- They fail to acknowledge the influence of nearby urban areas (conurbations).
- There is inadequate consideration of the changing scale and nature of recreation and tourism.
- The objectives do not reflect that thriving, sustainable communities are an integral part of the national park's cultural heritage.
- Several respondents emphasized the need to balance environmental, social, and economic factors, suggesting a broader interpretation of the national park's purposes and duties.

**Implications for Policy Development:**

All relevant concerns will be addressed in the redrafting of the spatial objectives to better reflect the diverse priorities identified through the consultation.



## 2.2 Delivering National Park Purposes

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue explored how general spatial policies (GSPs) in the new local plan can deliver national park purposes. It also examined the implications of recent legislation, including the **Climate Change Act 2008** and the **Environment Act 2021**.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Type Number of Responses

Yes (Agree) 33

No (Disagree) 13

Unsure 8

Not Answered 3

**Total 57**

Most respondents agreed that the correct policy issues had been identified. However, comments — including from statutory bodies — highlighted areas where policy should be **strengthened or reconsidered**.

### Key Areas Identified for Further Attention:

- Nature recovery
- Climate change
- Blue/Green infrastructure, flood risk and surface water management
- Economic and social objectives
- Defining 'enhancement'

- Developer contributions
- Air quality
- Sustainable travel
- Carbon capture
- MOD land

### **Implications for Policy Development:**

Implications for GSPs *only* are considered here. Topics/issues will also be addressed under specific policy themes.

- For nature recovery to consider:
  - High level spatial policy alongside national park purposes (GSP1, GSP2).
  - Explicit link to Biodiversity Net Gain and either Local Nature Recovery Strategies or NPA One Plan for Nature Recovery (see comments re Issue 3.1) (GSP3).
- For climate change to consider strengthened policy (GSP3).
- For Blue/Green infrastructure, flood risk management, surface water management to consider an explicit policy (in GSP3).
- For economic and social objectives to consider a strengthened reference in GSP1 (D).
- To strengthen GSP2 so that 'enhancement' is better defined, for example in relation to nature recovery.
- To strengthen GSP4 (developer contributions) in accordance with the viability assessment.<sup>1</sup>
- For air quality to consider inclusion in GSP3.
- To consider a new sustainable travel policy (new T1) within GSPs.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of writing the viability assessment is underway but not complete.

## 2.3 Defining Special Quality Key Features

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue explored how to define the elements of the national park that should be conserved or enhanced through planning. The current Local Plan uses the term 'valued characteristics', while the National Park Management Plan (NPMP) refers to 'special qualities' and 'special quality key features'.

The consultation proposed aligning the Local Plan more closely with the NPMP by incorporating the NPMP's 'special quality key features' (listed in an appendix).

### Analysis of Responses

Rather than clear support for the approach, feedback highlighted two main themes:

1. Suggestions for additional key features to be included.
2. Concerns about the principle and execution of the 'key features' approach — including that the list was:
  - Inaccurate
  - Incomplete
  - Contradictory

There was also criticism of vague language and misalignment between the Local Plan and NPMP, particularly since the existing 'special qualities' were not designed for planning or development management purposes.

### Selected Key Features Suggested for Inclusion:

#### Suggested Features

Flow of landscape character beyond the park boundary

Green space within villages and rural settlements

## **Suggested Features**

Natural lithophytic communities on gritstone and limestone edges

Valley bottom mesophytic flushes and marshes

Hawthorn scrub, hazel scrub (×2 mentions)

19th-century plantations

Rewilding sites

Extend lowland pastoral landscapes to Dark Peak valley bottom

Hedges and unimproved verges

Ancient local access routes linked to historic industries (×2 mentions)

Geology as the foundation of landscape and heritage

Ancient woodlands and plantations on ancient woodland sites

Temperate rainforest

Nest sites of Curlew, Golden Plover, Hen Harrier

Human activity (especially farming) as essential to maintaining special qualities

Species and species assemblages

Tranquillity and markers of tranquillity (e.g., wheeling buzzards, croak of raven, curlew calls)

Graveyards and milestones

Biodiversity (×2 mentions)

Thriving and sustainable communities (×5 mentions)

Positive landscape impact of industrial heritage

Key landscape features

Open access and rights of way

## **Suggested Features**

Climate adaptation in relation to landscape, wildlife, habitats, farming, and communities

Drystone walls

Historic abandoned industrial sites (suggested change to wording)

Natural heritage – incorporating landscape, habitat, land use, and cultural heritage

## **Implications for Policy Development:**

There remains an unresolved question of how to clearly define what the Local Plan is aiming to conserve or enhance — especially with respect to landscape, wildlife, and cultural heritage.

A closer working relationship is needed between:

- The Land and Nature Team (Landscape Strategy)
- The Policy Team (National Park Management Plan)

The Local Plan should adopt the NPMP language of ‘special qualities’ instead of ‘valued characteristics’.

However, these special qualities need to be made more specific, as they were not originally developed with planning policy in mind.

The ‘key features’ approach itself was questioned in the consultation, with concerns over:

- Vagueness
- Lack of precision for use in planning
- Internal inconsistencies in the current draft list

## 2.4 Settlement Tiers

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue explored different options for structuring the settlement strategy in the Local Plan. It asked respondents to consider how settlements are categorised in terms of suitability for development.

Three options were presented:

- Option 1: Retain the current two-tier strategy:
  - DS1 settlements: where new development is acceptable in principle
  - Non-DS1 settlements: where it is not
- Option 2: Retain a two-tier strategy, but review the list of DS1 settlements
- Option 3: Move to a multi-tiered strategy with more categories of settlements

### Analysis of Responses

| Option             | Total Responses | Parish Councils | Local Authorities | Other Organisations |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Option 1           | 10              | 9               | 0                 | 0                   |
| Option 2           | 11              | 7               | 0                 | 2                   |
| Option 3           | 33              | 5               | 5                 | 8                   |
| Unsure / No Answer | 23              | 5               | 1                 | 6                   |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>77</b>       |                 |                   |                     |

This was the second-most responded to issue in the consultation, with 77 out of 221 respondents providing feedback.

There was no clear consensus on a preferred option:

- Option 3 was the most selected overall, particularly among local authorities and other organisations.
- Parish councils generally preferred Option 1 or Option 2.

### **Summary of Feedback by Option:**

- **Option 1 – Retain current two-tier approach:**
  - Works well and aligns with national park purposes
  - More tiers seen as too complex
  - No evidence it would deliver more homes or support sustainable communities
  - Risk of overdevelopment
  - Support for a ‘parish-first’ approach
- **Option 2 – Retain two tiers but review list:**
  - Current DS1 list is outdated
  - Suggestion that limited development should be allowed in all settlements
- **Option 3 – Introduce more tiers:**
  - Seen as a more flexible and sensible strategy
  - Could support larger, viable housing schemes
  - Encourages living near services and public transport
  - Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions

### **Other Key Themes:**

- Several respondents (including those favouring Option 1 or 2) suggested some settlements — such as Bakewell, non-DS1 settlements, and split settlements — may warrant different or more tailored approaches.

### **Implications for Policy Development:**

Policy should:

- Consider a different approach for Bakewell, or Bakewell and other larger, sustainably located settlements
- Review and update the list of DS1 settlements
- Determine whether to allow small-scale development (e.g. 1–2 homes) in non-DS1 settlements

- Clarify policy approach to split settlements

## 2.5 Sites for Housing Development

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue considered two options for enabling greenfield sites to deliver affordable housing in the National Park:

- **Option 1: Exceptions approach** — retain the current policy where no sites are allocated in any settlement.
- **Option 2: Exceptions sites plus allocations in ‘Tier One’ settlements** — maintain exceptions but allocate sites in the most sustainable locations.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Type Number of Responses

|                     |    |
|---------------------|----|
| <b>Option 1</b>     | 24 |
| <b>Option 2</b>     | 28 |
| <b>Unsure</b>       | 6  |
| <b>Not Answered</b> | 8  |
| <b>Total</b>        | 66 |

There was no clear consensus, although slightly more respondents supported Option 2.

- Three largest constituent local authorities supported Option 2.
- Parish councils generally supported Option 1.
- Other organisations were mixed in their views.



**Support for Option 1 – Exceptions Approach:**

- Helps prevent over-concentration of housing in a few settlements, promoting more balanced community development.
- Keeps land values lower, supporting affordable housing delivery.
- Avoids delays in the plan due to complex site allocation.
- Maintains a parish-level link to housing need.
- Minimises greenfield development and supports National Park purposes.

**Support for Option 2 – Exceptions + Allocations:**

- Allows for planned development in sustainable locations.
- Provides certainty for landowners, Registered Social Landlords (RSLs), estates, and individuals wishing to develop housing.

**Breakdown of Responses by Stakeholder Group:****Parish Councils**

| Option   | Number of Parish Councils |
|----------|---------------------------|
| Option 1 | 8                         |
| Option 2 | 5                         |

**Unsure/Not Answered** 2

**Local Authorities**

| Option   | Number of Local Authorities |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| Option 1 | 0                           |
| Option 2 | 6                           |

**Unsure/Not Answered** 2

**Other Organisations**

| <b>Option</b>              | <b>Number of Organisations</b> |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Option 1</b>            | 5                              |
| <b>Option 2</b>            | 7                              |
| <b>Unsure/Not Answered</b> | 5                              |

#### **Implications for Policy Development:**

As no strong preference emerged, the policy choice remains open.

The Authority may continue to consider either approach if suitable sites come forward.

A flexible approach may be necessary, depending on the settlement hierarchy, housing need, and availability of sustainable locations.

## 2.6 Development Boundaries

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue explored options for setting development boundaries around settlements to help manage and direct new development.

### Three options were presented:

- **Option 1:** Retain the current policy — development boundary only for Bakewell. Other parishes can define boundaries via neighbourhood plans.
- **Option 2:** Remove all development boundaries — any parish can define one through a neighbourhood plan.
- **Option 3:** Introduce development boundaries for Bakewell and other key settlements.

### Analysis of Responses

| Option             | Total Responses | Parish Councils | Local Authorities | Other Organisations |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Option 1           | 12              | 3               | 0                 | 1                   |
| Option 2           | 4               | 3               | 0                 | 0                   |
| Option 3           | 20              | 0               | 4                 | 4                   |
| Unsure / No Answer | 10              | 3               | 1                 | 5                   |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>46</b>       | <b>9</b>        | <b>5</b>          | <b>10</b>           |

- Response rate was low, with only 46 total responses and just 8 parish councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum submitting answers.
- Option 3 received the most overall support, particularly from local authorities, organisations, and private individuals.
- Parish councils were evenly split between Options 1 and 2, with none expressing preference for Option 3.

## **Key Themes and Comments:**

### **Support for Development Boundaries (Options 1 & 3):**

- Provide clarity to developers and the public.
- Support tiered settlement strategies.
- Allow communities to influence development without needing full neighbourhood plans.
- Bakewell in particular needs defined limits due to its size and development pressures.
- Some noted that neighbourhood plans are too complex for many parish councils to deliver.

### **Opposition to Boundaries (Option 2 or general concerns):**

- Boundaries are too rigid and may not be effective in managing appropriate growth.
- Concerned about delays to the plan process from trying to agree boundary lines.
- Questioned whether boundaries actually achieve better planning outcomes.

## **Breakdown by Stakeholder Group:**

### **Parish Councils**

| <b>Option</b>   | <b>Number of Parish Councils</b> |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Option 1</b> | 3                                |
| <b>Option 2</b> | 3                                |
| <b>Option 3</b> | 0                                |

**Unsure/Not Answered** 3

### **Local Authorities**

| <b>Option</b>   | <b>Number of Local Authorities</b> |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Option 1</b> | 0                                  |
| <b>Option 2</b> | 0                                  |
| <b>Option 3</b> | 4                                  |

| Option | Number of Local Authorities |
|--------|-----------------------------|
|--------|-----------------------------|

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Unsure/Not Answered | 1 |
|---------------------|---|

#### Other Organisations

| Option | Number of Organisations |
|--------|-------------------------|
|--------|-------------------------|

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| Option 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| Option 2 | 0 |
|----------|---|

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| Option 3 | 4 |
|----------|---|

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Unsure/Not Answered | 5 |
|---------------------|---|

#### Implications for Policy Development:

This issue needs to be considered alongside the settlement strategy and the call for housing sites.

Given the mixed response and low numbers, a balanced approach may be best:

- Undertake a capacity study for selected key settlements (similar to the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's approach)
- Use findings to guide development policy without necessarily designating formal boundaries

This could provide clarity without over-complicating the Local Plan process.

## 2.7 Protected Open Space and Local Green Space (LGS)

### Summary of the Issue:

This issue explored whether there is ‘additional local benefit’ in designating Local Green Space (LGS) within or on the edge of Peak District settlements — given that national parks are already protected landscapes.

Government guidance suggests LGS should only be designated where it offers additional benefit beyond the existing national park protections.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Type Number of Responses

**Yes** 29

**No** 6

**Unsure** 8

**Total** 43

- Majority agreed that LGS designations can bring additional local benefit even within a national park.
- Supportive comments focused on:
  - Links to green infrastructure
  - Importance of community involvement
  - LGS helping to define and protect important spaces near development boundaries or development sites

### Implications for Policy Development:

LGS designation may provide community-level benefits not fully addressed by broader national park protections.

The approach to LGS designation should be coordinated with the call for development sites to ensure key green spaces are not lost to development.

Consideration should be given to:

- Involving local communities in identifying candidate LGS
- Aligning LGS with other spatial policies such as settlement boundaries and infrastructure planning

## 2.8 Spatial Strategy - Sustainable Travel

### Summary of the Issue:

Issue 2.8 focuses on sustainable travel, particularly relating to the current Core Strategy Policy T1. Policy T1 aims to reduce the general need to travel and encourage sustainable transport through seven key principles:

- **A.** Conserving and enhancing the National Park's valued characteristics as the primary planning and design criterion for transport and its management.
- **B.** Deterring cross-park traffic.
- **C.** Encouraging modal shift to sustainable transport.
- **D.** Improving connectivity between sustainable travel modes.
- **E.** Minimising traffic impacts within environmentally sensitive locations.
- **F.** Promoting sustainable access for quiet enjoyment without harming valued characteristics.
- **G.** Seeking demand management and low carbon initiatives where appropriate.

### Analysis of Responses

- Number of responses to the question: **61**

*(Note: Specific data on responses (e.g., yes/no counts or thematic comments) was not provided.)*

### Implications for Policy Development:

The comments will be considered in the development of the new T1 equivalent Policy.



### 3.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives for Landscape, Biodiversity and Nature Recovery

#### Summary of the Issue:

The consultation proposed a set of new spatial objectives aligned with national park purposes, the 2021 Environment Act, and the ambition to lead in nature recovery. The draft objectives include:

- Managing development by considering special qualities, valued landscape character, and nature recovery.
- Enhancing biodiversity following the Lawton Principles (more, bigger, better-connected habitats) and statutory nature recovery strategies.
- Protecting remoteness, wildness, open character, and tranquillity of hills, moorlands, and dales.
- Protecting distinctive historic character of settled agricultural landscapes.
- Protecting and extending the Natural Zone per nature recovery strategies.
- Maintaining and improving darkness of night skies.
- Promoting nature-based solutions for climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- Promoting healthy soil, clean air, and water.
- ?
- What is the reason for your answer?

#### Analysis of Responses

##### Response Type Number of Responses

|            |    |
|------------|----|
| Agree      | 49 |
| Disagree   | 3  |
| Unsure     | 7  |
| Not stated | 5  |

- Overall support for the objectives, but key stakeholders raised concerns including:

- Need for greater ambition to reverse nature damage, enhance recovery, and build climate resilience.
- Inclusion of farming best practices (e.g., Catchment Sensitive Farming).
- Protection of groundwater quality and groundwater-dependent features.
- Addressing tension between preserving settled agricultural landscapes and promoting nature recovery.
- Referencing the Peak District Nature Recovery Plan rather than only statutory strategies.
- Revising wording to align with the landscape strategy.
- Adding more scope for the historic environment.

**Implications for Policy Development:**

Spatial objectives will be amended to reflect comments from consultees and stakeholders, including the need for increased ambition, more precise wording, and broader environmental considerations.

## 3.2 Landscape and Nature Recovery

### Summary of the Issue:

The consultation outlined a broad policy approach to landscape and nature recovery (excluding Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), which was covered separately). The proposed policy aims to:

- Conserve and enhance special qualities.
- Maximise the potential for all development, even small-scale, to contribute to nature recovery.
- Clearly define requirements for developments outside mandatory BNG, including ecological information, mitigation, or enhancement needs.
- Ensure proposals align with local priorities and strategies to create the right habitat in the right place.
- Promote enhancements that also achieve nutrient neutrality (where applicable), reduce flood risk, and contribute to natural capital and green infrastructure strategies, including cross-boundary ones.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Type Number of Responses

|            |    |
|------------|----|
| Agree      | 46 |
| Disagree   | 2  |
| Unsure     | 12 |
| Not stated | 3  |

### Key issues raised:

- Small-scale requirements must include specific design needs for building-dependent species (e.g., swifts, house martins), currently excluded from DEFRA's BNG metric.
- Requirements for developments outside mandatory BNG should include expectations even where baseline units are zero to ensure environmental enhancement.
- Policy should focus on **reducing** flood risk rather than merely mitigating it.

