Local Plan Review Topic Paper

Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure

PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK

Cover image courtesy of Sam North

April 2021

Contents

Introduction

This topic paper has been prepared to inform the review of the Peak District National Park Local Plan. Its focus is sustainable transport and infrastructure

Its purpose is to:

- assess the performance of existing policy
- examine the latest research, guidance and evidence that will impact on new policy
- highlight gaps in knowledge and generate areas of further research

Other topic papers in this series cover:

- Climate Change and Sustainable Buildings
- Economy
- Health and Well-being
- Heritage and Built Conservation
- Housing
- Landscape, Biodiversity and Nature Recovery
- Minerals (pending)
- Recreation and Tourism
- Shops and Community Facilities
- Utilities

Executive Summary

The Peak District is home to 38,000 residents and receives up to 26 million visits every year. This means that there is a high demand for travel to, from and within the National Park.

Road and public transport powers are held by a number of organisations across the Peak District and the establishment of sub-National Transport bodies adds an additional layer of complexity. As the body responsible for planning, the National Park Authority uses its planning policies to influence other organisations and encourage options for sustainable transport. We also play a role in the provision of parking for houses, businesses and visitors.

Headlines

- The overall aspirations for sustainable travel set out in the Core Strategy have proved challenging.
- Leisure cycling has increased during the life of the Core Strategy. The evidence for this is both anecdotal and from automatic counter data. However, for most popular leisure cycling destinations such as the Trail network, the majority of visitors arrive initially by car.
- The dominance of the car for travel is demonstrated by the resurgence in traffic over the life of the Plan, following the recession from 2008 onwards. Between 2012 and 2017, there was an increase in flows of approximately 13%.
- Policies relating to specific types of development appear to be most effective. There may be other methods more appropriate for encouraging behaviour change.
- Residents are concerned about parking provision in settlements and wider traffic and visitor management issues.

What has worked well?

- Road building – the Core Strategy approach has enabled the Authority to work with highway authorities and Highways England to influence remedial schemes across the National Park. Examples include the A54, A619 and A628. Highways England and Transport for the North (TfN) have engaged with the Authority in discussions about long term proposals to improve trans-Pennine connectivity.
- Design of transport infrastructure – building on previous work, the Peak District National Park Transport Design Guide SPD was adopted in 2019. We have a constructive relationship with some highway authorities over design, but not all.
- Rail – strong policies enabled the National Park Authority to influence the design of the Hope Valley Capacity Enhancement scheme within the National Park. This worked well enough for the Authority to withdraw its objection to the proposals prior to the public inquiry in May 2016.
- Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding – promoting the enhancement of former railway routes.

What has been more challenging?

- Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport – this is an aspirational policy and difficult to measure. Using average annual daily traffic flows as a proxy indicator we can see that between 2012 and 2017 there was an increase of approximately 13%.
- Travel Plans – the use of Policy T2F should ensure that developers consider non-car access to new sites. However, a decline in the availability of alternative means of transport in some areas can limit effectiveness. The policy is also dependent on robust ongoing monitoring and evaluation of travel plans.
- Parking – a change in Government approach meant that the Core Strategy policy of maximum standards became out of date quite quickly. The DMP policies are pragmatic, with both maximum and minimum standards, and an updated parking standards document. It is still too early to measure the success of this approach.

Part 1: Context

1.1 National Park Context

1.1.1 The Peak District National Park lies at the heart of England surrounded by urban areas and with a visitor catchment of approximately 13.5 million[1]. The National Park experiences up to 26 million visits per year[2], with the majority of visitors arriving by private car.

1.1.2 The National Park also has a population of approximately 38,000 residents. Our residents depend on surrounding urban areas for access to services including employment, education and healthcare. According to the 2011 Census, 92% of resident households have access to a car or van.

1.1.3 Since 2011, there has been a reduction in public transport services providing access to, from and within the National Park. This decline reflects budgetary constraints experienced by the National Park's constituent transport authorities. Leisure and evening services have been the hardest hit.

1.1.4 The National Park's close proximity to urban areas also means that there is a desire for improved connectivity between our neighbouring towns and cities, with the most direct routes often crossing the National Park. There are two strategic east to west cross-Park transport routes. These are the A628 Trunk Road[3] and the Sheffield to Manchester railway (the Hope Valley Line).

