

CONSULTATION ON CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Sheet 3

Landscape Policy SPRING 2007



Peak District National Park Authority

Aldern House
Baslow Road
Bakewell
Derbyshire
DE45 1AE

Tel: (01629) 816 200
Text: (01629) 816 319
Fax: (01629) 816 310
Email: customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk
Website: www.peakdistrict.gov.uk

Your comments and views on this options paper are welcomed up to 29 June 2007. Enquiries can be directed to Brian Taylor, Policy Planning Manager on 01629 816 303. This report is also accessible from our website located under www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/plansandpolicies.htm .

We are happy to provide this information in alternative formats on request where reasonable.

Published April 2007

<p>Issue</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need for Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) 2. Need to retain character and appearance of the Natural* Zone 3. Need to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of agricultural and historic industrial landscapes 4. Need to understand the future for landscape policy as a result of changes to farming and climate issues 5. Impact of large modern farm buildings 6. Trends highlighting the loss of traditional landscape features and habitats <p>* The Natural Zone is a definition used in legislation however all landscapes comprise geology, topography, habitat and the impact of thousands of years of management by man and animals.</p>
<p>Evidence</p>	<p>National</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1995 Environment Act; (National Park purposes and associated duty) <p>National park purposes, as defined in the 1995 Environment Act, are:</p> <p>to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage [of the national parks]; and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of those areas by the public.</p> <p>The duty of the National Park Authority and other organisations as defined in the 1995 Environment Act is:</p> <p>to ‘seek to foster the economic and social well-being’ of their local communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planning Policy Statement 7 : Sustainable development in rural areas <p>National Parks are afforded the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty which should be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions.</p> <p>Regional</p> <p>East Midlands Regional Guidance Policy 30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the past decade increased weight has been placed on understanding local variations in landscape type and character and carrying out work to make this easily understood. National and Regional Policy now require that local policies are based on such a “landscape characterisation” approach. <p>Local</p> <p>National Park Management Plan Outcome required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The natural beauty of the landscapes means they are still attractive places to live in and visit and assets to communities and the economy and. • There is a clear characterisation of the whole of the landscape and it is conserved and enhanced in accordance with that characterisation.

[State of the Park Report 2000 and 2004](#) update:

- Shows decreasing quantities of dry stone walls and hedges, hay meadows, unimproved enclosed pastures, lead rakes and ponds.
- Shows 72% of Sites of Special Scientific Interest in the National Park are considered to be in unfavourable condition (English Nature December 2003)
- Future expectations for landscape are unclear (given changes in farming and climate change).
- Landscape and biodiversity are being affected by climate change. The pressures on rare heather moorlands are being monitored by the Moors for the Future project.
- Overall the characteristic sparse nature of development outside settlements has been retained and in particular the wild, undeveloped character of the Natural Zone has been protected.
- The biggest development pressure in the open countryside is for large modern agricultural buildings. Some of these do not require planning permission)

58% believe deterioration in landscape quality would affect their business.
(Prosperity and Protection : Yorkshire and Humber Regional Study into the economic impact of National Parks designation on that regions economy)

[Survey 2004 results](#)

Total number of responses = 388

Where were responses generated?

- 28.6% from the Bakewell Show.
- 19.1% from the Penistone show.
- 15.5% from the Manifold show.
- 14.9% from the Hope show.
- 10.3% from the Tourist Information Centres.
- 6.2% from the Staffordshire Moorlands CVS.
- 4.4% from our local libraries (Bakewell, Matlock, Buxton and Ashbourne).

Where do these people live?

- 63.1% described themselves as visitors to the park.
- 34.3% described themselves as residents of the park.
- 2.6% gave no response.

How do you think farming should develop in the National Park?

- 14.2% said 'No change'
- 17% said 'Economic diversification'
- 34.8% said 'Environment and landscape management'
- 42% said 'Linking Environment and Economy'
- 11% said 'Other'
- 2.3 % did not reply

Environmental management is becoming a more important part of farming in the National Park?

- 80.9% 'Agree'
- 7.0% 'Disagree'
- 9.8% had 'No opinion'
- 2.3% did not respond

Farmers within the Peak District find it difficult to make a good economic return from their land – would it be acceptable for them to change the landscape to improve their income?

- 58.8% felt 'Yes' it would be acceptable
- 33.2% felt 'No' it would not be acceptable
- 3.9% had 'No opinion'
- 4.9% did not reply.

How important is it to conserve and enhance the traditional village scene?

- 3.4% felt it is 'Unimportant'
- 22.7% felt it is 'Quite important'
- 73.5% felt it is 'Very important'
- 1.3% had no opinion

Responses to "Help Shape the Future," (2005) – (not web base but can be sent email.)

- Clear that concern for landscape conservation and enhancement is widely shared.
- strong support for the retention of the Natural Zone; for new Landscape Character Assessment; and for strategies aimed at conserving and enhancing valued characteristics to be placed at the centre of policy.
- Need for landscape character and building design matters to be properly integrated.
- Clear support for the control of infrastructure in the landscape with particular emphasis on reducing roadside clutter, and more sensitive use of directional signage and street furniture.
- The need to respect dark skies and tranquillity are viewed as valuable aims in respecting landscape character.