- Concern about increased burdens on developers and residents within National Park boundaries.
- Recognition that climate change means nature may not fully recover to previous conditions; policy should protect and value a changed landscape.
- Biodiversity mitigation/enhancement should consider operational infrastructure (utilities) and avoid placement over water/wastewater assets.
- Reference should be made to the Peak District Landscape Strategy, Wooded Landscapes Plan, and Nature Recovery Plan.
- Policies should promote enhancements reducing emissions and increasing landscape/climate resilience.
- A policies map should clearly identify wildlife-rich habitats, ecological networks, and priority opportunity areas for nature recovery, per the NPPF.

**Implications for Policy Development:**

Policy wording can be amended to incorporate the comments, and some detail may be more appropriate for inclusion in a new design guide or code.

Policy should reconcile the requirements of the NPPF, Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS), and the PDNPA Nature Recovery Plan, and expressing this in a local plan policy map.

If preference is to reference the PDNPA Nature Recovery Plan rather than LNRS, a spatial expression of that plan will be required.

### 3.3 Biodiversity Net Gain

#### Summary

The consultation proposed that new planning policy for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) should go beyond the current 10% mandatory requirement. We asked whether consultees agreed with this and the reasons for their answers.

The approach was broadly supported, but concerns were raised about the impact on development viability and that it could place an unjustified burden on developers and local people.

Detailed issues included the need to expect environmental enhancement even when baseline biodiversity units are zero, the importance of robust local evidence to justify any increased requirements, clear explanation of additional obligations, and the need to define how 'significance' is determined.

#### Analysis of Responses

##### Response Number

Agree 41

Disagree 13

Unsure 7

Not stated 5

#### Implications for policy development

Policy can be developed reflecting the comments and concerns raised.

### 3.4 Development in the Natural Zone

#### Summary

The consultation outlined current policy (DMP Policy DMC2) that restricts development in the Natural Zone except in exceptional circumstances. We asked whether respondents thought the current policy correctly defines these exceptional circumstances and their reasons.

The approach was broadly supported, but some concerns were raised:

- The reference to ‘valued characteristics’ is considered too broad.
- The policy’s support for enabling farm businesses to remain viable is problematic, as it could create a circular argument protecting farm businesses as a ‘special quality’ even when they may harm other special qualities.

#### Analysis of Responses

##### Response Number

Agree 33

Disagree 11

Unsure 8

Not stated 2

#### Implications for policy development

The approach to farm viability requires reconsideration, as noted in supporting text paragraph 3.19, which states it is not intended to curtail existing farming activities or make existing farms unviable.

## 3.5 Whole Estate Plans

### Summary

The consultation described Whole Estate Plans (WEPs) and asked whether the new local plan should include a policy on WEPs, and the reasons for respondents' views. There is no clear consensus. More respondents supported a WEP policy (28 out of 51) than opposed or were unsure, but 23 responders disagreed, were unsure, or did not answer.

Supporters valued WEPs for enabling a holistic approach to landscapes, nature recovery, heritage, and energy planning. Those opposed or unsure raised concerns about the planning status of WEPs and the potential for them to be used to gain 'favourable treatment'.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Number

Agree 28

Disagree 11

Unsure 9

Not stated 3

### Implications for policy development

A balanced approach is needed, weighing the benefits and concerns about WEPs. If a WEP policy is adopted, accompanying guidance should be developed to clarify criteria for the form, content, and consultation process for WEPs.

## 4.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives

### Summary

This summary focuses on proposed spatial objectives for cultural heritage and the built environment, including managing development with regard to landscape character and heritage, enhancing heritage assets, and supporting a low carbon future.

The majority (61%) of 57 respondents agreed with the objectives, with support largely driven by climate concerns related to the low carbon transition objective. Those who disagreed emphasized the need for landscape and cultural sensitivity in renewable and climate adaptation efforts.

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|     |    |      |
|-----|----|------|
| Yes | 35 | 61.4 |
|-----|----|------|

|    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| No | 9 | 15.7 |
|----|---|------|

|        |   |      |
|--------|---|------|
| Unsure | 6 | 10.5 |
|--------|---|------|

|                   |   |      |
|-------------------|---|------|
| No specific reply | 7 | 12.2 |
|-------------------|---|------|

### Respondent Breakdown

| Group | Number |
|-------|--------|
|-------|--------|

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Government Agencies | 3 |
|---------------------|---|

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Local Authorities | 6 |
|-------------------|---|

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Parish Councils & Peak Parishes Forum | 12 |
|---------------------------------------|----|

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| Individuals | 36 |
|-------------|----|

### Implications for policy development

Policy should expand expectations for cultural heritage and environment in spatial objectives and revisit the low-carbon development section to ensure balance between climate goals and heritage protection.



## 4.2 Heritage Assets

### Summary

The consultation highlighted issues around designated and non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) within the National Park.

Existing policy protected designated assets, but these represented less than 5% of the Park’s cultural heritage; most planning applications related to non-designated assets assessed on a case-by-case basis.

The question asked about setting a methodology for deciding if a building qualified as a NDHA and its significance. There was widespread agreement on the need for a clear, flexible, and transparent methodology to support balanced decision-making. Respondents stressed that cultural heritage was dynamic, and rigid protections risked overlooking modern or less-recognized assets (e.g., inter-war chalets, community buildings) and could hinder adaptive reuse and sustainability.

Concerns included inconsistent enforcement, scope creep, and economic burdens on small landowners. A pragmatic, proportionate approach balancing heritage conservation with environmental, social, and economic realities was advocated, supporting the evolving nature of the Peak District’s living heritage.

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Type | Number | Approximate Support Rate (%) |
|---------------|--------|------------------------------|
|---------------|--------|------------------------------|

|                    |    |      |
|--------------------|----|------|
| Clearly Supportive | 27 | ~90% |
|--------------------|----|------|

Total Responses Reviewed 30

### Implications for Policy Development

Policy development will likely consider incorporating a transparent and well-justified methodology for identifying and managing NDHAs. The approach may need to be flexible and balanced, allowing heritage to evolve alongside necessary development and climate adaptation. Therefore, consideration will be given to improving consistency and clarity in the application of heritage policies to support sustainable heritage conservation.

## 4.3 Local List

### Summary

Issue 4.3 asked whether a Local List of non-designated heritage assets should be created to support a clear methodology.

There were 47 responses to the question of whether to create a Local List.

Responses were:

- Yes: 27 (57.4%)
- No: 10 (23.4%)
- Unsure: 5 (10.6%)
- No specific reply: 4 (8.5%)
  - Those in favour felt a Local List would:
    - Provide certainty in planning decisions
    - Protect local heritage not covered by national listings
    - Support local character and historic landscapes
    - Encourage community involvement in heritage decisions
    - Bring consistency across the National Park
    - Guide development to respect local style
    - Highlight overlooked assets with cultural or historic value
    - Help owners and buyers understand heritage status
    - Be flexible and evolve with changing views on heritage
    - Act as a long-term investment in cultural and social value

Those opposed or unsure raised concerns about:

- The significant time and resource commitment required
- Potential duplication of protections already offered by listed buildings and conservation areas

- Risk of slowing development and adding bureaucracy
- The possibility that case-by-case assessment during planning might be more efficient and flexible
  - Overall, opinions were mixed but leaned towards conditional support if key concerns (time, resources, methodology) were addressed.

### **Analysis of Responses**

| <b>Response Type</b> | <b>Number</b> | <b>Percentage (%)</b> |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Yes                  | 27            | 57.4                  |
| No                   | 10            | 23.4                  |
| Unsure               | 5             | 10.6                  |
| No specific reply    | 4             | 8.5                   |

### **Implications for Policy Development**

The local plan may consider introducing a Local List of non-designated heritage assets, subject to developing a robust and justifiable methodology. The approach might explore options for a flexible, possibly reactive Local List to manage time and resource concerns.

Policy development would likely need to balance the benefits of a Local List with the risk of added bureaucracy and ensure it complements existing heritage protections.

## 4.4 The Conversion of Isolated Traditional Buildings

### Summary

Issue 4.4 addressed the adaptive re-use of the National Park's traditional buildings.

Current policy allows buildings in the countryside to be converted to new uses if consistent with National Park purposes (Policies DS1, L1, DMC10).

The consultation considered whether the new local plan should include a specific policy for the conversion of isolated traditional buildings outside existing settlements in the open countryside. Question 17 asked whether there should be a specific policy and the reasons for the answer.

There were 59 responses:

- Yes: 39 (66.1%)
- No: 8 (13.5%)
- Unsure: 1 (1.7%)
- No specific reply: 9 (15.3%)
  - The majority supported a specific policy for isolated traditional buildings. Key reasons included:
    - The need for clear guidance as current policy causes confusion
    - Concerns about urbanisation, harm to dark skies, wildlife, and landscape; some preferred decay over inappropriate conversions
    - Support for reuse in storage, farm support, or community needs; concern over gentrification from high-end or holiday lets
    - Recognition that conversions can reduce carbon impact compared to new builds and support decarbonisation (e.g., solar panels, batteries)
    - Adaptive reuse seen as a means to protect heritage and prevent dereliction

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|     |    |      |
|-----|----|------|
| Yes | 39 | 66.1 |
|-----|----|------|

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| No | 8 | 13.5 |
|----|---|------|

|        |   |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| Unsure | 1 | 1.7 |
|--------|---|-----|

|                   |   |      |
|-------------------|---|------|
| No specific reply | 9 | 15.3 |
|-------------------|---|------|

### **Implications for Policy Development**

The new local plan may include a specific policy addressing the conversion of isolated traditional buildings, especially field barns. Any such policy would likely need to balance preservation of heritage and landscape, address local needs, and avoid overly restrictive regulations. Careful drafting will be required to provide clear guidance, mitigate concerns about inappropriate conversions, and support sustainable reuse aligned with National Park purposes.

## 5.1 Challenges and Spatial Objectives

### Summary

This issue focused on proposed spatial objectives for climate change and sustainable building. A total of 72 responses were received, with the majority (62.5%) agreeing with the objectives.

Supportive responses welcomed stronger action on climate through renewable energy, low-carbon buildings, and reducing emissions. Many supported natural solutions to flood risk such as wetlands and SuDS, and backed objectives that promote nature recovery, carbon sequestration, tree planting, and habitat connectivity.

Respondents who disagreed or were unsure felt the objectives lacked clarity or ambition. Some raised concerns about the visual impact of renewable energy infrastructure on landscape character, and others called for stronger language and clearer commitments to climate action.

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Type     | Number | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------|--------|----------------|
| Yes               | 45     | 62.5%          |
| No                | 6      | 8.3%           |
| Unsure            | 8      | 11.1%          |
| No specific reply | 13     | 18.0%          |

### Implications for Policy Development

The proposed objectives are likely to be taken forward, but with revisions to ensure clearer language, stronger commitments, and better integration of landscape sensitivities and climate ambition.

## 5.2 Replacement Dwellings

### Summary

This issue explored whether policies on replacement dwellings should evolve to reflect sustainability concerns, particularly the importance of **embodied carbon**, the **criteria used in Policy DMH9**, and the **loss of smaller homes**. While overall response levels were moderate, the feedback showed clear trends on most points.

Most respondents supported factoring in **embodied carbon** in planning decisions, highlighting the need to reduce demolition where possible and retain existing structures, especially smaller dwellings, which support affordability and sustainability goals.

Views on whether the current **DMH9A criteria** were appropriate were more mixed, with respondents split between support, disagreement, and calls for clarification.

There was stronger consensus that policy should **specifically address the loss of smaller homes**, given their role in meeting local housing needs and reducing the carbon impact of redevelopment.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Embodied Carbon

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|     |    |       |
|-----|----|-------|
| Yes | 34 | 69.3% |
|-----|----|-------|

|    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| No | 2 | 4.0% |
|----|---|------|

|        |   |      |
|--------|---|------|
| Unsure | 3 | 6.1% |
|--------|---|------|

|                   |    |       |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| No specific reply | 10 | 20.4% |
|-------------------|----|-------|

#### DMH9A Criteria

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|     |    |       |
|-----|----|-------|
| Yes | 15 | 30.6% |
|-----|----|-------|

|    |    |       |
|----|----|-------|
| No | 14 | 28.0% |
|----|----|-------|

|        |   |       |
|--------|---|-------|
| Unsure | 5 | 10.2% |
|--------|---|-------|

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|                   |    |       |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| No specific reply | 15 | 30.6% |
|-------------------|----|-------|

### Loss of Smaller Homes

| Response Type | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|--------|----------------|
|---------------|--------|----------------|

|     |    |       |
|-----|----|-------|
| Yes | 28 | 57.0% |
|-----|----|-------|

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
| No | 5 | 10.2% |
|----|---|-------|

|        |   |      |
|--------|---|------|
| Unsure | 3 | 6.1% |
|--------|---|------|

|                   |    |       |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| No specific reply | 13 | 26.5% |
|-------------------|----|-------|

### Implications for Policy Development

A future policy could include consideration of embodied carbon, but it will need clear, practical guidance and definitions to avoid overcomplicating the planning process.

The current DMH9 criteria may need review and refinement to ensure clarity, fairness, and alignment with sustainability goals.

There is likely to be support for a new policy that protects smaller homes, especially where linked to affordability, though further work may be needed to ensure its targeted and enforceable.



## 5.3 Avoiding Carbon Emissions in Development

### Summary

This issue explored whether the new Local Plan should set out specific sustainability measures for different types of development. The question generated broad support for stronger climate action, with an emphasis on aligning the Local Plan with the National Park's net zero target by 2040. Respondents focused on a wide range of suggested sustainability measures for homes, farms, and businesses—spanning renewable energy, energy efficiency, emissions reduction, and low-carbon construction. While most supported the principle, many emphasised the need for flexibility, viability, up-to-date guidance, and coordination with national policy.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Type Number Percentage

|          |    |      |
|----------|----|------|
| Yes      | 38 | 64%  |
| No       | 4  | 6.6% |
| Unsure   | 4  | 6.6% |
| No reply | 14 | 23%  |

#### Key Themes by Development Type

**Homes:** Support for solar panels/tiles, heat pumps, high insulation, EV charging, rainwater collection, and reuse of materials. Preference for EPC B+ standards. Emphasis on flexibility, particularly in conservation areas.

**Farms:** Encouragement for solar, ground-source heating, and emissions reduction from farming practices. Caution around wind turbines. Preference for guidance-based rather than prescriptive policy.

**Businesses:** Endorsement of BREEAM standards, on-site renewables, EV infrastructure, and passive design. Calls for expert advice and site-specific solutions.

**General:** Strong desire for measurable, enforceable policies, though concerns were raised around over-regulation, cost, enforceability, and potential conflict with national policy (e.g. Dec 2023 WMS).

### **Implications for Policy Development**

A future policy could set out sustainability expectations across different types of development.

These may include renewable energy generation, energy efficiency standards, and carbon reduction strategies. However, policies will likely need to remain flexible to reflect site context and evolving technologies; be aligned with national policy and building regulations; include clear, evidence-based justification where they go further than national requirements; consider viability and equity, especially for small or affordable schemes; and be enforceable and regularly reviewed to ensure effectiveness and adaptability.

## 5.4 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Development

### Summary

This issue considered whether new policy should define “small-scale” renewable energy and identify areas on a policy map where such development is more or less likely to be acceptable. The majority of the 55 respondents expressed support for renewable energy in the National Park, with a strong preference for community-led, small-scale, and site-sensitive solutions. While some supported mapping suitable areas, others stressed the need for case-by-case flexibility to allow for innovation and evolving technologies.

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Type | Number | Percentage |
|---------------|--------|------------|
|---------------|--------|------------|

|              |          |                        |
|--------------|----------|------------------------|
| Yes/Positive | Majority | ~70%+ inferred support |
|--------------|----------|------------------------|

|             |          |   |
|-------------|----------|---|
| No / Unsure | Minority | — |
|-------------|----------|---|

### Implications for Policy Development

Future policy could define “small-scale” renewable energy more clearly and may identify criteria for assessing suitable areas, either spatially or through policy wording. A flexible, context-based approach is likely to be favoured over strict zoning. The policy could support community-led renewables, promote integration with existing infrastructure, and ensure strong landscape, biodiversity, and heritage safeguards. It may also need to consider security measures for installations and allow for adaptation as technology and climate demands evolve.

## 5.5 – Carbon Capture

### Summary

This issue explored whether the Local Plan should set out a clear position on Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS), particularly in relation to industrial proposals such as the Peak Cluster project. While the Authority would not determine such proposals directly, it would be a statutory consultee. The question asked whether a supportive-in-principle policy should be included, and if so, what criteria it should include.

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Type         | Number | Percentage |
|-----------------------|--------|------------|
| Yes                   | 26     | 55.3%      |
| No                    | 5      | 10.6%      |
| Unsure / Not Answered | 16     | 34%        |

### Parish Councils

#### Yes No Unsure / Not Answered

7 1 3

### Neighbouring / Constituent Authorities

#### Yes No Unsure / Not Answered

0.5 0.5 3

### Implications for Policy Development

A future Local Plan may consider including a policy setting out the Authority's position on CCS, especially in relation to large-scale projects like Peak Cluster.

If included, policy could be framed as supportive in principle, but only where strict criteria are met, such as:

- Proven technology with measurable outcomes

- Avoidance of sensitive landscapes and habitats
- No facilitation of increased industrial emissions or cement production
- Temporary or reversible infrastructure
- Opportunities for biodiversity gain (e.g. habitat corridors)
- Community and environmental impact mitigations

The policy may need to remain flexible and contingent on further evidence, including national guidance and the progression of the Peak Cluster project.

## 6.1 Recreation and Tourism - Objectives

### Summary

Issue 6.1 focuses on proposed Spatial Objectives for Recreation and Tourism aimed at:

- Directing recreation development to settlements and existing hubs to enhance enjoyment, sustainable travel, and the National Park's qualities.
- Supporting conversion of traditional farmstead buildings to visitor accommodation.
- Supporting temporary overnight tourist accommodation suited to locations.
- Maintaining and expanding rights of way and multi-user recreational trails.