English national parks and the broads: UK government vision and circular 2010

1.1.5 Paragraph 85 of the English national parks and the broads: UK government vision and circular 2010 states that: -

> "*Improvements of main routes through the Parks are governed largely by considerations outside those relating to the Park area itself. However, there is a strong presumption against any significant road widening or the building of new roads through a Park, unless it can be shown there are compelling reasons for the new or enhanced capacity and with any benefits outweighing the costs very significantly. Any investment in trunk roads should be directed to developing routes for long distance traffic which avoid the Parks.*"

Sub-National Transport Bodies

1.1.6 The Peak District National Park lies inside the areas covered by Transport for the North (an established sub-national transport body) and Midlands Connect (the transport arm of the Midlands Engine). Both of these organisations have prepared transport strategies or plans containing their aspirations for transport. In the case of Transport for the North, these include improved east-west connectivity by road and rail across the National Park.

---

[1] Office for National Statistics Census Data (2011) indicates that 13.5 million people live within a one-hour drive of the National Park boundary.
[2] STEAM data indicates that there are approximately 13 million visits lasting 3 hours or more, whilst estimates suggest that an equal number of visits last less than three hours. Source Peak District National Park State of Tourism Report (2019)
[3] Part of the Strategic Road Network managed by Highways England.

1.2   National Planning Policy Framework

1.2.1   The National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 (NPPF)[4] sets the context for planning at the national and local level. Under '*Strategic Planning*', paragraph 20 states that:

> "*Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for…infrastructure for transport*"[5].

1.2.2   Under 'Supporting a prosperous rural economy', paragraph 84 states that:

> "*Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport)*"

1.2.3   Under '*Open space and recreation*', paragraph 98 states that:

> "*Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.*"

1.2.4   Chapter 9 of the NPPF, '*Promoting Sustainable Transport*', states in paragraph 102 that; "*Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals*". In achieving this, the focus should be on: -

a)   Addressing any potential impacts of development on the transport network;

b)   Making best use of opportunities arising from existing or proposed transport infrastructure to incorporate changing transport technologies and ways in which people travel;

c)   Identifying and delivering opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use;

d)   Identifying, assessing and taking account of the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure, including through taking opportunities to avoid and mitigate adverse effects; and delivering environmental net gains;

e)   Integrating patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations into the design of schemes to ensure delivery of high quality places.

---

[4] National Planning Policy Framework (2019) https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf
[5] Paragraph 20, part b of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

1.2.5 Paragraph 103 of the NPPF (2019) goes on to state that; "*the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives*".

1.2.6 Chapter 15 of the NPPF (2019) '*Conserving and enhancing the natural environment*', states that "*Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks*" (paragraph 172). The paragraph goes on to state that "*the scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited*", and that: -

> "*Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.*"

1.2.7 Paragraph 172 then sets out the criteria against which these exceptional circumstances may be judged, in relation to;

    i)   The need for the development;

    ii) The opportunities for the development to take place outside of the National Park; and

    iii) The detrimental effects of the development on "*the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities*", balanced against opportunities to moderate such effects.

1.3 Local Plan

1.3.1 The Peak District National Park Authority is neither a highway nor a transport authority; these roles lie with our constituent authorities[6]. Each of our constituent transport authorities produces a Local Transport Strategy and / or Local Transport Plan, setting out its aspirations. These vary according to the authority in question.

1.3.2 Whilst the National Park Authority does not have transport powers, it is the planning authority for the whole National Park. The complicated political geography of the Peak District makes it necessary and advantageous for the Authority to utilise its planning powers to further National Park purposes in relation to transport.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011)

1.3.3 The Core Strategy (2011) sets out the following spatial ambition in relation to Accessibility, travel and traffic:

> "*Residents, visitors and businesses will access their needs in ways that conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park*"[7].

1.3.4 Chapter 15 of the Core Strategy (2011) contains seven policies under the heading of '*Accessibility, travel and traffic*'. **Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport**, sets the tone. This policy

---

[6] The National Park falls under the control of the following 7 highway authorities plus Highways England; Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, Cheshire East Council, Derbyshire County Council, Kirklees Council, Oldham Council, Sheffield City Council, and Staffordshire County Council. In addition there are 6 Transport Authorities; Cheshire East Council, Derbyshire County Council, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, Staffordshire County Council, Transport for Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire Metro.