Responses

- We welcome LCA but don't apply too rigidly as will prevent natural evolution e.g from semi improved grassland to moor. (Mr Bob Kelly - Ramblers Association, New Mills & District Group)
- We strongly support this proposal and it should be a priority for the Park. However some thought should be given to avoid duplication: habitat audits and joint character areas have done a lot to characterise the area. (Mr Jon Stewart - English Nature, Peak District & Derbyshire Team)
- Object if it means more legislation and restrictions on the small businesses Responder (Greg Potter - Peak District Sustainable Tourism Forum)
- But a great deal of support and resource needed to ensure homogenous

work across different communities. (Hayfield Parish Council)

- We agree with the text. (Sheldon Parish Council)
- LCA can help define the baseline for landscape but you need to monitor change to the urban parts of the landscape using Conservation Area Appraisals as baseline. (Ann Plackett - English Heritage)
- LCA should not be a detailed record of what is now - this will restrict adaptation. It should show how landscape has changed over 2000 years and why. This allows you to define underlying qualities and suggest how design can adapt incorporating these qualities in changing conditions. (Jan Stetka - Bakewell and District Historical Society)
- We support LCA work with Landscape Heritage and Conservation Assessments. (Norris, Laura Norris - Vivat Trust)
- We agree that a baseline is required. We are not sure about the extent to which cultural heritage can be brought into this because a lot of cultural heritage is social history and not physical manifestations in the landscape. (Don't forget social history and bring it to life by interactive educational programmes e.g drama and film.) Groundwork's Creative Media Team has a track record in cultural heritage projects. (Rachel Billings - Groundwork Derby and Derbyshire)
- We support the suggestion that LCA methodologies may assist here, in particular the Community Landscape Character Statement process that has been developed by CPRE nationally. (John King - Friends of the Peak District)
- LCA can help to provide this but this should also be linked to Heritage Landscape Characterisation. Again community engagement is crucial to 'square the circle' and achieve non-expert involvement. (John King Friends of the Peak District)
- Guidelines rather than prescriptions might be more appropriate. The BAP and JCAs can help. Stewart, (Jon Stewart - English Nature, Peak District & Derbyshire Team)
- CLA does not welcome the imposition of management by prescription by any authority that affects any privately owned property, and this is frequently resented by landowners. If an authority is desirous of change then this is something they must discuss with the affected landowners at the outset and win their support. (Mr Andrew Shirley Country Land and Business Association)
- Object if it means more legislation and restrictions on small businesses (Mr R G Potter - Peak District Sustainable Tourism Forum)
- Support prescriptions for land management in line with LCA and valued characteristics (Janet Cuff - Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peak area)
- Prescription for landscape management would quickly become proscriptive. Leave it at description (Hayfield Parish Council)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCA needs prescription but it mustn't be overly definitive - allowing flexibility and landscape change over time. (Sheldon Parish Council) • Prescriptions are needed alongside LCA (Ann Plackett English Heritage) • LCA should not include prescriptions because landscape is constantly changing. The LCA and design guide should inform design and development but not stifle new design where it respects the landscape character described by LCA (Pat Wilson High Peak Borough Council) • Have guidelines for adaptation rather than strict prescriptions or 'free for all' experimentation. It should not be biased towards current methods of landscape management given the warming environment. (Jan Stetka - Bakewell and District Historical Society) • We support prescriptions for land management on the back of LCA as long as it allows community involvement on decisions about change. The best management plans are about parameters for change not strict prescriptions. (Laura Norris Vivat Trust) • We support this approach (Rachel Billings Groundwork Derby and Derbyshire) • Yes. This would preferably involve, beyond the description phase, identification of forces for change, evaluation of strength of character, condition, landscape sensitivity and capacity. Landscape strategies and objectives for each LCA area/ type would be identified plus a 'shopping list' of landscape management issues and opportunities that can help shape future conservation and enhancement. (John King - Friends of the Peak District) <p>Further Evidence Outstanding</p> <p>Results of Landscape Character Assessment due Spring 2008</p>
Option 3.1	<p>More control based on deterioration of landscape and loss of traditional features and habitats and introduce the concept of enhancement zones to target degraded areas (and possibly link to planning gain)</p>
Option 3.2	<p>No change in principle to saved policies* until further debate has taken place with key stakeholders to agree the future of landscapes. Could begin to be informed by Landscape Character Assessment to aid the integration of new development and scope for landscape enhancement.</p> <p>* <i>Strict protection of the Natural Zone with scope for exceptional development outside the Natural Zone and of towns and villages relating to: agriculture; forestry; farm diversification; extension of residential buildings; development promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the National Park; mineral working; and the conversion of traditional buildings for tourist accommodation or for affordable housing for local need where a contribution can be secured in larger schemes. All development should be compatible with other policies in the plan, and should not adversely affect the character and setting of</i></p>

	<i>valued characteristics.</i>
Option 3.3	Allow a more flexible approach that enables the landscape to change and evolve even if this means loss of the valued character of the National Park e.g. grazed land, stone walls, traditional barns, etc. Could be informed by Landscape Character Assessment.

Do you have a preferred option or is there another option you would prefer to see?