Out of 73 responses to the question on agreement with these objectives:

- 44% agreed, 27% disagreed, 15% were unsure, and 14% gave no specific reply.

Main concerns from dissenting respondents related to:

- Impact of holiday accommodation on affordable housing.
- Visitor impact on communities.
- Expansion of trails and recreation hubs increasing pressure on infrastructure.
- Preference for accommodation within settlements, not countryside.
- Insufficient provision for cycle routes and day-to-day transport needs.

The feedback highlighted a need to clarify policy reasoning, particularly on visitor accommodation and affordable housing, ahead of further consultation.

### Analysis of Responses

| Group               | Yes     | No          | Unsure   | No Specific Reply | Key Themes/Concerns         |
|---------------------|---------|-------------|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Government</b>   | Natural | Environment | Historic |                   | Mostly supportive or unsure |
| <b>Agencies (3)</b> | England | Agency      | England  |                   |                             |

| Group                                   | Yes                                                                | No                                                                                                                                                                          | Unsure                               | No Specific Reply                      | Key Themes/Concerns                                |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Local Authorities (8)</b>            |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                             | Derbyshire County Council,           | High Peak Borough                      |                                                    |
|                                         | Derbyshire Dales DC,                                               | High Peak Borough Council                                                                                                                                                   | Staffordshire County Council,        | Sheffield Council,                     | Mixed views, several unsure or no reply            |
|                                         | Staffordshire Moorlands DC                                         |                                                                                                                                                                             | Derbyshire Dales DC                  | Parks & Countryside                    |                                                    |
|                                         |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                                        |                                                    |
|                                         |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                                        |                                                    |
| <b>Parish Councils &amp; Forum (17)</b> |                                                                    | Bamford with Thornhill, Castleton, Eyam, Great Hucklow, Hathersage, Hope & Derwent Woodlands, Hope with Aston, Taddington & Priestcliffe, Winster, Peak Park Parishes Forum | Great Longstone                      | Stanton in Peak, Great Longstone       | Majority of opposition from parish councils        |
|                                         |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                                        |                                                    |
| <b>Stakeholders (18)</b>                |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                             |                                      |                                        |                                                    |
|                                         | Majority including National Trust, Ramblers, Community Land Trusts | CPRE Peak District, Hope Valley Climate Action                                                                                                                              | Business Peak District, Forward Land | Hotel Solutions, British Horse Society | Strong support but some opposition and uncertainty |

| Group            | Yes | No | Unsure | No Specific Reply | Key Themes/Concerns                                                                                                                        |
|------------------|-----|----|--------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Individuals (26) | 12  | 8  | 3      | 3                 | Split views; supporters emphasize visitor management and accommodation; opponents prioritize permanent housing and managing visitor impact |

### Policy Implications

Policy should:

- Clarify the rationale behind spatial objectives, especially around visitor accommodation and affordable housing.
- Reassess policies to prioritize permanent housing where shortages exist and manage conversion of agricultural buildings.
- Develop and communicate visitor management strategies addressing parking, wild camping, and sustainable tourism impacts.
- Balance expansion of recreation hubs and trail networks with community capacity to avoid overdevelopment.
- Enhance support for cycle routes and sustainable travel in response to concerns over day-to-day journey needs.
- Continue engagement with stakeholders and communities to refine objectives before next consultation.



## 6.2 Recreation and Tourism – Recreation attractions and hubs

### Summary

Issue 6.2 addresses the proposed definition and mapping of **Recreation Attractions** and **Recreation Hubs**, mostly outside settlements where development is currently restricted except by exception. The policy aims to clarify what types of development are permitted to support recreational visits. The consultation asked whether respondents support defining these areas on a map with specific planning policies.

There were 55 responses:

- Yes: 23 (42%)
- No: 17 (31%)
- Unsure: 4 (7%)
- No specific reply: 11 (20%)

Concerns included:

- Publicising hubs and attractions may increase visitor pressure.
- Lack of resources to enforce policy.
- Development intensification in unsuitable countryside locations.
- Preference for transport hubs over recreation hubs.
- Desire for visitor dispersal to minimize impact.

Half of the parish councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum opposed the approach. It was supported by Natural England, the National Trust, and two-thirds of responding local authorities. There is a clear need to better communicate the policy's purpose and scope.

### Analysis of Responses

| Group                          | Yes             | No | Unsure | No Specific Reply | Key Themes / Concerns |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----|--------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Government Agencies (1)</b> | Natural England |    |        |                   | Supportive            |

| Group                                   | Yes                                                                                | No                                                                                                                                               | Unsure                                  | No Specific Reply                                                                | Key Themes / Concerns                                           |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Local Authorities (6)</b>            | Derbyshire County, Derbyshire Dales DC, Sheffield City, Staffordshire Moorlands DC | Derbyshire Dales DC (1 unsure)                                                                                                                   |                                         | Oldham Council (no reply)                                                        | Mostly supportive, some unsure or no reply                      |
| <b>Parish Councils &amp; Forum (16)</b> | Great Longstone, Holme Valley, Stanton in Peak                                     | Bamford with Thornhill, Edale, Eyam, Great Hucklow, Hartington Town Quarter, Hope & Derwent Woodlands, Hope with Aston, Peak Park Parishes Forum | Castleton                               | Middleton & Smerrill, Over Haddon, Taddington & Priestcliffe, Winster (no reply) | Majority opposition among parish councils and forum             |
| <b>Stakeholders (11)</b>                | National Trust, Rural Action Derbyshire, Trans Pennine Trail & Sustrans            | Country Landowners Association, Derbyshire Association of Local Councils, Marsh Farm Development Company                                         | Greater Manchester & High Peak Ramblers | Bradwell CLT, Devonshire Group, Hotel Solutions, Youlgrave CLT (no reply)        | Supportive stakeholders balanced by some opposition             |
| <b>Individuals (20)</b>                 | 11                                                                                 | 6                                                                                                                                                | 1                                       | 2                                                                                | Support with suggestions; opposition based on pressure concerns |

## Policy Implications

Policy will:

- Need to **better articulate the purpose and scope** of the policy, clarifying what is and isn't covered by it.
- Address **concerns about intensification and visitor pressure** at designated hubs by balancing infrastructure capacity and environmental protection.
- Consider the **relationship between Recreation Hubs policy and existing settlement policies**, ensuring clarity on policy boundaries and effects.
- Explore **strategic, flexible approaches** that allow appropriate development across the park, avoiding rigid location restrictions.
- Increase emphasis on **visitor dispersal and transport connectivity**, potentially integrating transport hubs with recreation hubs to reduce localized impacts.
- Engage further with parish councils and local communities to address opposition and improve understanding before the next consultation.

## 6.3 Recreation and Tourism - Temporary camp sites

### Summary

Issue 6.3 focuses on temporary campsites. Current Local Plan policies support development of temporary campsites to enable farm diversification.

Recent amendments to permitted development rights (2023) now allow land to be used as a recreational campsite for up to 60 days per calendar year without full planning permission, for up to 50 tents, motorhomes, or campervans.

This change benefits some landowners by allowing diversification with relatively small investment but may economically impact existing touring camping and caravanning sites with established facilities.

In busy areas, multiple temporary sites can cumulatively create negative landscape impacts due to the 'constant' presence of tents, motorhomes, caravans, and associated facilities.

The National Park Authority can request the Government to remove permitted development rights through an Article 4 Direction, applicable to the whole National Park or defined areas, requiring evidence of harm. With this, landowners must apply for planning permission as usual.

The consultation question asked if the Authority should seek an Article 4 Direction, its geographical and temporal scope, and what harm is caused by current permitted development rights.

Of 49 responses to whether to apply for an Article 4 Direction, 59% supported it, 14% opposed, and the remainder were unsure or did not reply specifically.

Concerns against the Article 4 Direction included that it falls outside the Local Plan scope, economic benefits to farmers, issues with campervan parking, discouragement of wild camping, and fears it would reduce visitors and harm the local economy.

Those unsure were concerned about economic effects or believed the issue should be addressed case-by-case.

Over half (63%) of parish councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum supported the proposed Article 4 Direction approach. Two local authorities supported the approach but also submitted additional responses opposing or not replying specifically.

| Category                                              | Details                                                                           | Data / Summary                                                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Total Responses</b>                                | Number of responses to Article 4 Direction question                               | 49 total                                                                                        |
| <b>Responses on Article 4 Direction</b>               | Support, oppose, unsure, no reply                                                 | Yes: 29 (59%)<br>No: 7 (14%)<br>Unsure: 7 (14%)<br>No reply: 6 (12%)                            |
| <b>Government Agencies</b>                            | Responses                                                                         | Environment Agency: No specific reply<br>Natural England: No specific reply                     |
| <b>Local Authorities</b>                              | Derbyshire Dales, Staffordshire Moorlands, High Peak Borough                      | Derbyshire Dales: Yes + No<br>Staffordshire Moorlands: Yes + No<br>reply<br>High Peak: No reply |
| <b>Parish Councils &amp; Peak Park Parishes Forum</b> | 16 responses                                                                      | Yes: 10 (63%)<br>No: 4<br>Unsure: 2<br>No reply: 1                                              |
| <b>Stakeholders (7 responses)</b>                     | Derbyshire Assoc. Local Councils, Marsh Farm Dev, Rural Action Derbyshire, others | Yes: 3<br>No: 2<br>Unsure: 2                                                                    |
| <b>Individuals (18 responses)</b>                     | General public                                                                    | Yes: 14<br>No: 1<br>Unsure: 2<br>No reply: 1                                                    |
| <b>Extent of Permitted Development Removal</b>        | Views on removing 60-day PD right entirely or reverting to 28 days                | Remove entirely: 9<br>Revert to 28 days: 18 (two-thirds favoured 28 days)                       |

| Category                                         | Details                                                                                         | Data / Summary                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Geographical Scope of Article 4 Direction</b> | Areas suggested for PD removal                                                                  | Whole National Park: 11<br>Sites with impact: 2<br>Several locations: 1<br>Other/discretionary: 3   |
| <b>Problems Identified with 60-Day PD Right</b>  | Most common problems                                                                            | Visual/landscape impact: 12<br>Impact on residents (noise, amenity): 7<br>Traffic/congestion: 5     |
|                                                  | Other issues                                                                                    | Negative impact on existing sites: 3<br>Enforcement difficult: 3<br>Increased visitor's pressure: 2 |
|                                                  | Environmental concerns, waste, fire risk, light pollution, litter, habitat damage: multiple     | Each cited by 1-2 respondents                                                                       |
| <b>Benefits / Concerns Against Article 4</b>     | Economic benefit, discouragement of wild camping, concern about impact on tourism/economy       | Economic benefit to farmers: 4<br>Tourism revenue concerns: 1<br>Wild camping discouraged: 1        |
| <b>Supporter Comments Highlights</b>             | Visual impact, community nuisance, need to control motorhomes/caravans separately               | Emphasized landscape harm, community impacts, and differentiation between tents and motorhomes      |
| <b>Opposition Comments Highlights</b>            | Process outside Local Plan scope, economic benefit to farmers, concerns about campervan parking | Suggested Article 4 decision is separate process, emphasized benefits of current PD rights          |

## **Policy Implications**

Fifty-nine percent of respondents supported seeking an Article 4 Direction relating to temporary campsites. Of supporters, two-thirds favoured reverting to the 28-day permitted development limit.

The general consensus was for the Article 4 Direction to apply to the whole National Park.

Impacts identified include visual/landscape harm, impact on local residents' amenity, and issues with traffic, congestion, and access.

The National Park Authority is currently assessing harm related to the 60-day permitted development right. Based on this assessment, the Authority will decide whether to pursue an Article 4 Direction.

## 6.4 Recreation and Tourism – Touring caravan and camping sites

### Summary

Issue 6.4 addresses touring camping and caravan sites, supported by current Local Plan policies to promote farm diversification and affordable visitor accommodation.

Restrictions on operating months are considered necessary due to increased landscape impact in winter, community respite, and unsuitability of sites for full-time residential use.

Current policy limits occupancy by any one person to 28 days per year, but operating periods are usually defined by planning conditions.

There is a perceived policy gap regarding seasonal operation restrictions, which this consultation seeks to address.

Question 26 asked if operations should be restricted seasonally and if occupancy limits should remain.

### Analysis of Responses

#### Response Category Seasonal Operation Restriction (Q25a) Occupancy Restriction (Q25b)

|                        |           |           |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Yes                    | 24 (59%)  | 28 (68%)  |
| No                     | 6 (15%)   | 4 (10%)   |
| Unsure                 | 5 (12%)   | 2 (5%)    |
| No specific reply      | 6 (15%)   | 7 (17%)   |
| <b>Total responses</b> | <b>41</b> | <b>41</b> |

### Key Points from Responses:

- Majority (59%) support restricting operation to certain months to reduce winter landscape impacts.
- Majority (68%) agree with maintaining 28-day occupancy limits.
- Concerns from dissenters include:
  - Restrictions may be unnecessary if landscape impacts can be mitigated.



- Unfairness compared to unrestricted roadside campervan parking.
- Need for improved guidance to applicants.
- Unsure respondents often cited economic concerns or questioned the necessity of seasonal restrictions.
- Parish councils and Peak Park Parishes Forum showed strong support (71% for seasonal restrictions and over 81% for occupancy limits).
- Mixed views from local authorities and stakeholders, with some uncertainty or no specific reply.
- Government Environment Agency provided no specific reply.

### **Policy Implications**

The National Park Authority will develop policy to restrict the operation of touring camping and caravan sites to certain months of the year, likely aligning with British Summer Time and Easter periods, with potential for exceptions.

The existing occupancy limit of 28 days per calendar year per person will be maintained.

These measures aim to balance landscape protection with farm diversification and visitor access.

Future guidance may be enhanced to address landscape impacts more effectively and clarify policy expectations for applicants.

The Authority will consider concerns regarding unfairness compared to roadside parking in ongoing policy development.

## **6.5 Recreation and Tourism - Static Caravans, Lodges, and Other Permanent Structures**

## Summary

Issue 6.5 addresses the use of static caravans, lodges, and other permanent structures as holiday accommodation within campsites or holiday parks. The current Local Plan does not permit such structures except in exceptional circumstances where they have minimal impact on the landscape. These permanent structures often require fixed foundations and connections to utilities, which can cause significant and lasting harm to the landscape, especially when combined with additional infrastructure such as access tracks and parking.

The consultation recognized that many products marketed as ‘pods or shepherd’s huts increasingly resemble large lodges or static caravans, leading to growing concern over their permanent presence and visual impact. Although the current approach is restrictive, there is a need to clarify exceptions, particularly in relation to what constitutes ‘small and simple’ structures, potential locations beyond farmsteads and woodlands, and the allowance for structures where harm is negligible. The consultation received 43 responses, with nearly three-quarters supporting continued restrictions on such permanent holiday accommodation, while a minority opposed. Parish councils showed strong agreement with the proposed restrictive approach.

## Analysis of Responses

### Response Category Restrict Policy (Q27a)

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Yes                    | 32 (74%)  |
| No                     | 5 (12%)   |
| Unsure                 | 2 (5%)    |
| No specific reply      | 4 (9%)    |
| <b>Total responses</b> | <b>43</b> |

## **Policy Implications**

The National Park Authority will continue to restrict static caravans, chalets, lodges, and other large, permanent holiday accommodation structures to protect landscape and special qualities.

Policy will better define what constitutes 'small and simple structures' to clarify exceptions.

Exceptions will likely be limited to cases with minimal landscape and biodiversity impact, possibly close to farmsteads or woodland locations, and subject to strict criteria including design, scale, and environmental considerations. Robust guidelines will be developed to ensure permitted exceptions do not compromise National Park purposes.

## 7.1 Local Plan Spatial Objectives for Housing

### Summary

This document outlines proposed spatial objectives for housing development in the Peak District National Park up to 2045. The plan supports building between 960 and 2000 new homes distributed across three landscape areas (White Peak, Dark Peak, South West Peak), prioritizing new uses for heritage buildings, and encouraging affordable local needs housing in locations sensitive to landscape and access considerations. Public consultation revealed mixed opinions: some support the approach for addressing demographic shifts and affordable housing needs; others expressed uncertainty or opposition, concerned about landscape preservation, clarity of figures, and sufficiency of affordable housing. Overall, the spatial housing objectives lack clear majority support, highlighting the need for more detailed evidence and clarity on housing figures, types, and development sites.

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Category | Number of Respondents | Key Points Raised                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Support           | 26                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Need to address demographic change</li><li>- Importance of affordable housing and specialist housing for older people</li><li>- Rational distribution of housing targets</li><li>- Commendation of evidence base supporting the plan</li></ul>              |
| Unsure            | 14                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Unclear calculation of 960-2000 housing figure</li><li>- Questioning uniform targets per settlement</li><li>- Concern over external housing pressures from neighbouring areas</li><li>- Uncertainty about actual need for more affordable housing</li></ul> |
| Oppose            | 10                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Priority on conservation over housing growth</li><li>- Belief that new housing targets are misguided or unattainable</li><li>- Targets for affordable housing seen as too low</li></ul>                                                                     |

| <b>Response Category</b> | <b>Number of Respondents</b> | <b>Key Points Raised</b>                                                |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                          |                              | - Concern over impact on historic landscapes and National Park identity |
| <b>No Direct Answer</b>  | 15                           | - No specific comments provided                                         |

### **Policy Implications**

The spatial housing approach currently lacks broad support and requires further refinement.