[7] Paragraph 8.3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy

focuses on discouraging cross-Park traffic, whilst encouraging visitors and residents to use alternatives to the car. The policy also seeks to address the negative impact of traffic on environmentally sensitive areas, through demand management, where appropriate. Part A of the policy also makes clear the requirement for transport to conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park by planning and design. The remaining six policies add detail to Policy T1, as follows: -

1.3.5 **Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic within the National Park** sets out the Authority's overall opposition to road building within the National Park, along with its support for transport schemes that reduce traffic. The policy describes the road hierarchy for the National Park, along with preferences for how different users use different types of road dependent on their destination and journey purpose. Finally, the policy encourages Travel Plans to achieve sustainable travel for new developments.

1.3.6 **Policy T3: Design of transport infrastructure** focuses on a minimalist approach to transport infrastructure, along with a requirement to have regard to the valued characteristics of the National Park. The Peak District National Park Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) adds detail to this policy.

1.3.7 **Policy T4: Managing the demand for freight transport** sets out the criteria for the location of freight facilities, with reference to the use of rail, the appropriate road network and the needs of businesses within the National Park.

1.3.8 **Policy T5: Managing the demand for rail, and reuse of former railway routes** safeguards land associated with the potential reinstatement of the Matlock to Buxton and Woodhead railways, and encourages enhancement of the Hope Valley Line, whilst requiring continuity of the Monsal and Trans Pennine Trails as recreational trails.

1.3.9 **Policy T6: Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, and waterways** seeks to protect the Public Rights of Way network, existing multi-user trails and the Huddersfield Narrow Canal. It also offers opportunities for the reuse of any other disused railways for walking, cycling or horse riding.

1.3.10 **Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks** commits to reviewing current traffic management schemes. The policy aims to limit parking to a minimum, whilst taking account of operational requirements and environmental constraints. The policy also encourages park and ride schemes where appropriate.

Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (NPDPP) (2019)

1.3.11 Chapter 9 of the NPDPP (2019) contains nine policies under the heading of '*Travel and transport*'. The policies add detail to the strategic policies contained within the Core Strategy.

1.3.12 **Policy DMT1: Cross-Park roads** adds clarity to Policy T1 by defining the criteria under which new or upgraded Cross-Park Roads might be supported or permitted. **Policy DMT2: Local road improvements** provides similar criteria for improvements to local roads.

1.3.13 **Policy DMT3: Access and design criteria** complements Policy T3. The Peak District National Park Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019)[8] adds detail to both policies.

1.3.14 **Policy DMT4: Railway construction** adds criteria against which the development of new railways will be assessed.

1.3.15 **Policy DMT5: Development affecting a public right of way** provides criteria, which must be met, if a public right of way or multi-user trail is affected by development.

1.3.16 **Policies DMT6: Business Parking**, **DMT7: Visitor parking** and **DMT8: Residential off-street parking** all add detail to Policy T7. This section of the Plan also introduces the Peak District National Park Parking Standards, which apply across the whole of the National Park and are contained within Appendix 9 of the Development Management Policies document.

1.3.17 Finally **Policy DMT9: Air Transport** sets out controls on the use of sites for the take-off and landing of aircraft within the National Park. The policy applies to both powered and non-powered flight and includes the use of drones.

---

[8] Transport Design Guide: Peak District National Park

Part 2: Performance of Policy

2.1 What are we judging policy against?

2.1.1 The Core Strategy contains the high level outcome 'residents, visitors and businesses will access their needs in ways that conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park.'

Peak District National Park Management Plan NPMP (2018–23)

2.1.2 The review process that led up to this plan included topic papers covering areas of relevance to the review including sustainable travel and transport. This included the aspirations of the Peak District National Park Sustainable Transport Action Plan (2012-17) because these aspirations remain relevant: -

> "*The National Park is known as a place you can easily and inexpensively travel to, within and from, without a car. Choice of travel options makes using public transport, walking and cycling more attractive and part of the National Park experience, and there is less reliance on the private car. Innovative travel solutions become part of the attraction of the National Park.*
>
> *Transport infrastructure is at a minimum, sympathetically designed and there are no redundant structures. Therefore, the National Park is known as a place where transport infrastructure respects the environment and protects the valued characteristics, while promoting safety.*"[9]

2.1.3 The current NPMP focuses on 6 key areas of impact: -

> 1: Preparing for a future climate
>
> 2: Ensuring a future for farming and land management
>
> 3: Managing landscape conservation on a big scale
>
> 4: A National Park for everyone
>
> 5: Encouraging enjoyment with understanding
>
> 6: Supporting thriving and sustainable communities and economy

Sustainable transport and infrastructure plays a key role in 'areas of impact' 1, 4 and 6.

