



Local Plan Review Workshop Summary

Workshop Topic: Heritage and Built Conservation
Date: 22nd June 2021
Time: 14.00
Workshop led by: Adele Metcalfe, Sarah Welsh, Anna Badcock

Summary of Attendees:

Number of external attendees:	19
Organisations Represented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fisher German• Bradwell CLT• Chatsworth• Oldham Council• Friends of Loxley Valley• CLA• PDNPA Members• National Trust• Transport for the North• Peak Park Parishes Forum• Over Haddon Parish Council• Staffordshire County Council• Hope Valley Climate Action• Stoney Middleton Parish Council• Quaker Community

Link to topic paper:

[Heritage-and-Built-Conservation.pdf \(peakdistrict.gov.uk\)](#)

Link to presentation:

[PowerPoint Presentation \(peakdistrict.gov.uk\)](#)

Questions asked for workshops:

1) Do you agree that we are delivering National Park purposes to conserve and enhance the cultural heritage of the Peak District National Park?

2) Could we still achieve National Park purposes if our detailed policies for new development (where permitted) were more flexible and allowed applicants to be more creative in terms of design, materials and methods of construction?

(2a) What might be the risks to a more flexible approach

Summary of responses given:

- Group 1: There are some conservation challenges – e.g. double glazing.
- Need to support a flexible approach, this will drive innovation but isn't cheap and may increase the gap between those with and those without. We could use innovation to build more Affordable housing but the process can be demoralising.
- Need to keep what we already have and make it re-habitable.
- Need to assess on a case by case basis and communicate effectively.
- Group 2: We need to make greater use of climate change mechanisms in planning. There is massive room for improvement but high costs are associated with this.
- Concern that the cost of retrofitting will increase the value of house prices and price people out. Also concern that the cost would lead to the deterioration of Heritage Assets.
- Concern that if housing is up for sale it will be sold to be holiday homes.
- There is limited creative design to reference in the Peak District. Would having more creative design impact on its character? The group thought not.
- Need to see more enabling measures.
- Group 3:

Q1 Do you agree that we are delivering National Park Purposes to conserve and enhance the cultural heritage of the Peak District National Park?

- In principle yes but need to be clear what 'conserve and enhance' actually mean – it shouldn't result in the Park being a place frozen in time. How is it measured?
- Need to ensure that the planning process is managing change in an appropriate way, there needs to more done to alter the perception that the Park always refuses planning permission and has a very negative approach to development. Only the contentious applications are presented to committee and these take the limelight in terms of the Parks approach to development, when over 87% of applications are actually dealt with through delegated authority.
- Any revisions to approach and policy need to be promoted in a positive manner.
- Moors for the Future Strategy has had hidden benefits for cultural and historic landscapes and assets. Positive hidden benefits of the policy – consequences for the restoration of cultural heritage.

Q2 Could we still achieve National Park purposes if our detailed policies for new development (where permitted) were more flexible and allowed applicants to be more creative in terms of design, materials and methods of construction?

- The Park should also consider existing buildings that may be subject to development such as through change of use, extension, conversion not solely 'new' build development.
- Any revised policy could focus on the different characters within the Peak Park, it is the inherent characteristics of different parks of the park that provide the overall character.
- There should be scope for modern development, approach to design, materials etc. whilst recognising that the attraction of the Park is the scenery, heritage and landscapes etc.
- Change within the historic environment should be carefully managed to complement the environment, not recreate a pastiche.
- New developments can fit in and could be used to show evolution of development in the Park through time.
- Recognised that there are examples of modern development that have been permitted but these are very far and few between – fact there are very few demonstrates that the Park is doing very little which is innovative. Suggested that the recent development at Bradwell could have done more to be more innovative in terms of design, material etc.
- Discussion on Core Strategy approach and named settlements – different views on whether the policy should allow more development opportunities over and above current stance for only on Brownfield sites.
- Recognition that there is a need for the strategy to provide more support for services and facilities within villages and development may achieve this.

Q3 What might be the risks to a more flexible approach?

- Significant impact on heritage assets, architecture, grounds and historic parklands.
- Fine balance between adapting to address climate change and resulting in significant harm to heritage and cultural assets.
- Balance to be struck between mitigation and adaptation.
- Park needs to do more to encourage new developments to be proactive to address climate change and include measures to mitigate. Pre application advice and guidance key to this being successful and should be promoted widely.
- Argue that there is scope for more flexibility but that this should be implemented gradually and monitored – suggested that change shouldn't be simply brought in overnight.
- Flexibility in approach will possibly drive innovation but will lead to cost implications for development. May lead to social and economic consequences – costs for development may increase – resulting in increase in costs of housing = impact on affordability for local people.
- Greater flexibility may slow down the planning and development process.
- NPPF enabling policy approach should be included in Park policy reviews.
- Mitigation should be the number one priority then adaptation.
- Group 4: The National Park is doing its job.
- Cultural heritage needs to be balanced with social and economic issues.