Greater clarity and transparency are needed on:

- How the housing targets (960-2000 homes) were derived.
- The balance between affordable and market housing within these figures.
- The allocation between greenfield and brownfield development sites.

Policy development should emphasize protecting the National Park's landscape and heritage assets while addressing demographic and affordable housing needs.

Engage further with stakeholders to build consensus and address concerns about housing impact and conservation priorities.

7.2 Local Plan Spatial Objectives - Holiday Homes and Permanent Homes

Summary

This issue focuses on addressing the impact of holiday homes on housing availability and affordability for local residents within the Peak District National Park. While holiday homes provide income and support farm diversification, high concentrations negatively affect community sustainability. The consultation proposed three policy options: (1) no change, allowing new homes to be either permanent or holiday homes; (2) a park-wide permanent residence clause restricting new homes to permanent residency only; and (3) a permanent residence clause applied only to specific settlements with high holiday home concentrations. There was clear overall support for implementing a permanent residence clause, particularly a park-wide approach, to protect rural settlements and local community needs. However, concerns remain about implementation, exceptions for certain properties, and the balance between holiday accommodation benefits and community sustainability.

Analysis of Responses

| Response Category                                       | Number of Respondents | Key Points Raised                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Support Park-wide permanent residence clause (Option 2) | 39                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Prevents decline of rural settlements</li><li>- Avoids concentration of holiday homes</li><li>- Supports local economy and community sustainability</li><li>- Tight controls needed on exemptions (farm diversification, countryside buildings)</li><li>- Recognizes seasonal emptiness and low economic contribution of holiday homes</li></ul> |

| Response Category                                                     | Number of Respondents                                            | Key Points Raised                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Support permanent residence clause in specific settlements (Option 3) | 10                                                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targets areas with high holiday home concentrations</li> <li>- Easier to implement locally</li> <li>- Recognizes some settlements may not need restrictions</li> <li>- Emphasizes local determination and flexibility</li> </ul> |
| No policy change (Option 1)                                           | 4                                                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Holiday homes provide essential income and support local business</li> <li>- Belief that holiday homes and local housing can coexist</li> <li>- Suggest alternative measures like council tax or multipliers</li> </ul>          |
| Not stated / Other                                                    | 12 (including 8 generally supporting permanent residence clause) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Varied or unspecified preferences</li> <li>- Some general support for permanent residence clause without specifying options</li> </ul>                                                                                           |
| Unsure                                                                | 1                                                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No detailed comment provided</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                          |

### Policy Implications

There is strong support to impose restrictions on new dwellings to ensure they are used as permanent residences, particularly across the entire park.

Local Plan policies should allow for well-defined exemptions (e.g., farm diversification, buildings unsuitable for permanent residency, properties in the open countryside) with tight controls to prevent misuse.

A flexible approach may be needed for specific settlements where holiday home concentration varies, balancing local needs and practical implementation.

Review and potentially revise current policies preventing the change of existing holiday homes to permanent residences, particularly where conservation objectives have been met.

Recognize that broader measures like council tax policies or government Use Class changes fall outside Local Planning Authority control but impact holiday home dynamics.

Consider requests from parishes without settlements for permanent residence use of buildings in the open countryside to support dispersed community needs.

Address concerns about the impact of holiday homes on noise, disturbance, and rural character, balancing economic benefits against environmental and social sustainability.



## 7.3 Affordable Housing Eligibility Criteria in the Peak District National Park

### Summary

This issue addresses the eligibility criteria for affordable housing occupation within the Peak District National Park, a key factor in justifying new housing developments on greenfield sites. Current policy limits eligibility based on housing need, local connection, and tenure security. The consultation explored whether these criteria should be widened to reflect local circumstances such as employment in essential services or family connections. Many respondents supported broadening eligibility to include workers in essential services, immediate family ties, and reducing the 10-year local connection to five years to better support sustainable communities and address recruitment challenges. Some opposed widening criteria, concerned about increased demand on greenfield sites and the special landscape purpose of the National Park. Responses on tied accommodation were inconclusive due to lack of clear information.

### Analysis of Responses

| Question                                                       | Yes | No | Unsure | Unspecified | Key Points from Responses                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|--------|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Widen eligibility for RSL-managed affordable housing?</b>   | 34  | 6  | 5      | 11          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for including key workers and immediate family connection</li> <li>- Suggest reducing local connection from 10 to 5 years</li> <li>- Emphasis on housing need over geography</li> <li>- Concerns about administrative complexity</li> <li>- Need to support workforce (nurses, teachers, care workers)</li> <li>- Opposition due to potential pressure on greenfield sites</li> </ul> |
| <b>Widen eligibility for privately owned affordable homes?</b> | 31  | 5  | 4      | 16          | <p>Similar to RSL responses, emphasizing need to broaden criteria for sustainability and essential workers</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

| Question                                  | Yes | No | Unsure | Unspecified | Key Points from Responses                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------|-----|----|--------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Explore new policy on tied accommodation? | 9   | 4  | 15     | 2           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many unsure due to lack of clear explanation</li> <li>- Some support for tied housing in care, tourism, farming sectors</li> <li>- Concerns about tied housing limiting employee career progression</li> <li>- Some feel demand should be prioritized for those with genuine local connection</li> </ul> |

### Policy Implications

A review of eligibility criteria for affordable housing is necessary to consider widening to include essential workers, immediate family connections, and possibly reducing the local connection period from 10 to 5 years.

The cascade mechanism and local connection criteria should be evaluated to balance community sustainability with the National Park's conservation objectives.

Impacts of widening eligibility on demand for greenfield development sites must be carefully assessed to avoid undermining the Park's special purpose.

Additional clarity and information are needed on tied accommodation policies to enable informed consultation in future stages.

Consideration should be given to employment-linked eligibility criteria, balancing administrative feasibility with fairness and local housing needs.

Coordination with Issue 31 is recommended to align policies and responses regarding affordable housing eligibility and management.

## 7.4 Affordable Housing Eligibility - Local Connection

### Summary

This issue reviews the local connection requirement tied to eligibility for affordable housing, a principle retained but with its precise definition under reconsideration. The current 10-year residency rule, in place for over 20 years, faces divided opinion: some support keeping it, others advocate reducing it to 5 years, reflecting practices in other national parks where local connection definitions vary between 3 and 10 years, sometimes using tiered priority systems. The consultation focuses on whether to retain or reduce the local connection for both Registered Social Landlord (RSL) homes and privately developed affordable homes, redefine “local connection” for returnees, and consider exceptions for rural enterprise needs.

### Questions Asked

- Should the 10-year local connection requirement for first occupation of RSL homes be retained or reduced?
- Should the 10-year local connection requirement for privately developed homes, including self-build, be retained or reduced?
- Should the definition of "local connection" be redefined for people wishing to return to the Peak District?
- Should there be exceptions to the local connection requirement, such as for homes needed to support farming, forestry, or rural enterprises?

### Analysis of Responses

| Question                    | Support<br>Retaining 10-<br>Year | Support<br>Reducing<br>10-Year | Unsure | Other/Unspecified                | Key Points from<br>Responses                                                  |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Retain or<br>reduce 10-year | 21                               | 25                             | 6      | 11 (comments with<br>preference) | - Retention supporters<br>argue 10 years sustains<br>communities, flexibility |

| Question                                                         | Support<br>Retaining 10-<br>Year                                                                   | Support<br>Reducing<br>10-Year | Unsure Other/Unspecified | Key Points from<br>Responses                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| local connection<br>for RSL homes?                               |                                                                                                    |                                |                          | <p>needed for key workers and family connections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction supporters find 10 years too restrictive, advocating 3-7 years; support inclusion of key workers (care, farming, hospitality).</li> <li>- Unsure respondents highlight lack of clear rationale for change, some support local connection generally but want flexibility for essential workers.</li> <li>- Local authorities Favor reduction; Parish Councils split evenly.</li> </ul> |
| Retain or<br>reduce 10-year<br>for private/self-<br>build homes? | <p>Not explicitly<br/>stated but<br/>implied mixed<br/>views aligned<br/>with RSL<br/>response</p> |                                |                          | <p>Reflects crossover in responses and concerns as above.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Redefine 'local<br>connection' for<br>returnees?                 | <p>Not explicitly<br/>quantified</p>                                                               |                                |                          | <p>Some support broader definitions to allow return of locals who have left for study/work.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |

| Question                        | Support           | Support          | Unsure | Other/Unspecified | Key Points from Responses                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                 | Retaining 10-Year | Reducing 10-Year |        |                   |                                                                                                                            |
| Exceptions to local connection? | Mixed views       |                  |        |                   | Suggested for rural enterprises like farming and forestry; some believe exceptions are justified to support these sectors. |

### Policy Implications

There is no clear consensus to change the 10-year local connection requirement, but feedback suggests a need for greater flexibility in eligibility to better support sustainable communities and essential workers.

The local connection policy should be reviewed alongside eligibility criteria (Issue 30) due to their interconnected nature.

Consider introducing tiered or nuanced local connection definitions that prioritize longer-term residents but allow some flexibility for newcomers and essential workers.

Explore specific exceptions for rural enterprises and assess how these exceptions align with National Park conservation goals.

Engage further with stakeholders, including Parish Councils and Local Authorities, to balance housing needs with the National Park's special purposes.

## 7.5 Local Plan Affordable Housing – House Size

### Summary

Affordable homes currently have size restrictions to help keep them affordable in perpetuity, as smaller homes tend to be cheaper. These size limits are based on the Government's Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards (NDSS) published in 2015.

The issue explores whether to retain the principle of size restrictions in the new Local Plan and what size thresholds should apply. It also considers if different standards should apply to locally built homes.

### Analysis of Responses

| Position                                   | Key Points                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | # Respondents |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Support Retaining Size Restrictions</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Maintains long-term affordability</li><li>- Prevents overdevelopment</li><li>- Needs modernisation (e.g. WFH, family growth)</li><li>- Aligns with Homes England standards</li></ul> | 20            |
| <b>Support Removing/Relaxing</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Current sizes are cramped and outdated</li><li>- Doesn't suit flexible modern lifestyles</li><li>- Suggest NDSS as minimum, not maximum</li></ul>                                    | 15            |
| <b>Unsure / Conditional</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Support limited flexibility (e.g. extension allowance)</li><li>- Different rules for private vs RSL</li><li>- Prefer planning obligations to size limits</li></ul>                   | 6             |
| <b>Other Comments</b>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Design should follow Rural Housing guidelines</li><li>- RSLs need discretion</li><li>- Affordability better managed via conditions</li></ul>                                         | —             |

### Implications for Policy Development

There is clear support for exercising flexibility in size restrictions for affordable housing. Policy should:

- Consider revising size standards to better reflect modern housing needs, including homeworking and family growth.

- Differentiate approaches for RSL-managed versus privately developed affordable homes, with more flexibility for the latter.
- Ensure any restrictions or guidelines align with the goal of preserving National Park special qualities and efficient land use.
- Use planning conditions or obligations alongside size standards to secure long-term affordability.

## 8.1 – Challenges and Spatial Objectives

### Summary

This issue focuses on proposed **spatial objectives** intended to support the retention and development of local shops, services, and community facilities. The objectives aim to:

- Support thriving, sustainable communities through access to essential services.
- Reduce the need to travel, encouraging sustainable modes of transport.

The public consultation (Question 33) received 49 responses:

- **Yes** – 39 (79.5%)
- **No** – 3 (6.1%)
- **Unsure** – 2 (4.1%)
- **No specific reply** – 5 (10.2%)

The majority supported the proposed objectives. However, respondents who disagreed or were unsure raised concerns about housing impacts, transport assumptions, the vague term “sustainable communities,” and threats from second-home ownership.

Initial recommendation: proceed with the proposed spatial objectives, addressing key concerns raised.

### Analysis of Responses

| Theme                    | Key Points                                                                     |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| General Support          | Broad agreement that the objectives align with sustainability and local needs. |
| Sustainable Communities  | The term is seen as vague; examples show services often rely on visitors.      |
| Housing and Demographics | Small-scale housing unlikely to reverse population and service decline.        |



| Theme                       | Key Points                                                                       |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Transport and Accessibility | Declining rural transport weakens viability of local services.                   |
| Threats to Infrastructure   | Pubs, shops, and other facilities under pressure from second homes and low use.  |
| Local Economy               | Freelancers and remote workers need better digital infrastructure and workspace. |
| Policy Practicality         | Flexibility is needed for policy to work in both thriving and declining areas.   |

### Policy Implications

The strong level of support provides a clear mandate to adopt the proposed spatial objectives.

Clarifying what is meant by “sustainable communities” will improve policy focus and alignment. The objectives should not assume that small-scale housing development alone can sustain rural services, particularly where demographic and economic trends point in the opposite direction.

A more integrated approach to rural transport is needed, including support for active travel and better alignment with spatial planning. Meanwhile, policies must respond to the pressures placed on community infrastructure by second homes and holiday lets, with tools to retain and support vital services.

## 8.2 The Retention of Shops, Services, Community Facilities and Businesses

### Summary

This issue focuses on expanding protections for community facilities beyond the current policy (HC4(C)), which requires that proposals to change the use of such facilities prove they are no longer needed, viable, or available elsewhere.

The proposed change would expand the list of protected uses to include **shops, cafés, and offices**, in response to the ongoing decline of such facilities in the National Park.

**Question 34** received 41 responses:

- **Yes** – 32 (78%)
- **No** – 3 (7.3%)
- **Unsure** – 3 (7.3%)
- **No specific reply** – 3 (7.3%)

Most respondents supported the proposal, highlighting the need to protect a broader range of services that contribute to community life and economic resilience. Some concerns were raised about prioritisation, particularly around protecting businesses without viability and ensuring medical and care facilities are included.

Initial recommendation: expand the list of protected services, while addressing concerns over service viability and other essential facilities.

### Analysis of Responses

| Theme             | Key Points                                                                   |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| General Support   | Most respondents agreed with expanding protection to shops, cafés, offices.  |
| Economic Benefits | Seen as a way to support local jobs, reduce commuting, and promote vitality. |

| Theme                    | Key Points                                                                       |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Flexibility in Policy    | Some supported protections only if there is flexibility for unviable businesses. |
| Housing and Demographics | Some responses linked policy to housing needs, especially for older people.      |
| Health and Care Services | Some felt medical and care services should be prioritised in the policy.         |
| Opposition to Overreach  | A few questioned why cafés or light industry should be protected if unviable.    |
| Tourism vs Local Needs   | Concerns about converting to housing for tourism rather than community benefit.  |

### Policy Implications

The clear majority in favour supports expanding the list of protected community services and facilities to better reflect the evolving needs of local residents and to counter the ongoing decline in rural services.

However, this expansion should be carefully implemented. Policies must remain flexible—where a business or facility is genuinely no longer viable, alternative uses should still be considered.

Additionally, it's important to prioritise essential services, such as medical and care facilities, which were highlighted as being as important—if not more—than cafés or offices.

Expanding protections must also be balanced with local housing needs, ensuring that conversions to residential use genuinely serve communities and not just the tourism market. Stronger evidence and support mechanisms (such as funding for community-run facilities) could also help make the policy more effective and fairer.

## 9.1 Protection of Bakewell's Special Character and Setting

### Summary:

Bakewell's special character and landscape setting are currently protected through general National Park policies (Core Strategy L1A, GSP3, and Valued Characteristics). However, the current Local Plan does not include a **Bakewell-specific chapter or policy**. This issue explores whether Bakewell's unique development pressures and heritage merit tailored policies in the new Local Plan.

### Analysis of Responses:

#### A. Should there be a Bakewell-specific chapter?

| Response Type          | Number    | Percentage  |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Yes                    | 15        | 48.4%       |
| No                     | 8         | 25.8%       |
| Unsure                 | 3         | 9.6%        |
| No specific reply      | 5         | 16.1%       |
| <b>Total responses</b> | <b>31</b> | <b>100%</b> |

- **Supporters (Yes):**
  - Believe Bakewell faces **unique development pressures**.
  - Want policies to maintain its **distinctive character** (e.g., local materials, historic identity).
  - Emphasised the need to **address congestion** and **enhance transport**, including ideas like reinstating the railway.
- **Opponents (No/Unsure):**
  - Believe existing National Park policies already provide **adequate protection**.
  - View a Bakewell-specific policy as **redundant** or potentially inconsistent with park-wide standards.
  - Accept Bakewell's uniqueness but stress the importance of applying **consistent controls** across the park.

### C. Are Bakewell's qualities properly reflected in Appendix 2?

| Response Type | Number | Percentage |
|---------------|--------|------------|
|---------------|--------|------------|

|     |   |       |
|-----|---|-------|
| Yes | 8 | 25.8% |
|-----|---|-------|

|    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| No | 2 | 6.4% |
|----|---|------|

|        |   |       |
|--------|---|-------|
| Unsure | 5 | 16.1% |
|--------|---|-------|

|                   |    |       |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| No specific reply | 16 | 51.6% |
|-------------------|----|-------|

- **Yes:** Respondents largely felt that the existing framework is consistent and sufficient for all areas.
- **No:** Noted omissions such as the **Agricultural Business Centre** and **Farmers Market**, indicating a potential gap in the documentation of Bakewell's character.

#### Policy Implications:

The responses indicate a clear, though not overwhelming, preference for including a Bakewell-specific chapter in the new Local Plan. Almost half (48%) of respondents supported the idea, citing Bakewell's unique pressures, identity, and importance within the National Park. This suggests a potential case for developing dedicated policies, particularly if further evidence shows that general policies do not fully address Bakewell's distinct needs.