2.2 Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR) (2012/13 to 2016-17)

2.2.1 The AMRs judge performance of the Core Strategy Policies. The following text provides an assessment of the performance of the policies based on those indicators.

2.2.2 **Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport** – the Indicator for this policy focuses on Average Annual Daily Traffic Flows (AADT), with figures being based on average flows across a mix of 'Cross-

---

[9] Peak District National Park Management Plan Topic Papers
https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0032/78179/Background-Topic-Papers.pdf

Park' roads, 'A Roads' and 'Recreational Routes'. Between 2012 and 2017, there was a total increase of approximately 13%. Year-on-year increases varied between 2.4% and 4.4%. It was anticipated that the overall trend in growth would continue beyond 2017. However, the Covid-19 pandemic has significantly affected traffic flows. These effects will be visible within the AADT for 2020.

2.2.3 **Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic within the National Park** – there are two indicators: -

      a) The number and type of road building schemes within the National Park, and;

      b) The number and type of changes to the road traffic network.

2.2.4 During the life of the Plan, the Authority has supported structural improvements relating to the safety and integrity of the Park's road network. This has included remedial schemes relating to subsidence on the A54, A619 and A628 within the National Park. During this time, the Highways England Trans Pennine Upgrade Programme included a proposal for two climbing lanes along the A628 within the National Park. However, whilst these formed part of a non-statutory public consultation in 2017, the proposals did not form part of the two subsequent statutory public consultations in 2018 and 2020. Separately, Highways England and Transport for the North have engaged with the Peak District National Park Authority in relation to further proposals along the A57 / A628 Woodhead strategic route.

2.2.5 **Policy T3: Design of transport infrastructure** – the indicator focuses on schemes that incorporate design that is sympathetic to the National Park. Over the life of the Plan, the Authority has responded to consultations on the design of a number of schemes. In addition, we adopted the Peak District National Park Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) to support this policy aim.

2.2.6 **Policy T4: Managing the demand for freight transport** – the indicator records permissions for freight facilities granted contrary to policy.

2.2.7 **Policy T5: Managing the demand for rail, and reuse of former railway routes** – the indicator relates to any changes reported to safeguarded routes. Just prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy, the Pedal Peak Project (2010-11) delivered enhancement to the Monsal Trail. It included the reopening of four tunnels between Bakewell and Blackwell Mill. The project did not materially affect the ability to safeguard- the route. On rail routes, a Public Inquiry (May 2016) found in favour of capacity enhancements to the Hope Valley Line, including a passing loop between Hathersage and Bamford. Delivery of this scheme has not started yet.

2.2.8 **Policy T6: Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, and waterways** – the indicator records changes in length of the network of permissive and statutory routes. The Pedal Peak II Project (2013-15) delivered enhancement to routes both linking to, and within the National Park.

2.2.9 **Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks** – the indicator for this policy is changes to Traffic Management Schemes. Over the course of the Plan, there have been

minor tweaks to traffic management within the National Park. However, in the aftermath of the Covid-19 lockdown, there has been a consistent demand from residents for improved traffic management measures. This is in response to an increase in occurrences of obstructive and dangerous parking, along with other antisocial or inappropriate behaviours. This has resulted in the introduction of a range of Temporary Traffic Management Orders during 2020, including at the Upper Derwent, Miller's Dale and Thorpe.

2.3   Other evidence and data

Parish Statements

2.3.1 The Peak District National Park Authority has worked in partnership with its constituent parishes to produce a series of Parish Statements. The statements include the aspirations of each parish, along with an assessment of its existing level of facilities and access to services. The Peak District National Park First Report on Parish Statements (2020) amalgamates the information from these statements.

2.3.2 One of the reasons for producing the Parish Statements was to establish a definition for '*thriving and sustainable communities*'. One of the elements that parishes feel is required to meet this definition is '*Good public transport*'. The Core Strategy defines good transport as more than five journeys each way per day. However, it is clear from feedback, that the timing and connections available for accessing jobs and education are more important than the overall number of journeys[10].