However, the split in opinion — with about a quarter opposed and others unsure — highlights the need for further consultation and evidence gathering. A Bakewell-specific chapter should only be included if a robust justification can be provided, supported by detailed studies on local development pressures, infrastructure challenges, and character preservation needs.

Regarding Appendix 2, although most respondents did not engage with this question, the few who did raise valid points about missing key features. This suggests it may be worthwhile to review and potentially expand Appendix 2 to reflect Bakewell's special functions, such as its role as a market and business centre.

## 10.1 Local Plan Spatial Approach to the Rural Economy

## Summary:

Rural England, including the Peak District, is undergoing significant change driven by shifts in agricultural support, biodiversity markets, carbon trading, and improved digital connectivity. Local authorities see opportunities in knowledge-based, creative, digital industries, tourism, and farming. The Local Plan aims to support business growth that aligns with National Park purposes, focusing on conserving or enhancing the Peak District's landscape, which is its prime economic asset.

The proposed spatial approach to the rural economy includes:

- Supporting business development that conserves and enhances the Peak District's special qualities through farm diversification, reuse of traditional buildings, and new development near key settlements.
- Supporting Bakewell's role as an agricultural market town and tourist hub.
- Protecting and enabling the expansion of well-located existing employment sites.

## Analysis of Responses:

| Response Type                 | Number | Summary of Views                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Support (Yes)</b>          | 32     | Support protecting existing employment sites, flexible use of sites, development at suitable scale, need for broadband, climate and heritage considerations, and recognition of minerals sector contribution. Some concerns about farming practices and business relocation due to site shortages. |
| <b>No clear Yes/No/Unsure</b> | 3      | Suggested including heritage, cautious on landscape/biodiversity impacts, prefer development in settlements/farmsteads, and highlight digital connectivity issues.                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Do Not Support (No)</b>    | 12     | Concerned about over-reliance on tourism and low-paid jobs, oppose development on settlement edges, seek stronger climate emergency actions, want innovation and greener economy focus, and support sustainable reuse of agricultural buildings. Mineral extraction phase-out is controversial.    |

### Policy Implications:

Overall, the proposed spatial approach to supporting the rural economy has broad backing but with clear calls for improvement. Respondents want the policy to place **greater emphasis on nature recovery, climate change mitigation, heritage protection, and improved digital connectivity**, all aligned with national guidance.

Flexibility regarding employment site use is important to support diverse, sustainable business growth, helping prevent businesses from relocating outside the park due to lack of appropriate space.

Criticism focuses on the perception that the current approach is too similar to existing policies and does not sufficiently embrace innovation, a green economy, or address the climate emergency. To address this, the Local Plan should integrate **forward-looking measures** that promote **innovative industries, sustainable farm diversification, and low-carbon development**, including ensuring new or refurbished buildings facilitate active travel and public transport access.

The contentious issue of mineral extraction beyond 2042 highlights the need for careful balancing between economic benefits and environmental protection.

## 10.2 Additional Tests to Control Piecemeal Expansion of Businesses in the National Park

### Summary:

Piecemeal expansion—incremental small extensions—to existing businesses can cumulatively harm the landscape and special qualities of the National Park. Current policy limits extensions to modest increases but does not address the cumulative impact of piecemeal growth, sometimes resulting in developments disproportionate to the original permission. This issue explores whether clearer limits or additional tests are needed, especially for developments in the open countryside.

### Analysis of Responses:

| Suggested Tests / Themes      | Summary                                             |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Define “piecemeal”            | Clear definition needed for better control.         |
| Relocation consideration      | Encourage relocation over ongoing piecemeal growth. |
| Climate & nature crisis tests | Expansion must address environmental impact.        |

| Suggested Tests / Themes       | Summary                                                |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Assess cumulative impact       | Review total expansion as a single application.        |
| Support planned, scaled growth | Promote controlled, well-planned expansion.            |
| Appropriate location           | Extensions must fit settlement/landscape context.      |
| Sympathetic design             | Development should enhance landscape and nature.       |
| Needs assessment               | Business growth should be justified by clear need.     |
| Flexibility with protection    | Balance growth support with safeguarding NP qualities. |
| Alternative site viability     | Relocation to core sites preferred if less impactful.  |

### Policy Implications:

There is broad support for continuing to support businesses within the National Park while safeguarding its special qualities from harmful piecemeal growth. Many agree current policy tests are generally sufficient if rigorously applied but emphasize the need to **clearly define piecemeal expansion** to avoid ambiguity.

New policy should require a **holistic assessment of cumulative impacts**, ensuring expansions are evaluated as a whole rather than in isolated parts. It should integrate tests addressing **climate and nature crises**, ensuring business growth aligns with environmental sustainability.

Policy should also encourage or require businesses to consider **relocation to appropriate employment sites** when expansion in sensitive areas threatens the landscape, releasing existing sites for alternative beneficial uses, such as affordable housing.

A balance between **flexibility to support economic vitality** and **strong safeguards to protect the National Park's landscape and heritage** is essential. Planned, sensitively designed, and well-located expansions that maintain or enhance special qualities should be prioritized.



## 11.1 Conversion of Whole Farmsteads to New Uses

### Summary:

Traditional farmsteads are a key part of the Peak District’s heritage. Many are no longer operational farms, but policies currently discourage changing the use of entire farmsteads, focusing instead on supporting farming and farm diversification.

The proposed approach accepts conversion of whole farmsteads (no longer in farming use) for business or residential use only if they are in or on the edge of settlements, physically related to settlements, and in sustainable locations with close access to a main road. For isolated farmsteads in open countryside, only low-intensity uses (e.g., holiday accommodation) would be acceptable. All conversions should seek enhancement, including removal of modern agricultural buildings.

### Analysis of Responses:

| Theme                                              | Summary of Views                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Support for location criteria                      | Conversion near settlements, sustainable locations favored (with caveats).         |
| Support for low-intensity uses in open countryside | Mixed support; holiday accommodation debated as not truly low-intensity.           |
| Heritage and conservation focus                    | Strong desire to conserve/enhance heritage assets.                                 |
| Flexibility and “on merits” approach               | Calls for case-by-case assessment rather than strict rules.                        |
| Concern over holiday accommodation                 | Seen as disruptive, not always low-intensity, especially in dispersed communities. |
| Access considerations                              | Preference for conversion sites close to roads (not necessarily main roads).       |
| Farming continuity and diversification             | Strong support to keep farmsteads in farming or diversify to support agriculture.  |
| Definitions needed                                 | Clear definitions for “low-intensity use” and “no longer in farming use” required. |

## **Policy Implications:**

Policy should:

- Support continuation of farming and farm diversification to reduce loss of farmsteads from active agriculture.
- Adopt a flexible, case-by-case approach to conversion proposals, allowing for local circumstances and merits rather than strict blanket rules.
- Provide a clear definition of “low-intensity uses”, recognizing that holiday accommodation may not always fit this description, and consider community impacts carefully.
- Recognize that in parishes with no central settlement, permanent housing conversions are often preferred over holiday accommodation to support community sustainability.
- Promote business reuse of barns and farm buildings that align with National Park purposes, including climate change mitigation and biodiversity net gain.
- Policy should require buildings to have reasonable access to a road, though not necessarily a main road.
- Emphasize conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and landscape character as key criteria in any conversion.
- Address concerns over potential speculative sales and land banking by clarifying how “no longer in farming use” is determined.

## 11.2 Primary Business Ownership of Redundant Farm Buildings

### Summary:

Many older farm buildings are unsuitable for modern agriculture and may be converted to small-scale business uses. Current policy requires that the primary land management business (usually the farm) retains ownership and control of these buildings to ensure income supports appropriate land management and to avoid incongruous development.

Stakeholders suggested this may be too restrictive in all cases. Some redundant heritage buildings might be better conserved through sensitive conversion to stand-alone businesses, which could also reflect local skills and support the local economy.

The issue is whether the requirement for primary land management ownership should continue in all cases.

### Analysis:

#### Viewpoint

#### Key Points

**Support retention of ownership** - Prevents neglect of land/infrastructure.

- Maintains historic, landscape, and cultural consistency.
- Supports farming landscape and community.
- Avoids fragmented ownership and risk of inappropriate development.
- Ensures cohesive site management. |  
| **Against retention requirement** | - Could stifle economic development.
- More flexibility needed to attract/retain businesses and create jobs.
- Selling redundant buildings may support farm viability.
- Allows skilled, enthusiastic new enterprises to flourish.
- Should be decided case-by-case via planning applications. |  
| **Unsure / Conditional** | - Should be based on need and merits.
- Concerns over access rights and management if ownership fragmented.

- Prefers a simple assumption that farm retains ownership unless justified otherwise. |  
| **Additional Comments** | - Restrictive policy may risk the primary farming business itself.
- Decisions should be on individual merits. |

### **Policy Implications:**

Majority support maintaining the current policy requiring farm business ownership/control. Policy should:

- Need to ensure farm buildings maintain strong links with the surrounding land and landscape.
- Policy should retain flexibility to support farm diversification and allow new business start-ups where appropriate.
- Promote nature recovery and consider impacts on cultural heritage, sustainable development, and thriving rural communities.
- Reflect on employment needs and lessons from relevant case studies in future policy updates.

## **12.1 Travel and Transport – Proposed Spatial Objectives**

### **Summary:**

The key spatial objective linked to travel and transport in the National Park Management Plan is:

**Objective 1:** To significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, focusing on major emitters under our influence.

Challenges include:

- The Authority only controls planning policy for car parks, not other travel/transport aspects.
- Traffic flows increased by 16% between 2012 and 2023.
- Road transport is the third largest CO2 emitter in the Peak District.
- Car journeys and parking negatively impact special qualities of the park.

- Resident concerns over parking and visitor traffic management.
- Growing electric vehicle adoption requires supportive infrastructure aligned with National Park purposes.

**Proposed spatial objectives for travel and transport:**

- Encourage development patterns reducing travel needs and supporting sustainable travel (public transport, active travel).
- Resist proposals that increase cross-park traffic, including new roads.
- Support infrastructure for low/zero carbon transport.
- Protect and expand strategic multi-user trails.
- Create and protect walking, cycling, wheeling, and horse-riding routes.
- Collaborate with partners to reduce traffic and impacts at recreational hubs.

**Analysis:**

| <b>Response</b>   | <b>Count</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Yes               | 45           | 63%               |
| No                | 13           | 18%               |
| Partial Agreement | 6            | 8%                |
| Unsure            | 3            | 4%                |
| No Specific Reply | 5            | 7%                |

- Strong overall support for the proposed spatial objectives.
- Suggested amendments will be considered during draft Plan development.

## 12.2 Visitor Parking

### Summary:

This issue focuses on parking for visitors at attractions, recreation hubs, and villages, covering cars, vans, motorcycles, and camper vans.

The Peak District receives up to 26 million visits annually; around 75% are within a 1-hour travel catchment.

- Up to 85% of visits are made by private car or van.
- Many visitor destinations are remote with limited or no public transport, causing parking demand to often exceed supply. Expanding parking is physically difficult and risks harming the National Park's setting and special qualities.

Current policy allows new or extended parking only where a clear need is demonstrated, with a requirement to remove on-street parking if off-street parking is added.

### Analysis

| Option                  | Responses | Percentage |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Less restrictive policy | 24        | 32%        |
| More restrictive policy | 18        | 24%        |
| Retain current policy   | 13        | 18%        |
| No specific reply       | 13        | 18%        |
| Unsure                  | 5         | 7%         |
| None of the options     | 1         | 1%         |

- No clear majority preference.
- The 'less restrictive' option was most popular but closely followed by 'more restrictive.'
- Retaining the current policy was the third most preferred option.
- Current policy seen as a balanced approach by its supporters.

- Both more and less restrictive options have trade-offs: potential harm from new car parks vs. parking shortages at popular spots.

#### **Policy Implications:**

Current policy balances the opposing views fairly well.

Policy should consider the feedback while developing the draft plan, weighing the pros and cons of increasing or decreasing parking restrictions.

### **12.3 Safeguarding and protecting multi-user trails on former railway routes**

#### **Summary:**

This issue focuses on two multi-user trails, the Monsal Trail and Longdendale Trail (part of the Trans Pennine Trail), both following former cross-Park railway track-beds linking Manchester with Derby and Sheffield respectively. After railway closures in 1968 (Monsal) and 1981 (Longdendale), these routes were repurposed as trails. There have been calls to reopen the lines, including proposals for heritage railway use on the Monsal Trail. National plans have not included reopening these railways, with Transport for the North and Midlands Connect focusing on other Trans Pennine routes.

Current policy safeguards these routes for potential future rail reinstatement but does not indicate support for reopening. Any rail reinstatement requires provision of an alternative trail of equal or better quality beforehand. Since completion of the Pedal Peak District Project in 2011, the uninterrupted 8.5-mile Monsal Trail has seen dramatically increased use and supports local businesses.

Respondents were asked to choose between two options:

Option 1: Continue safeguarding both trails for future rail use.

Option 2: Protect the trails from development that conflicts with their current recreational use.

There were 112 responses (the highest for any question). Some respondents preferred a change in policy for the Monsal Trail (Option 2) but wished to continue safeguarding the Longdendale Trail for rail use (Option 1).

#### **Policy Implications:**

There were strong arguments for both options. However, 60% of respondents supported Option 2, with about one-third supporting Option 1. Based on this, the preferred approach going forward will be to protect the Monsal and Longdendale Trails primarily for their current recreational use, subject

to further clarification. This reflects community support for retaining and enhancing the trails as valued multi-user recreational routes, while balancing the potential for any future rail reinstatement with the need to safeguard existing trail use and benefits to local businesses and visitors.

## 12.4 Travel and Transport - Road building schemes

### **Summary:**

This issue focuses on local road building schemes intended to increase capacity for local needs. The National Park Authority has consistently opposed road schemes that increase cross-Park traffic, including opposition to the Mottram-Hollingworth-Tintwistle bypass (2007) and the A57 Link Roads scheme (2022) due to their negative impact on the Park's Special Qualities. National policy generally does not support major development within national parks, including road building, unless exceptional circumstances apply. Current policy permits remedial works addressing road safety concerns—often related to geological instability—and allows new roads to provide access for housing or industrial developments. Previous policy allowed some local road schemes aimed at congestion relief but this was removed in 2011. Despite repeated calls for bypasses in some villages, many such schemes would likely increase cross-Park traffic due to their location on strategic highways. Respondents were asked if new policy should support road building schemes primarily for local capacity enhancement. There were 49 responses.

### **Policy Implications:**

Just over half of respondents (51%) did not support local road building schemes to increase capacity, though parish councils showed strong support for such schemes. There remains a general presumption against road building in national parks, with the National Planning Policy Framework's major development test requiring that such development be in the national interest. Current policy already supports many of the scenarios cited by respondents, including support for housing and business development and remedial safety works. Based on consultation responses, continuing with the current policy approach is preferred.



## 12.5 Travel and Transport - Overnight parking for campervans

### **Summary:**

Issue 12.5 focuses on overnight parking provision for campervans. Since the Covid-19 pandemic, campervan visits to the National Park have increased significantly. Many park overnight on roadsides or in free car parks, although most National Park car parks, including those owned by the National Park Authority, prohibit overnight parking. Most campervan users do not use touring caravan or camping sites within the park. Local residents have reported negative impacts from campervans parked roadside, including visual intrusion, displacement of other vehicles, litter, and organic waste. Touring caravan and camping sites provide facilities considered best suited for campervans, but some car parks with appropriate facilities (such as toilets) might be suitable for limited overnight parking, subject to limits on stay duration and no negative impact on local environment or residents' amenity. Respondents were asked whether new policy should support overnight stays in certain car parks for campervans or holiday homes. There were 48 responses.

### **Analysis of Responses:**

Responses to whether new policy should support overnight stays in car parks for campervans and/or holiday homes were:

- Yes: 24 (50%)
- No: 18 (38%)
- Unsure: 3 (6%)
- No specific reply: 3 (6%)

Among 19 individual respondents, 9 (47%) supported new policy to allow overnight stays, while 8 (42%) opposed it.

### **Policy Implications:**

Half of the consultation responses supported provision of overnight parking in car parks for campervans, while 38% opposed. Parish councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum were evenly split with a slight majority in favour. This is a challenging issue due to the popularity of campervans and negative impacts of roadside parking, including visual, environmental, and amenity concerns. Designated overnight parking in car parks could help mitigate these issues, but such facilities are

limited, would likely require charges, and reduce parking availability for other users. Suitable car parks are generally located within settlements, increasing potential impacts on local amenity and potentially making them unattractive to campervan users. Given these considerations, it is unlikely that a policy supporting overnight campervan parking in car parks will be adopted.

## 12.6 Travel and Transport - Air transport

### Summary:

Issue 12.6 focuses on the use of land within the National Park for aircraft take-off and landing sites, including organised flying fields for model aircraft and remote-controlled aircraft (drones). This covers both powered and unpowered flight. The Peak District is popular for various non-commercial flights. Camphill airfield is the National Park's only formal airfield, home to the Derbyshire & Lancashire Gliding Club and the Derbyshire Soaring Club, operational since 1935. Other areas such as Mam Tor, Rushup Edge, and Pym Chair are popular for hang-gliding and para-gliding. Occasional use of land for take-off and landing (up to 28 days/year) is covered by the General Permitted Development Order, but where regular use causes amenity issues or threatens ground-nesting birds, the Authority can use an Article 4 Direction to remove these rights. There were 46 responses to this question.

### Analysis of Responses:

Responses were grouped into an additional option (Option 1a): 'Aircraft take-off and landing sites will not normally be permitted except standby sites for emergency helicopters.'

- Aircraft take-off and landing sites will not normally be permitted: 14 (33%)
- Aircraft take-off and landing sites will not normally be permitted, except for commercial drones and standby sites for emergency helicopters: 11 (24%)
- Aircraft take-off and landing sites will not normally be permitted except standby sites for emergency helicopters: 9 (17%)
- Unsure: 8 (17%)
- No specific reply: 4 (9%)

### Policy Implications:

Half of the consultation responses supported either continuation of the current policy or an exception for standby sites for emergency helicopters. Parish councils showed relatively strong

support for emergency helicopter standby sites. Emergency helicopters are already permitted to take off and land as part of their operations, so any standby site provision would be aligned with emergency services' operational needs. There is also support for mapping 'no-fly' zones for commercial drones to protect environmentally sensitive areas, but this requires further consideration during Plan development.

### 13.1 Utilities - Proposed spatial objectives

#### **Summary:**

Issue 13.1 focuses on the proposed spatial objectives for Utilities. The spatial objectives of the National Park Management Plan are:

- Objective 1: To lower greenhouse gas emissions significantly, focusing on the largest emitters within our influence
- Objective 6: To protect and enhance the natural beauty of the Peak District National Park's contrasting and ever-evolving landscape
- Objective 10: To support sustainable communities by improving opportunities for affordable housing and connection to services

The challenge for utilities is ensuring that national park purposes are given due weight in the planning and development of utilities infrastructure. The proposed spatial objective is:

- That new or upgraded utilities infrastructure does not adversely affect the Peak District's Special Qualities.

Respondents were asked if they agreed with the proposed spatial objective for utilities; there was a total of 46 responses to this question.

#### **Analysis of Responses:**

Do you agree with the proposed local plan spatial objective for utilities?

- Yes: 33 (73%)
- No: 5 (11%)
- Unsure: 1 (2%)
- No specific reply: 6 (13%)

We received responses from two Government Agencies, both of which agreed with the proposed spatial objective.

#### **Government Agency Response**

Environment Agency Yes

Natural England Yes

We received three responses from Local Authorities. One agreed with the spatial objective whilst two did not.

| <b>Local Authority</b> | <b>Response</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------|
|------------------------|-----------------|

|                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Derbyshire Dales District Council | Yes |
|-----------------------------------|-----|

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| High Peak Borough Council | No |
|---------------------------|----|

|                                          |    |
|------------------------------------------|----|
| Staffordshire Moorlands District Council | No |
|------------------------------------------|----|

We received 11 responses from parish councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum. Ten (91%) agreed with the proposed spatial objective, one (9%) was unsure.

| <b>Parish Council</b> | <b>Response</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
|-----------------------|-----------------|

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Bamford with Thornhill | Yes |
|------------------------|-----|

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| Edale | Yes |
|-------|-----|

|      |     |
|------|-----|
| Eyam | Yes |
|------|-----|

|                                            |     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|
| Great Hucklow, Little Hucklow and Grindlow | Yes |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|

|                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Hartington Town Quarter | Yes |
|-------------------------|-----|

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Hope with Aston | Yes |
|-----------------|-----|

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Peak Park Parishes Forum | Yes |
|--------------------------|-----|

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Stanton in Peak | Yes |
|-----------------|-----|

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Taddington & Priestcliffe | Yes |
|---------------------------|-----|

| Parish Council | Response |
|----------------|----------|
|----------------|----------|

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| Tideswell | Yes |
|-----------|-----|

|             |        |
|-------------|--------|
| Over Haddon | Unsure |
|-------------|--------|

We received 12 responses from the following stakeholders. Seven (58%) agreed with the proposed spatial objective, one did not, and four gave no specific reply.

| Stakeholder | Response |
|-------------|----------|
|-------------|----------|

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Country Landowners Association | Yes |
|--------------------------------|-----|

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| Derbyshire ALC | Yes |
|----------------|-----|

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Devonshire Group | Yes |
|------------------|-----|

|                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Greater Manchester and High Peak Area of the Ramblers | Yes |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Marsh Farm Development Company | Yes |
|--------------------------------|-----|

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Trans Pennine Trail & Sustrans | Yes |
|--------------------------------|-----|

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| United Utilities | Yes |
|------------------|-----|

|                         |    |
|-------------------------|----|
| Rural Action Derbyshire | No |
|-------------------------|----|

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Business Peak District | No specific reply |
|------------------------|-------------------|

|                                        |                   |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------|
| CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire | No specific reply |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------|

|               |                   |
|---------------|-------------------|
| National Grid | No specific reply |
|---------------|-------------------|

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| National Trust | No specific reply |
|----------------|-------------------|

There were 18 responses from individuals, with 78% agreeing with the proposed spatial objective. Two (11%) did not agree, and two did not specifically reply.

- Yes: 14 (78%)
- No: 2 (11%)
- Unsure: (%)
- No specific reply: 2 (11%)

**Policy Implications:**

There was very clear support for the proposed spatial objective for utilities from a broad range of respondents including government agencies, parish councils, stakeholders, and individuals. This strong backing means the spatial objective can be confidently taken forward into the draft Plan.

### 13.2 Utilities - The development of new or expanded reservoirs

**Summary**

Issue 13.2 focusses on the development of new reservoirs or the expansion of existing ones. The Peak District contains a significant number of existing reservoirs which collect drinking water for distribution to the Park's surrounding urban areas. These include chains of multiple reservoirs in the Upper Derwent, Goyt and Longdendale valleys. In addition, the National Park contains reservoirs associated with the operation of the canal network.

The development of new or expanded reservoirs is major development within a National Park and as such is contrary to national planning policy. Previous Local Plans have included policies stating that no new reservoirs would be permitted.

A recent proposal to increase reservoir capacity in the Upper Derwent Valley was opposed by the National Park Authority due to it being major development within a National Park. The proposals would also have affected land with high-level ecological designations for habitats and species.

The geography of the National Park means that new or expanded reservoirs are likely to be located in the open countryside, and affect land within the Natural Zone. This land is also likely to be designated as SSSI, SAC and SPA.

Climate change and a growing population is likely to increase pressure for new reservoir capacity within the National Park.

Respondents were asked to choose between two options, there was a total of 46 responses to this question.

### Question 47

The question offered two options for the policy approach to this topic: -

Option 1 – Continue with our current approach. National policy would determine whether or not a new reservoir should be built. Local plan policies would be used to consider issues such as landscape, cultural heritage, biodiversity and recreation.

Option 2 – Write a new policy that says no new reservoirs will be permitted. National policy would still determine whether or not a new reservoir should be built. However, a new policy would clearly set out our agreed position and would be used alongside other local plan policies that considered landscape, cultural heritage, biodiversity and recreation.

a) What is your preferred option?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

### Analysis of Responses

- **Option 2** (no new reservoirs permitted) was preferred by 53% of respondents, including strong support from parish councils (75%) and most individuals (67%).
- **Option 1** (continue current approach) received 38% support, mainly from local authorities and key stakeholders such as United Utilities and Canal & River Trust.
- Government agencies were mixed, with the Environment Agency favouring Option 1 and Natural England unsure.

### Policy Implications

More than half of the responses to the consultation supported Option 2 – Write a new policy that says no new reservoirs will be permitted. This option was strongly supported by the parish councils / Peak Park Parishes Forum (75%). However, 38% of respondents supported Option 1 – our current policy approach. This was supported by local authorities and a number of stakeholders including United Utilities and the Canal and River Trust. On the basis of the consultation, a majority of those consulted support the development of new policy that says no new reservoirs will be permitted.

## 14.1 Minerals and Waste Challenges and Spatial Objectives

### Summary

The strategic objectives for minerals and waste are:

- Resist further mineral extraction except in exceptional circumstances.
- Allow small-scale building and roofing stone quarries.
- Require site restoration to deliver significant long-term landscape enhancement and contribute to nature recovery.
- Consider Hope Cement Works proposals with the understanding operations will cease by 2042 at the latest.
- Resist large-scale waste management facilities.
- Allow small-scale waste facilities serving local communities.

### Analysis of Responses

- **Yes:** 29 (72.5%) support the spatial objectives, emphasizing their alignment with the National Park's Special Qualities.
- **No:** 5 (12.5%) oppose any mineral extraction within the park, even in exceptional circumstances.
- **Unsure:** 6 (15%) raised concerns about groundwater protection (noted as addressed by Environment Agency policy), lack of clarity on 'small-scale' definitions, and the absence of a critical minerals policy. Suggestions included linking restoration to Local Nature Recovery Strategies and considering rail transit for minerals. There was also support for small-scale building stone extraction due to its low carbon impact and economic benefits.

### Implications for Policy Development

The clear majority supports the spatial objectives, though there is interest in developing a critical minerals policy and clearer definitions. These points will be considered further in the Local Plan Review process.



## 14.2 Limestone Quarries – Extending Beyond the ‘End Date’

### Summary

The Peak District National Park Authority estimates a 29-year landbank for crushed rock aggregates, meaning no new permissions are required up to 2045. All quarries have agreed or imposed end dates of 21st February 2042. However, some quarries may have remaining reserves beyond these dates, leading to potential applications for time extensions. Decisions must balance:

- The importance of existing sites with viable reserves to regional and national mineral supply;
- The fact that landscape harm would be perpetuated, with delayed restoration;
- That quarry extension constitutes major development, generally not permitted in national parks except in exceptional circumstances.

### Analysis of Responses

**Yes:** 13 (31.7%) support extensions, citing job provision, case-by-case assessment, the importance of fully exploiting permitted reserves to maintain the national landbank, and avoiding unsustainable sterilisation of resources.

**No:** 22 (53.6%) oppose extensions, often stating limestone quarries are inappropriate within the National Park, concerns over misuse of high purity limestone for aggregates, and that only fluorspar sites might merit extensions.

**Unsure:** 6 (14.6%) recognize quarrying reduces demand elsewhere but would prefer quarrying to end; some felt unqualified to comment.

### Exceptional Circumstances Suggested Include:

- Strict interpretation consistent with the NPPF;
- Strong business case;
- Vital national importance;
- Use of local building materials or particular minerals from specific sites;
- Previously consented sites with fully assessed impacts;
- Modern environmental management via RoMP.

### Implications for Policy Development

Responses show a majority oppose extending quarry operations, but a significant minority support

exceptions under narrow, well-defined circumstances. Future policy should clearly define exceptional circumstances aligned with national guidance and consider case-by-case assessments, balancing mineral supply needs with National Park protection.

### 14.3 Limestone Industrial Uses

#### **Summary**

The principle proposed is that future industrial limestone supply should come from outside the National Park (NP), as substantial permitted reserves exist in Derbyshire outside the NP with the same required high purity (97%). No new industrial limestone sites are anticipated within the NP during the plan period. The Authority is considering whether to include this principle as formal policy or to seek a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with neighbouring authorities to secure supply.

#### **Analysis of Responses**

##### **Yes – 23 responses**

Supporters argue:

- Quarries have no place inside National Parks, consistent with NP purposes.
- Sourcing from outside protects the NP's special qualities, reduces environmental damage, community impacts, and heavy vehicle movements.
- Avoids permissions granted for industrial use that might be diverted to aggregate production.
- Some suggest exceptions if extraction can occur without long-term harm or if alternatives do not worsen climate change.

##### **No – 6 responses**

Opponents, including minerals industry representatives and landowners, note:

- Existing permitted resources inside the NP should continue to be worked, including possible end-date extensions.
- Industrial minerals are nationally important and location-specific—only worked where they occur.
- Chemical purity and composition vary significantly within geological formations, so reserves are not interchangeable.

- Economic viability of reserves outside the NP is not guaranteed.
- Supplying from outside could increase transport-related CO2 emissions.
- The MoU approach may overlook views of operators and downstream industries.

#### **Unsure – 4 responses**

Some felt unqualified to comment or suggested NP quarries might have less community impact than new quarries outside the NP.

#### **Implications for Policy Development**

Most respondents support sourcing industrial limestone from outside the NP, aligning with conservation goals. However, significant concerns from the minerals industry remain regarding geological variability, economic viability, and supply certainty. The PDNPA acknowledges these complexities and data gaps in demonstrating alternative reserves' suitability. Future policy will need to balance conservation priorities with mineral supply realities, potentially requiring flexibility and further engagement with neighbouring authorities and industry stakeholders.

### **14.4 The Future of Hope Cement Works**

#### **Summary**

The future of Hope Cement Works (HCW) will be guided by a Supplementary Plan developed once the closure date is clearer, working with the landowner, stakeholders, and local community. This plan will define areas for restoration per existing consents and identify brownfield land for potential redevelopment. Meanwhile, the new local plan will set broad policy principles to ensure restoration and redevelopment deliver: National Park purposes for landscape, wildlife, cultural heritage, and public enjoyment, alongside fostering the economic and social wellbeing of local communities.

#### **Analysis of Responses**

Key themes include nature recovery, employment, and housing, with broad support for the stated purposes and duties. Other recurring topics were heritage, sustainable travel, master planning, community engagement, landscape, businesses, and public rights of way. Parish Councils strongly advocated for public consultation on the site's future.

- **Parish Council Responses:**

- *Hartington Town Quarter* emphasized prioritizing local community aspirations and ensuring developers respect decisions from public consultation.

- *Hope with Aston* urged that future uses align with Park policies, nature recovery, carbon reduction, and local priorities, with thorough community consultation at all stages.
- *Great Hucklow, Little Hucklow, and Grindlow* stressed the importance of maintaining skilled, sustainable employment post-closure, suggesting renewable energy development opportunities.
- *Edale* highlighted the need to balance heritage preservation with efficient land use for community benefits.
- *Eyam* believed restoration should be community-led.
- **Breedon Response:**  
 Breedon Cement stressed that policy should align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to ensure soundness. They commit to working with PDNPA on sustainable, long-term policy principles while acknowledging the Works' significant social and economic role, including a recent £5.2m GVA investment and 50-80 construction jobs for the ARM7 facility. Breedon supports efficient current operations and calls for policy wording (notably section 14.16) to better reflect the need for flexibility and economic resilience, aligning with government aims to build prosperity. They note the Plan's current spatial strategy focuses heavily on tranquillity but lacks economic and social context per NPPF. Breedon is keen to collaborate through the Draft Plan stage to ensure the Plan meets soundness tests and provides effective future guidance. They also highlight the sustainability appraisal currently omits consideration of Hope Works' future.

## 14.5 Stone for Building and Roofing

### Summary

Current policy (MIN3) permits only small-scale building stone quarries for local use. There is no formal agreement with neighbouring authorities to meet building stone demand. Four policy options were consulted on:

1. Retain current policy (MIN3)
2. Delete MIN3 (no specific policy)
3. New policy (no areas of search)

4. New policy with allocated areas of search

## **Question 52**

Which option do you prefer? Why?

### **Analysis of Responses**

- **Option 1 – 15 responses**  
Seen as effective and proportionate for protecting the National Park. Supports local character and conservation of built heritage. Some noted quarries outside the NP could meet local needs.
- **Option 2 – 0 responses**  
No support for removing the policy altogether.
- **Option 3 – 4.5 responses**  
Offers greater flexibility; some support for lifting local-use restrictions. Business viability and access to suitable stone highlighted. Some prefer this as a step toward Option 4.
- **Option 4 – 11.5 responses**  
Supported for providing clarity, control, and protecting the NP from speculative proposals. Areas of search could guide future development and ensure better supply for heritage repair. Industry strongly favours this option, viewing current restrictions as uncompetitive.
- **Unsure – 3 responses**  
Concerns around the definition of "small-scale" and viability of current policy. Some suggested requiring a portion of stone for NP use and promoting craft skills.

### **Implications for Policy Development**

There is clear support for retaining a specific building stone policy, though views differ on how restrictive it should be. Option 4 is favoured by industry and those seeking better control and supply clarity, while Option 1 appeals to those prioritising conservation and minimal impact. The Local Plan Review will consider whether a revised policy can balance viability, heritage needs, and landscape protection.

## 14.6 – Ancillary Mineral Development

### Summary:

The PDNPA asked whether active quarry sites with ancillary processing facilities should be allowed to import stone from other quarries **within** the National Park. This would apply only to **dimension stone and roofing slates**, not aggregates.

### Overall Response:

- **Yes** – 15 (56%)
- **No** – 6 (22%)
- **Unsure** – 6 (22%)

### Key Themes from Responses

#### Position Main Reasons

Yes      Utilises existing infrastructure, reduces need for new sites, supports viability, lowers overall traffic if centralised, supports local economy. Some would also allow limited imports from outside the NP if it serves NP purposes (e.g., conservation).

No      Increases HGV traffic, noise, air pollution, contradicts carbon and landscape policies, risks expanding operations unnecessarily.

Unsure      Lacked technical knowledge or required more detail on impacts.

### Stakeholder Summary

| Group              | Yes | No | Unsure |
|--------------------|-----|----|--------|
| Parish Councils    | 4   | 3  | 3      |
| Quarrying Industry | 5   | 0  | 0      |

**Policy Implications:**

Future policy should clarify: applies to non-aggregate stone only, may require criteria for scale and transport impacts.

## Issue 54: Restoration and Aftercare – Stronger Focus on Nature Recovery and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

### Summary

The Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) is considering whether new minerals policy should place a stronger emphasis on nature recovery during restoration and aftercare, and whether proposals with greater potential should be required to exceed the 10% mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

### Analysis of Responses

| Response Group        | Stronger Focus on Nature Recovery Require >10% BNG |                  |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Total (All)           | Yes – 35 (89.7%)                                   | Yes – 33 (84.6%) |
|                       | No – 3                                             | No – 5           |
|                       | Unsure – 1                                         | Unsure – 1       |
| Parish Councils (11)  | Yes – 10                                           | Yes – 8          |
|                       | No – 0                                             | No – 0           |
|                       | Unsure – 1                                         | Unsure – 2       |
| Minerals Industry (5) | Yes – 0                                            | Yes – 0          |
|                       | No – 1                                             | No – 4           |
|                       | Unsure – 4                                         | Unsure – 1       |

### Policy Implications

Strong support (including Parish Councils and public) for policies that go beyond minimal requirements to restore and improve biodiversity.