2.3.3 When asked about the issues affecting them, the most common one related to parking, with 9 parishes, identifying 'parking as a problem'[11]. The second most common concerns were 'busy roads and speed limits' (7 parishes). An equal number raised concerns in relation to visitor management[12].

2.3.4 Perhaps, unsurprisingly, these topics also featured, when parishes identified their future aspirations: -

- Tackling issues around public transport (4 parishes)
- Tackling issues around speed limits and busy roads (4 parishes)
- Village signage (3 parishes)
- Creating an accessible station (1 parish)[13]
- Visitor management issues (1 parish)

State of Tourism Report (2019)

2.3.5 According to the State of Tourism Report, the National Park receives approximately 12.64 million visits per year that last more than three hours. It is

---

[10] Peak District National Park Authority First Report on Parish Statements (2020)
[11] The inference is that this may be in relation to visitors but, many villages have limited off-street parking for residents also.
[12] Visitor management is included within this topic paper because in most cases, concerns about visitor management focus strongly on driver / rider (motorised and non-motorised) behaviours, both from an amenity and safety perspective.
[13] The assumption is that this refers to a railway station, and that therefore the comments are specific to the Hope Valley Line.

estimated that the National Park receives at least as many visits lasting less than three hours.

2.3.6 The majority of visitors to the National Park arrive by private car (83%) because it is most convenient for them. There are however locations within the National Park where bus and train offer convenient access. For example, the Hope Valley Railway allows easy rail access from Sheffield and Manchester to Edale, Hope, Bamford, Hathersage and Grindleford. The Buxton, Derwent Valley, Glossop and Trans Pennine lines also offer access to National Park Gateway settlements. Similarly, Bakewell acts as a hub for bus travel from a number of starting points including Buxton, Chesterfield, Matlock and Sheffield.

Annual Cycle and Pedestrian Count Reports

2.3.7 Since 2010, we have owned and managed a network of automatic counters on key multi-user trails across the National Park (High Peak Trail, Manifold Track, Monsal Trail and Tissington Trail). These counters record cyclist and pedestrian movements, with horse riders also recorded on the Pennine Bridleway spur along the Tissington Trail.

2.3.8 During 2018, a total of 519,000 visits were attributed to trails listed above, with 330,000 on the Monsal Trail[14]. During the summer of 2020, the easing of lockdown resulted in dramatic increases in user numbers. For example, the busiest July day in 2020 saw an increase in users from 3,000 to 4,000 (up 33%) over 2019. Overall, the average daily total for July in 2020 was double that of 2019[15].

2.4 Conclusion

2.4.1 The evidence suggests that the aspirations for sustainability set out in the Core Strategy have proved challenging to achieve. Levels of leisure cycling across the National Park have increased during the life of the Core Strategy. The evidence for this is both anecdotal (subjective) and objective, as derived from automatic cycle counter data. However, for most popular leisure cycling destinations such as the Trail network, the reality is that the majority of visitors arrive initially by car.

2.4.2 The dominance of the car is demonstrated by the resurgence in traffic over the life of the Plan, following the recession from 2008 onwards. It is too early to say what effect Covid-19 will have on travel behaviours over the medium term. However, early indications suggest that whilst the spring lockdown of 2020 encouraged walking and cycling, since lockdown eased in May 2020, car journeys have replaced some journeys previously made by public transport.

2.4.3 Overall, the indicators would suggest that policies relating to specific types of development are most effective. There may be other methods more appropriate than policy for encouraging behaviour change.

2.4.4. Some parts of the Core Strategy policies are aspirational in promoting sustainable transport. However, it is difficult to quantify the success of policy in improving the

---

[14] https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/learning-about/news/archive/2019-press-releases/news/happy-trails-half-a-million-visits-to-peak-district-routes
[15] Record numbers of people enjoying National Park 'multi-user' trails following lockdown: Peak District National Park

sustainability of transport, and therefore, we can question whether local plan policies are the best place to put our aspirations to achieve this. However, if these aspirations do not sit within the Local Plan, there may be some debate as where else they should go.

2.4.5 The concerns raised within the parish statements may have a bearing in the review of our policies, particularly with respect to parking provision in settlements and wider visitor management approaches. There are strong links between the Sustainable Transport & Infrastructure and the Recreation & Tourism themes in this respect.

Part 3: Issues and Evidence Driving New Policy

Regional Connectivity

3.1   There is a desire for improved road and rail connectivity between Greater Manchester and the Sheffield City Region, including to the North Midlands.   More recently, this has expanded to encompass wider connectivity between the Humber and Mersey ports.

Glover Report

3.2   Proposal 19 of the Glover Landscapes Review proposes:

   'a new approach to coordinating public transport piloted in the Lake District, and new, more sustainable ways of accessing national landscapes'.

   We are in discussion with the Department for Transport and Defra about the Peak District becoming an additional pilot area. We have also been working closely with Derbyshire County Council to investigate options for a Low Carbon Sustainable Transport Project.

Covid-19 Pandemic

3.3   Covid-19 has significantly changed travel behaviour across the National Park. During the spring lockdown of 2020, traffic flows were extremely low, with the general population being encouraged to work from home and only to make essential journeys.   At the same time, travel by all forms of public transport was actively discouraged other than for essential journeys

3.4   As lockdown eased from May 2020 onwards, there was a significant increase in visitors. However, these visits were largely made by car, with a slow return to both public transport provision and uptake.   During the late spring and summer of 2020, the large numbers of vehicles arriving at popular visitor locations such as the Upper Derwent Valley, Longshaw and Dovedale had a negative impact on the safe and efficient operation of the road network.   This made it necessary for the relevant highway authority to introduce emergency temporary traffic regulation orders restricting on-street parking in these locations.

3.5   The Autumn 2020 Covid-19 lockdown does not appear to have had the drastic effects on travel patterns that the Spring lockdown did. However, the January 2021 lockdown is quite restrictive in relation to travel, with a perception of greater levels of enforcement.   Therefore, it is likely that travel patterns will be similar to those of the Spring 2020 lockdown.

Ultra Low Emission / No Emission vehicles and other advances in technology

3.6   Road and rail transport remains a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. To date, where advances in technology have reduced emissions per vehicle, the growing number of journeys made has negated the benefits achieved. The Government has adopted ambitious targets for achieving net-zero Carbon by 2050. Achievement of these targets will require changes in the way that people travel.

3.7   It is likely that this will require more journeys to be made by active travel such as walking and cycling; and by public transport. There are still journeys that will need to be made by cars. However, it may become more common for people to use car clubs rather than personally own a car. Increasingly cars and other motor vehicles will be powered by electricity or in some cases hydrogen fuel cell technology. There will be a need for more facilities to encourage this change, including more public Electric Vehicle Charging points or facilities to supply hydrogen.

3.8   The move to Ultra Low Emission and No Emission vehicles is likely to include most types of vehicle from cars, to buses, to HGVs, to trains. As a result, it will become increasingly important for these vehicles, both private and public to interact with energy supply systems. Vehicles are likely to draw power from the grid at times of low demand and when the electricity is cheap. However, they will also act as batteries, providing electricity reserves for the grid during times of high demand, receiving payment or credit in return. This approach will determine the net cost of charging electric vehicles and may influence the times that people choose to make non-essential car journeys.

3.9   It is still relatively early to assess the attractiveness of e-bikes compared to conventional bikes. However, as demand reduces the cost of ownership, it is likely that they will become more popular. E-bikes may encourage new or returning cyclists. It may also mean that they will replace the car for some journeys, or that more people will make more frequent or longer journeys by bike. Growth in the uptake of cycling in general and e-bikes in particular is likely to increase the need for safe and secure cycle parking facilities as well as opportunities for charging.

3.10   Additional advances in technology could further change how we travel. These include, but are not restricted to autonomous / semi-autonomous vehicles, connected vehicles; and advances in how people use apps to plan and pay for door to door journeys across different types of transport. For example a journey could include a taxi pick-up from home to the railway station, followed by a train journey, a bus ride and a hired e-bike to make the final part of the journey, all arranged and paid for in advance with guaranteed connections. This approach is known as Mobility as a Service or MaaS.

Part 4: Requirement for Further Evidence and Questions Arising

4.1 Further Evidence

4.1.1 There is scope to assess changes in the availability of access by public transport over the life of the Plan based on the Peak District Timetable books from winter 2011 compared with winter 2019. This is useful information, but its relevance to the policy development is probably contextual rather than directing policy. This may be of use in pursuing aspirations for sustainable transport outside of the scope of the Plan.