Industry resistance suggests the need for careful wording to encourage, not mandate, BNG >10%, unless legally supported.

Consider phased BNG assessments during a quarry's lifespan and clearer guidance for existing permissions.



## Sustainability Appraisal

9.7 As part of the Local Plan Review – Issues and Options stage, the Peak District National Park Authority also published an initial Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report and an Equalities and Health Impact Assessment (Equal) for public comment. Feedback was received on the Sustainability Appraisal.

9.8 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) undertaken for the Local Plan Review assessed each Issue and Option against a comprehensive SA Framework, considering environmental, social, and economic impacts. Stakeholders were invited to comment on the SA, resulting in seven submissions, six of which provided detailed feedback. Respondents included Natural England, Derbyshire County Council, the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) Peak District and South Yorkshire, and the Greater Manchester and High Peak Ramblers Association.

9.9 Several key points emerged from the responses. It was noted that the SA baseline lacks specific evidence relating to carbon emissions within the Peak District National Park, particularly in connection with quarrying and the cement industry. Additionally, the SA Framework was criticized for not including sufficiently specific and measurable indicators, such as targets for new homes to meet net-zero carbon standards, or explicit reference to the Climate Change Commission's recommended actions and timescales.

9.10 Stakeholders also highlighted the need to incorporate Green Infrastructure more explicitly within the SA monitoring framework, emphasizing its benefits for biodiversity, access to nature, and public health and wellbeing. While the SA references climate change data, the sources of this information were not clearly identified. Furthermore, the linkages between the Key Issues identified in the plan and the SA Framework were considered unclear, with public rights of way and access notably underrepresented.

9.11 Concerns were raised regarding potential conflicts between spatial objectives for Recreation and Tourism and those for Sustainable Transport. Some respondents challenged the SA's treatment of options related to railway reinstatement and multi-user trails, pointing out that these options are not mutually exclusive and that the possibility of reinstating railway services within the plan period (up to 2045) should be recognized.

9.12 Respondents suggested refining SA indicators to better measure sustainable transport outcomes—for example, excluding recreational cycleways from metrics since their use often generates additional car journeys rather than replacing them. There were also factual corrections noted, such as an inaccurate count of schools within the National Park area.

9.13 These comments have important implications for policy development. The SA process will continue to shape policies and their assessments in future iterations. Particular focus is needed to enhance considerations around Green Infrastructure, Climate Change, Minerals and Waste, Recreation and Tourism, and Travel and Transport. The baseline data underpinning the SA should be improved and updated to address identified gaps. Monitoring indicators require refinement to better capture meaningful outcomes. Lastly, the spatial objectives within the plan should be reviewed to ensure they align with the National Park’s purposes, special qualities, and are internally consistent.

| Issue/Comment                   | Summary of Response                                                                  | Source(s)                  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| SA baseline data                | Lacks specific carbon emissions data, especially on quarrying and cement industries  | Natural England, DCC, CPRE |
| Measurable indicators           | Missing specific targets (e.g., % of new homes meeting net-zero carbon standards)    | CPRE, Ramblers             |
| Climate change references       | Data sources not clearly identified                                                  | Multiple respondents       |
| Green Infrastructure            | Should be explicitly included in monitoring for biodiversity and health benefits     | Natural England, CPRE      |
| Public rights of way and access | Not well represented in SA Framework; quality of network should be assessed          | Ramblers, CPRE             |
| Spatial objectives conflict     | Recreation and Tourism objectives may conflict with Sustainable Transport objectives | Various                    |
| Railway reinstatement option    | SA should recognize possibility of railway reinstatement within plan period          | Ramblers                   |

| <b>Issue/Comment</b>          | <b>Summary of Response</b>                                                                        | <b>Source(s)</b> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Sustainable transport metrics | Proposed metrics should exclude recreational cycleways to avoid misrepresenting car travel impact | Ramblers         |
| Factual inaccuracies          | Incorrect number of schools in the National Park area                                             | Various          |

## Appendix 1: Advertisement



**PEAK  
DISTRICT  
NATIONAL  
PARK**



# **A new Local Plan for 2026-2045**

**Come and meet the team  
TODAY**

**21 October 2024  
3pm – 8pm**

**Winster – Burton Institute**

The National Park Authority is  
consulting on issues and  
options for new planning  
policy that may affect you,  
your family or your business.

Issues and options consultation 7 Oct-29 Nov 2024

<https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/policies-and-guides/the-local-plan/regulation-18-consultation>

Figure 2 Event Flier sample taken from the event at Winster



## PDNPA Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation

The consultation will run from 7<sup>th</sup> October to 29<sup>th</sup> November 2024 (8 weeks)

PDNPA officers will be hosting drop in events at the following locations, 3-8pm unless stated otherwise.

- 10 October- Hathersage Memorial Hall, Hathersage
- 14 October- Parwich Memorial Hall, Parwich
- 15 October- Hope Sports Club, Hope (1pm-5pm)
- 17 October- Tideswell Community Hall, Tideswell
- 18 October- Youlgrave Village Hall, Youlgrave
- 21 October- The Burton Institute, Winster
- 22 October- Warslow Village Hall, Warslow
- 24 October – PDNPA office, Aldern House, Bakewell
- 6 November – Medway Centre, Bakewell
- 8 November - Bradfield Village Hall, Low Bradfield (4pm-8pm)

*Figure 3 In person events advertisement*

### Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation 7 October – 29 November 2024




We are writing a new Local Plan for the Peak District National Park.

It will set out the **vision**, **spatial strategy** and **planning policies** that will be used to guide decisions on **future development**.

The Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation is the first stage in the process of writing a new Local Plan.

We would like you to get involved and have **YOUR SAY**

*Figure 4 Postcard template used for advertisement*

|                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>PUBLIC NOTICE</b><br/> <b>TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012</b></p> <p><b>REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION NOTICE</b><br/> <b>PREPARATION OF A LOCAL PLAN</b></p> |  <p><b>PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK</b></p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The Peak District National Park Authority (the local planning authority 'LPA') is reviewing its Local Plan. The LPA considers that a new Local Plan is necessary to ensure it is up to date and in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF').

Pursuant to Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the LPA is required to notify the following bodies and/or individuals as listed below about the subject of a local plan and invite them to make representations to the LPA about what a Local Plan with that subject ought to contain.

- A. Such of the specific consultations bodies as the LPA consider may have an interest in the subject of the proposed Updated Local Plan.
- B. Such of the general consultation bodies as the LPA consider appropriate.
- C. Such residents or other persons carrying on business in the LPA's area from which the LPA consider it appropriate to invite representations.

*The subject of the new Local Plan is set out in the Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report.*

#### **Consultation Period**

The consultation will run from 7<sup>th</sup> October 2024 to 29<sup>th</sup> November 2024 ("Consultation Period") and the LPA invites and encourages all consultees to make representations at the earliest opportunity and in any event no later than by the end of the Consultation Period.

#### **Inspection of documents**

The Regulation 18 *Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report* is available for inspection:

- on the Peak District National Park Authority website
- at libraries in Bakewell and nearby towns (during normal opening hours)
- at the Peak District National Park Authority Head Office during normal opening hours (Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, DE45 1AE).

#### **Representations**

Formal written representations on the Local Plan Review Issues and Options document are invited to be made during the Consultation Period and can be made in the following ways:

- On the consultation platform, accessible from the website.
- By letter or email.

**Email:** [localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

**Postal address:** Issues and Options Consultation, Policy and Communities Team, Peak District National Park Authority, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, DE45 1AE

**Website:** <https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/policies-and-guides/the-local-plan/regulation-18-consultation>

Figure 5 Public Notice

Dear Consultee,

## **PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – REGULATION 18 ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

The Peak District National Park Authority is reviewing its Local Plan.

In accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and as set out in this [Public Notice](#), I am writing to notify you about the subject of the new local plan and invite you to make representations.

*The subject of the new Local Plan is set out in the Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report.*

We are also inviting comments on the accompanying *Sustainability Appraisal*.

### **Consultation Period**

The consultation will run from 7 October 2024 to 23.59hrs on 29 November 2024. Submissions received after this date may not be considered.

### **Inspection of documents**

The *Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report* is available for inspection:

- on the Peak District National Park Authority [website](#)
- at [libraries](#) (during normal opening hours)
- at the [National Park Authority Head Office](#)

### **Representations**

Formal written representations on the *Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report* are invited to be made during the Consultation Period. They can be made:

- On-line by using the consultation platform, accessible from the [website](#).
- By letter or email. Please make specific reference to the Issue you are commenting on.

Email: [localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Postal address: see [website](#) for details, please mark the envelope 'Issues and Options Consultation, Policy and Communities Team'.

If you have any questions regarding the consultation please contact [customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk) (01629816200). We look forward to receiving your representation.

Adele Metcalfe  
Policy and Communities Team Manager

Figure 6 consultation email

Peak District National Park Authority

Tel: 01629 816200

E-mail: [customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Web: [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Aldern House. Baslow Road. Bakewell. Derbyshire. DE45 1AE



Parish Councils, Town Council and Parish Meetings in the Peak  
District National Park

Your ref:

Our ref:

Date: 4 October 2024

Dear Parish Council, Town Council or Meeting,

## PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: REGULATION 18 ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

The Peak District National Park Authority is reviewing its Local Plan.

In accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and as set out in the enclosed Public Notice, I am writing to notify you about the subject of the new local plan and invite you to make representations.

***The subject of the new Local Plan is set out in the enclosed Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report. We are also inviting comments on the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.***

### Consultation Period

The consultation will run from 7th October 2024 to 29th November 2024, 11:59pm.

### Inspection of documents

The *Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report* and the Sustainability Appraisal are also available for inspection:



- at <https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/policies-and-guides/the-local-plan/regulation-18-consultation>
- at libraries (during normal opening hours) – see above website for details
- at the National Park Authority Head Office.

## Representations

Formal written representations on the *Local Plan Review Issues and Options Report* are invited to be made during the Consultation Period. They can be made:

- On-line by using the consultation platform, accessible from the above website.
- By email to [localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@peakdistrict.gov.uk)
- By letter to the above address (please mark the envelope 'Issues and Options consultation, Policy and Communities Team').

Please note that representations made by email and letter should include the person's name and address and clearly state the Issue Number.

I have also enclosed a poster and post cards and would be most grateful if you could display and/or distribute these to publicise the consultation in your parish.

Yours faithfully,



Adele Metcalfe

Policy and Communities Team Manager

Encl. Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation Report

Local Plan Review Issues and Options Sustainability Report

Public Notice

Poster

Post cards

*Figure 7 Letter to Parish Councils*

Peak District National Park Authority

Tel: 01629 816200

E-mail: [customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Web: [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Aldern House. Baslow Road. Bakewell. Derbyshire. DE45 1AE



Libraries serving the Peak District National Park

Your ref:

Our ref:

Date: 3 October 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

**PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: REGULATION 18 ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

The Peak District National Park Authority is formally consulting on a new Local Plan. (See enclosed Public Notice.)

I am writing to respectfully request that the Notice and documents enclosed with this letter are made available for public viewing between 7<sup>th</sup> October – 29<sup>th</sup> November, 2024, 11.59pm.

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, state that consultation documents should be made available for inspection and the PDNPA Statement of Community Involvement lists this library as a location for people to view the documents publicly.

If you have any questions regarding the consultation or the documents enclosed, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink on a light yellow rectangular background. The signature reads 'Adele Metcalfe' in a cursive script.

Adele Metcalfe

Policy and Communities Team Manager

Encl. Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation

Local Plan Review Issues and Options Sustainability Report

Public Notice

*Figure 8 Letter to Libraries*

Peak District National Park Authority

Tel: 01629 816200

E-mail: [customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Web: [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Aldern House. Baslow Road. Bakewell. Derbyshire. DE45 1AE



---

Constituent Authorities of the Peak District National Park

Your ref:

Our ref:

Date: 3 October 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

**PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: REGULATION 18 ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

The Peak District National Park Authority is formally consulting on a new Local Plan. (See enclosed Public Notice.)

I am writing to respectfully request that the Notice and documents enclosed with this letter are made available for public viewing between 7<sup>th</sup> October – 29<sup>th</sup> November, 2024, 11.59pm.

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, state that consultation documents should be made available for inspection and the PDNPA Statement of Community Involvement lists constituent authorities of the PDNPA as locations for people to view the documents publicly.

If you have any questions regarding the consultation or the documents enclosed, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Adele Metcalfe". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed on a light yellow rectangular background.

Adele Metcalfe

Policy and Communities Team Manager

Encl. Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation Report

Local Plan Review Issues and Options Sustainability Report

Public Notice

*Figure 9 Letter to Authorities*

## Appendix 2: Consultation Question set

### Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation Question Set

#### Spatial Strategy

##### Question 1

Spatial strategy: Proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for sustainable development in a national park

- a) Do you agree with the proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for sustainable development?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

##### Question 2

Spatial Strategy: Delivering national park purposes

- a) Have we identified the right policy issues with regard to delivering national park purposes?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

##### Question 3

Spatial strategy: Defining valued landscape character and special qualities

What additional elements should be included in a Special Quality Key Features list for the local plan?

##### Question 4

Spatial strategy: Settlement tiers

- a) Which option do you prefer?
- b) Do you think there is another option?
- c) What are the reasons for your answers?

##### Question 5

Spatial strategy: Sites for housing development

- a) What is your preferred option?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 6

Spatial Strategy: Development boundaries

- a) Which is your preferred option?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 7

Spatial Strategy: Protected open space and local green space

- a) Do you think that there is 'additional local benefit' to be gained by designating Local Green Space in and on the edge of Peak District settlements?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 8

Spatial Strategy: Sustainable travel

Thinking about current policy T1, is there anything else we should include in an aspirational sustainable transport land-use policy?

### **Landscape, Biodiversity, and Nature Recovery**

#### Question 9

Landscape, biodiversity and nature recovery: Proposed Local Plan spatial objectives

- a) Do you agree with the proposed spatial objectives for landscape, biodiversity and nature recovery?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 10

Landscape and nature recovery

- a) Do you agree with the proposed policy approach to nature recovery?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 11

Biodiversity net gain

- a) Do you agree that new planning policies for biodiversity net gain should go beyond the 10% mandatory requirement?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 12

##### Development in the Natural Zone

- a) Do you think that current policy (DMC2) correctly sets out the exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 13

##### Whole estate plans

- a) Do you think the new local plan should have a policy for whole estate plans?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Cultural Heritage and the Built Environment**

#### Question 14

##### Proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for cultural heritage and the built environment

- a) Do you agree with the proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for cultural heritage?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 15

##### Heritage assets

Please tell us about any issues or concerns you have about our approach to heritage assets.

#### Question 16

##### Local list

- a) Do you think that we should have a Local List of non-designated heritage assets?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?



#### Question 17

The conversion of isolated traditional buildings

a) Do you think the new local plan should contain a specific policy relating to isolated traditional buildings? b) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Climate Change and Sustainable Building**

#### Question 18

Proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for climate change and sustainable building

a) Do you agree with the proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for climate change and sustainable building?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 19

Replacement dwellings

a) Do you agree that embodied carbon should be considered as part of the requirement for high sustainability standards?

b) Do you think the criteria in current policy DMH9A (above) are correct?

c) Should new policy specifically address the loss of smaller homes?

d) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 20

Avoiding carbon emissions in development

a) Do you think that the new local plan should set out in policy the sustainability measures we expect for different types of development?

b) What specific measure are most appropriate for homes?

c) What specific measure are most appropriate for farm buildings?

d) What specific measure are most appropriate for business development?

e) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 21

Low carbon and renewable energy development

What criteria could we use to identify areas (on a policy map) where renewable energy development is more likely to be acceptable?

Question 22

Carbon capture and storage

- a) Do you think that the new local plan should set out in principle policy support for Carbon Capture and Storage?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

**Recreation and Tourism**

Question 23

Proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for recreation and tourism

- a) Do you agree with the proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for recreation and tourism?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

Question 24

Recreation attractions and hubs

- a) Do you think that the new local plan should define 'Recreation Attractions' and 'Recreation Hubs' on a map and develop specific planning policies for those areas?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?
- c) Which areas/sites do you consider to be Recreation Attractions and Hubs?

Examples are shown in Appendix 3: Recreation attractions and hubs (excluding settlements)

Question 25

Temporary camp sites

- a) Do you think that we should apply for an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights for temporary camping and caravan sites?
- b) If yes, should the permitted development right be removed entirely or revert to 28 days as previously?
- c) If yes, what areas should they be removed from?
- d) What problems are being caused by the 60-day permitted development right?

#### Question 26

##### Touring camping and caravan sites

- a) Do you agree that operation of touring camping and caravan sites should be restricted to certain months of the year in order to address the increased landscape impact in the winter months?
- b) Do you agree that touring camping and caravan sites should be restricted to no more than 28 days per calendar year by any one person?
- c) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 27

##### Static caravans, lodges and other permanent structures

- a) Do you agree that new policy should restrict static caravans, chalets, lodges and other large, permanent structures used as holiday accommodation?
- b) What exceptions should we make to this principle?
- c) What criteria should we use to ensure that the structures permitted as an exception to this principle, do not harm the National Park's special qualities?
- d) What is the reason for your answer?