4.1.2 Given the ongoing debate on reinstatement of rail, it would be useful to gather some user opinion as to the benefits of the Trail network and possible continued support for safeguarding it or not. This could be a user survey, but should also be via the NPA and appropriate partner websites to encourage a wider debate.

4.1.3 A review of access to services would be useful for all settlements – this may have varied from the norm during Covid-19. The best approach to this is via highway authorities and Accession[16]. Possibly two scenarios based on pre-Covid-19 (Winter 2019/20) and post Covid-19 (Winter 2020/21).

4.1.4 An assessment of the use of and effectiveness of Travel Plans in relation to qualifying planning applications.

4.1.5 Air quality has become a key concern for public health, with poor air quality contributing to ill health and early death, particularly amongst vulnerable groups. The Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted this impact, where exposure to poor air quality appears to be a contributory factor to the severity of the effects of the virus. The Automatic Traffic Counters on roads within the National Park can provide proxy emissions data across a range of pollutants, through the use of classified counts and a data processing algorithm. Using this data to assess trends would be useful in the preparation for a proposed Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document.

4.1.6 There are sources of data to assess the use of travel modes. This data is valuable in the pursuit of our aim to encourage sustainable and active transport.

4.2 Questions Arising

4.2.1 **Road building** – Core Strategy Policy T2C sets out a strategic approach to road building in the National Park, which limits new roads to those which provide access to new development, or where there are exceptional circumstances. These exceptional circumstances are that there is no alternative to the scheme and that it fulfills a national need; is in the public interest; and that it delivers long term transport, environmental and economic benefit to the National Park.[17]

A similar approach is adopted for road schemes that fall outside of the Authority's planning control. The policy states that such schemes "*will be strongly resisted except in exceptional circumstances*". Policies DMT1 and DMT2 support this

---

[16] Assesses travel time to key services by means other than the car.
[17] Policy DMT1: Cross Park Roads NPDPP (2019)

strategic approach, with DMT1 setting out the criteria for exceptional circumstances.

Is this the correct approach?

4.2.2 **Travel Plans** – Core Strategy Policy T2F seeks the use of travel plans to ensure sustainable access to new developments. This approach ensures that developers consider access to their sites by means other than the private car and provide appropriate facilities.

Should this approach be carried forward into the new plan?

4.2.3 **Design of transport Infrastructure** – Core Strategy Policy T3 and Development Management Policy DMT3 seek to influence the design of transport infrastructure in the National Park. The Peak District National Park Transport Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019) supports this approach.

Should the approach where all transport development in the National Park has regard to both setting and the special qualities of the National Park be continued within the new Local Plan?

4.2.4 **Freight Transport** – Core Strategy Policy T4 seeks to ensure that freight facilities within the National Park serve businesses within the National Park and that they are located on the A and B road network. The policy also supports development to enable the transfer of road freight to rail. We believe that this approach strikes a balance between the requirement for freight facilities and the movement of freight, and the impact of such facilities on the National Park.

Is this approach is still appropriate?

4.2.5 **Rail** – Core Strategy Policy T5A safeguards land tunnels and bridges for the potential reinstatement of the former Woodhead and Matlock to Buxton Railways, whilst Policy T5B seeks to ensure the continuation of the Monsal and Trans Pennine Trails in the event of reinstatement.

Is this still the right approach, given the proven importance of the use of these former railways as recreational multi-user trails and some of the most popular cyclist destinations in the Park?

4.2.6 **Parking** – Core Strategy Policies T7B and T7C take a restrictive approach to the provision of additional parking, based on maximum standards aimed at promoting sustainable transport over the private car. Policies DMT6, DMT7 and DMT8 of the Development Management Policies Document (DMPD), combined with the Peak District National Park Parking Standards take a less restrictive approach in line with the NPPF. We believe that the approach set out in the DMPD is more pragmatic and offers greater flexibility than the Core Strategy.

Is the more flexible approach to parking as contained within the Development Management Policies correct?

4.2.7 **Air Transport** – Policy DMT8 sets out our approach to air transport and in particular take-off and landing sites. This includes the control of sites from which drones may be flown. Drones may offer better options for parcel delivery and vegetation monitoring in the near future.

Do we need to revise our approach to drones?

If so, should this include the designation of no-fly zones or scientific research zones?

4.2.8 **Air Quality** – The current transport policies encourage sustainable transport, but do not specifically refer to air quality or transport related airborne pollution.

Is this an area that should be considered for inclusion within the new Local Plan?