### Housing

#### Question 28

##### Proposed Local Plan spatial objectives for housing

- a) Do you agree with the proposed spatial objectives?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 29

##### Holiday homes and permanent homes

- a) Which is your preferred option?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 30

##### Affordable housing eligibility

- a) Do you think that the eligibility criteria for occupation of RSL managed affordable housing (as set out in Policy DMH2) should be widened?

- b) Do you think that the eligibility criteria for privately owned and managed affordable homes (as set out in Policy DMH2) should be widened?
- c) Do you think we should explore new policy on tied accommodation?
- d) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 31

Affordable housing - local connection Please note, these questions apply specifically to new-build affordable homes built predominantly on green field sites.

- a) Do you think we should retain or reduce the 10-year local connection requirement for first occupation of RSL homes?
- b) Do you think we should retain or reduce the 10-year local connection for private developers, including people building their own homes?
- c) Do you think we should redefine 'local connection' for people wishing to return to the Peak District? If so, what criteria should we use?
- d) Do you think there should be any exception to the requirement for a local connection? (For example, no local connection is needed for new homes that are needed to support farming, forestry and other rural enterprises.)
- e) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 32

Affordable housing - house size

- a) Do you think that the new Local Plan should retain a size restriction on new affordable homes?
- b) Should the same standards be applied to RSL and privately developed homes?
- c) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Shops, Services and Community Facilities**

#### Question 33

Proposed spatial objectives for shops, services and community facilities

- a) Do you agree with the proposed spatial objectives?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 34

##### Community Services

- a) Do you agree with our proposal to expand the list of protected community services and facilities as described?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### **Bakewell**

#### Question 35

##### Protection of Bakewell's special character and setting

- a) Should the new local plan include a Bakewell specific chapter that would include policy on landscape setting and special character?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?
- c) Are the qualities that make up Bakewell's special character properly included in Appendix 2: Special Quality Key Features?
- d) If not, what else should be included?

#### **Rural Economy**

#### Question 36

##### Proposed spatial objectives for the rural economy

- a) Do you agree with the proposed spatial objectives?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 37

##### Extensions to existing businesses

- a) What other tests (other than those listed in current policy DME7 B) should we apply to ensure that the piecemeal expansion of businesses does not harm the landscape and the special qualities of the National Park?
- b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 38

##### Conversion of whole farmsteads to new uses

a) Do you agree that the conversion of whole farmsteads (that are no longer in farming use) for business or residential use should only take place if the farmstead is: in or on the edge of settlements physically well related to a settlement in a sustainable location with direct and close access to a main road?

b) Do you agree that the conversion of whole farmsteads (that are no longer in farming use) that are located in the open countryside and away from settlements, is only acceptable for low intensity uses, for example holiday accommodation?

c) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 39

##### Primary business

a) Do you think we should continue to require in all circumstances the primary land management business to retain ownership and control of the site and building when redundant farm buildings are converted for business use?

b) If we decide that a stand-alone business is acceptable, what are the risks associated with this?

c) If we decide that a stand-alone business is acceptable, what constraints should be applied?

d) What is the reason for your answer?

#### **Travel and Transport**

#### Question 40

##### Proposed spatial objectives for travel and transport

a) Do you agree with the proposed spatial objectives?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 41

##### Visitor car parking

a) Which option do you prefer?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 42

##### Safeguarding and protecting multi-user trails on former railway routes

a) What is your preferred option?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 43

##### Road building schemes

a) Do you think new policy should support road-building schemes where the primary purpose is local capacity enhancement?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

c) What are the exceptional circumstances that might justify this?

#### Question 44

##### Overnight parking for campervans

a) Do you think we should create new policy to support the use of certain car parks for overnight stays in campervans and/or holiday homes?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 45

##### Air transport

a) What is your preferred option?

b) Do you think that the National Park Authority should map 'no-fly' zones for commercial drones to protect the environmentally sensitive areas of the National Park (these are likely to encompass the Natural Zone? C) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Utilities**

#### Question 46

##### Proposed spatial objectives for utilities

a) Do you agree with the proposed local plan spatial objective for utilities?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 47

##### New or expanded reservoirs

a) What is your preferred option?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

## **Minerals and Waste**

### **Question 48**

Local plan spatial objectives for minerals and waste

a) Do you agree with the proposed local plan spatial objectives for minerals and waste?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Question 49**

Limestone quarries - extending beyond the 'end date'

a) Should mineral extraction at existing quarries with remaining reserves be allowed to continue beyond the agreed or imposed end dates?

b) Should this apply to specific quarries? If so, which ones?

c) What are the exceptional circumstances that would justify extensions of time for mineral extraction (as this would constitute major development in a national park)?

d) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Question 50**

Limestone industrial uses

a) Do you agree with the principle that the future supply of industrial limestone should come from outside the National Park?

b) What is the reason for your answer?

### **Question 51**

The future of Hope cement works

Taking into account national park purposes, what broad policy principles should be set out in the new local plan, to guide restoration and redevelopment at Hope Cement Works?

### **Question 52**

Stone for building and roofing

a) Which option do you prefer?



b) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 53

##### Ancillary minerals development

a) Should sites with ancillary processing in the National Park be able to import stone from other quarries in the National Park for processing?

b) Are there other appropriate locations for the small-scale processing of stone won and worked in the National Park?

c) What is the reason for your answer?

#### Question 54

##### Restoration and aftercare

a) Should new policy on restoration and aftercare have a stronger focus on nature recovery?

b) Should we require more than the 10% mandatory BNG for Mineral proposals/sites that have potential to achieve greater outcomes?

c) What is the reason for your answer?

#### **Local Plan Issues and Options Sustainability Appraisal**

##### **Question**

Do you have any comments to make on the Sustainability Appraisal?

## Appendix 3: Full set of records from OK with summaries

File links:

\\flagg\departments\Policy and Communities\Planning Policy\LOCAL PLAN REVIEW\2025 - Preferred Options - Draft Plan\Reg 18 analysis and report\OK - question point summaries

## Appendix 4: In-person events

### Activity Summary

#### MAP Activity:

For Activity One, an A0 map of the entire Peak District Authority area was printed for participants to interact with. A key issue discussed was the impact of tourism within the National Park and the potential development of a policy on recreation hubs. Participants were asked to identify areas of pressure on the map and mark them with stickers. This activity was carried out at all events, except the market mornings, resulting in a cumulative map of hotspots and pressures. In total, 46 locations were documented from the responses.

#### Tourism Sheet:

A box for general comments was provided, allowing participants to express concerns related to the issues and options consultation. The feedback covered a range of topics, including:

- Parking provision and its impact
- Insufficient street and road markings
- Park and Ride schemes
- Footpath signage and gates
- Visitor capacity at Mam Tor
- Distribution of visitors across the park
- Potential pressure from identified recreation hubs
- The 60-day camping rule, with calls for its removal
- Concerns over the wording of “hubs”
- Road surfacing issues
- The effect of parking on farming
- Social media-driven damage to locations
- Tourism reducing affordable housing provision
- Green infrastructure and network development needed to sustainably support tourism

While some of these comments may not directly relate to the consultation’s core issues, they were nonetheless recorded as valuable contributions.

#### Other:

The event at Great Longstone was not organised by the Authority, but the Parish Council highlighted two key points:

- Campervans and caravans should be confined to designated sites.
- Tourism should be designed to support rural communities.

### **Affordable Housing Activity:**

For the second activity, a printed sheet was provided on the topic of affordable housing and eligibility, offering four consultation options:

- No change to the current policy
- Include people with immediate family connections
- Include people with specific jobs
- Include anyone working within the National Park.

### **Hathersage Event:**

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 3
- Option 3: 3
- Option 4: 1

The following comments were received:

- The ageing population should be considered.
- Family homes are needed.
- There should be more transparency around housing needs and potential sites.
- The whole community should be considered for social housing.
- Elderly/disabled individuals from outside the area should be included if they have a local connection.
- A robust system is needed to ensure housing remains affordable and isn't turned into holiday lets.
- Housing should be appropriately sized.

### **Winster Event:**

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 3
- Option 3: 5
- Option 4: 5

No comments were received.

Bradfield Event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 3
- Option 3: 3
- Option 4: 2

No comments were received.

Youlgreave Event:

No responses to the activities on affordable housing and no comments.

Tideswell Event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 1
- Option 3: 2
- Option 4: 0

Comments:

- Agreement on the need for further provision of affordable housing.

Bakewell, Aldern House Event:

- Option 1: 1
- Option 2: 2
- Option 3: 4
- Option 4: 3

No comments received.

Medway Event:

- Option 1: 2
- Option 2: 2
- Option 3: 2
- Option 4: 1

No comments received.

Parwich Event:

- Option 1: 1
- Option 2: 6
- Option 3: 2
- Option 4: 1

No comments received.

Hope Event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 4
- Option 3: 2
- Option 4: 5

General comments:

- Every worker needs a house.
- Unaffordable housing should be considered unsatisfactory.

Warslow Event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 1
- Option 3: 0
- Option 4: 0

No comments received.

#### Great Longstone Event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 1
- Option 3: 1
- Option 4: 1

#### Comments:

- Younger residents should have affordability criteria.

#### Summary of Total Responses:

- **Option 1:** 4
- **Option 2:** 26
- **Option 3:** 24
- **Option 4:** 19

#### Social and Registered Landlords Activity:

##### Winster Event:

We also asked about eligibility applying to **social and registered landlords** as Option 1, or private development as Option 2.

- Option 1: 2
- Option 2: 3

##### Great Longstone Event:

- Option 1: 2
- Option 2: 2

#### Total for Option 1 and Option 2:

- **Option 1:** = 4
- **Option 2:** = 5

We found that participants did not fully understand the question regarding eligibility for social and registered landlords versus private development. As a result, we received fewer responses to this question at the events. The lack of clarity likely contributed to limited engagement, and further explanation may be needed to ensure better understanding and more comprehensive feedback in the future.

### **Holiday Homes:**

For the third activity, participants were asked about potential changes to the current policy on holiday homes and their restrictions, as outlined in the issues and options consultation document. The following options were presented, with stickers used to indicate public agreement:

- Option 1: No change to the policy
- Option 2: Impose a primary residency clause in settlements with existing multiple holiday homes
- Option 3: Impose a primary residency clause in all settlements

Hope event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 1
- Option 3: 6

Comments:

- Option 2 could provide income for wealthier long-term residents.
- Some people lack planning consent.
- Settlements with high percentages of holiday homes are "honeypots" and unsuitable for new market housing.
- Consider working with other agencies.

For the Warslow event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 0
- Option 3: 1

Comments:

- Cottages should be regulated.
- There should be monitoring in place.

Parwich event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 1
- Option 3: 9

No comments were received.

Medway event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 1
- Option 3: 4

No comments were received.

Aldern House event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 0
- Option 3: 5

Tideswell event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 0
- Option 3: 2

Comments:

- A primary residency clause is needed until balance is reached.
- There are too many holiday homes.

Winster event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 2
- Option 3: 7



Hathersage Event:

No response provided.

Great Longstone event:

- Option 1: 0
- Option 2: 9
- Option 3: 16

Comments:

- Rental housing needs to be affordable for young people.

### **Summary of Total Responses:**

- **Option 1:** 0
- **Option 2:** 14
- **Option 3:** 50

Generally, **Option 3** was the preferred choice across the consultation events, with a total of 50 responses. This option, which proposes imposing a primary residency clause in all settlements, received significantly more support compared to **Option 2** (14 responses) and **Option 1** (0 responses). The widespread preference for Option 3 suggests that there is strong backing for regulating holiday homes and ensuring they remain available for local residents.

### **General Comments**

**Warslow Event:**

- Lack of housing stock, particularly starter homes.
- Broader eligibility criteria for affordable housing.
- Houses should be better future-proofed for net zero.
- Rivers are not clean.
- Public transport should be encouraged.
- The Manifold track needs significant repairs.
- Fibre internet is required.

- Longnor needs its own car park.
- Grass verges on Warslow Road are messy.
- Resident parking permits should be considered.
- Second homes make no contribution to communities.
- No cross-county buses.
- A park and ride service is needed.
- There are too many stiles and gates.
- More short walking routes around Longnor are needed.
- There is no bus stop signage in Longnor.
- Light pollution from quarries; Peak Park should be a dark sky area.
- Caravan sites have lights on at night.
- More countryside code signage is needed.
- Car parking in Hartington is dangerous.
- There are many Airbnbs in Hartington.
- There is a lack of playgrounds for children in Hartington.

#### **Parwich Event:**

- Around 35 holiday lets in Parwich, which is a high proportion of the housing stock.
- The impact of holiday homes is more significant in small communities.
- Issues with the planning system, with uncertainty about approvals (pre-application not available).
- Suggestion to expand permitted development.
- Listed buildings should not require Listed Building Consent (LBC).
- Each listed building should undergo a heritage assessment.

#### **Medway Event:**

- Would adding more trees to woodlands detract from the landscape?
- Concerns about the state of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).
- Debate between infill vs scattered housing development.
- Pressure from tourism is too high.
- Issues with food management.
- Protection from wind farms is needed.

#### **Tideswell Event:**

- Farms should be considered brownfield sites.
- Concerns about farmers spreading waste on properties.
- Desire to see the back of the Hope Cement Works.
- Nutrient Neutrality issues in Tideswell.
- Worries about second homes.
- Importance of protecting trails.

- Need for more focus on improving the energy grid.
- Support for community renewable energy projects.
- A less restrictive wind turbine policy.
- Proposals for solar panels in disused quarries.
- Support for less restrictive solar energy policies.
- Better electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure.
- Authority campsites should offer charging to all.
- Future-proofing of housing.
- A requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 30%.
- Disagreement with carbon capture initiatives.
- Advocacy for more sustainable towns.
- Suggested changes to the bus service.
- Heat pumps should be installed in schools.
- Call to reach out to the government for funding.
- Support for sustainable design practices.
- River running under the road as an issue.
- No pharmacy available in the area.
- Monitoring of water quality should be prioritized.
- Updating properties with solar panels.
- Question raised about using farmland for music events.
- Support for barn conversions for affordable housing.
- Concerns that affordable housing is too small.
- Housing is needed for people entering the market.

#### **Youlgreave Event:**

- Too many holiday lets in the area.
- Difficulty in controlling existing housing stock.
- Need for a primary residency requirement.
- Overcrowding from too many visitors.
- Insufficient car parking.
- Applications are approved despite public objections.
- The village needs to be preserved.
- Improvements needed in sustainable connections.
- Reinstating former rail routes is suggested.
- Call for more consistency in the planning system.
- Support for wild swimming.
- Concerns over sewage capacity.
- Ongoing issue with holiday homes.
- Access to the campsite at Youlgreave is problematic.
- Better housing standards needed for new builds.
- Concerns about the competency of builders.
- Need for more electric vehicle (EV) charging stations.
- People are leaving cars charging at village halls.
- Call to stop wood burning and the use of stoves and chimneys.
- Support for grey water and water harvesting systems for toilets.
- Advocating for passive housing.

- The park should have a strategy for managing overnight stays.
- Issues with empty homes.
- Most properties lack parking.

#### **Hathersage Event:**

- Emphasis on special characteristics and local greenspaces.
- Caution advised in defining recreation hubs.
- Plenty of cycle paths, but lacking walking paths.
- Castleton is noted for being multicultural and diverse.
- Walkers no longer visit Castleton as frequently.
- Housing developers should meet net zero standards for new builds.

#### **Winster Event:**

- Stone walls are unnecessary if not built correctly.
- Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) should include hedges.
- Hedges should be considered a special quality.
- Building materials should be renewable.
- A range of housing sizes is needed to accommodate changing circumstances.
- The Authority should offer free advice for listed buildings.
- More information about funding should be provided.
- A more relaxed approach to alterations on listed buildings is suggested.

#### **Hope Event:**

- Focusing attention on hubs increases pressure on places like Castleton.
- Current policies aren't restrictive enough for day visitors.
- Questions raised about whether active travel will make a real difference.
- Parking issues in Castleton, with the view that the problem is more about people than the parking itself.
- Van life community should be allowed to park in designated areas, not just where they live or travel.
- Holidaymakers in campervans should not receive free parking.
- Suggestion to charge for parking at all times.
- The need for yellow lines in certain areas.
- Proposal to use fields around Mam Tor for temporary parking.
- Recreation hubs should have tiered levels of use.
- Caution against restricting tourism, as it supports local jobs.
- Visitor centres should be kept open.
- There is a need for more dedicated public toilets.

The consultation events highlighted several other key themes as taken from general comments submitted.:

1. **Housing:** A shortage of affordable housing, particularly starter homes, and concerns about the impact of holiday homes were common. There was strong support for primary residency requirements and future-proofing homes to meet net-zero standards.
2. **Sustainability:** Participants emphasized renewable energy projects, sustainable housing, and biodiversity gains, as well as the need for better management of water quality and waste.
3. **Tourism Management:** Overcrowding and parking issues, especially in popular areas, were raised. Suggestions included parking charges, designated campervan areas, and improved visitor infrastructure.
4. **Infrastructure:** Calls for better public transport, more electric vehicle charging stations, and improved roads, footpaths, and signage were common.
5. **Planning:** Participants wanted more clarity and consistency in the planning system, particularly regarding holiday homes and listed buildings, along with more sustainable design practices.
6. **Community:** There was a focus on preserving local character, addressing light pollution, and improving amenities like playgrounds and healthcare facilities.

Overall, the consultation stressed the need for sustainable development, improved infrastructure, and policies that balance housing needs, tourism, and environmental concerns.