



Peak District National Park Authority Local Plan Part 2 **Development Management Policies**

Interim Consultation Statement

October 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. Introduction	3
2. Statement of Community Involvement	4
3. Consultation Process Overview - including timeline for Regulation 18 (Preparation of a local plan)	6
4. Issues and Preferred Approaches	9
5. Publication Stage Reg.19 (November 2016)	28

1. Introduction

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared as a supporting document to the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies Document (DMP). It has also been produced to help comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (hereafter referred to as 'the Regulations'). It details how the National Park Authority has dealt with consultations, how comments (representations) have been sought, and how the representations that have been received have been addressed in the preparation and evolution of the DMP.

1.2 The DMP sets out the detailed policy framework that will be used for the determination of planning applications in the National Park alongside core policies already laid out in the adopted Core Strategy (2012).

1.3 In particular, and in line with the requirements of Regulation 22 of the Regulations, this statement sets out:

- Which bodies and persons the Authority invited to make representations under Regulation 18;
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulation 18;
- A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to Regulation 18; and
- How many representations made pursuant to Regulation 18 have been taken into account.

1.4 This Consultation Statement will be updated prior to the DMP being formally submitted to the Secretary of State (under Regulation 22) to reflect consultation methods and responses received at the Publication stage (Regulation 19) during November 2016 to January 2017.

2. Statement of Community Involvement

- 2.1 The Peak District National Park Authority has an adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI), which sets out how the Authority will involve the local community and other interested parties in the planning process.
- 2.2 The current SCI was adopted in May 2012 following public consultation. A number of amendments to the local planning regulations were made during April 2012, under the ***Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012***.
- 2.3 The adopted SCI therefore needs to be read alongside the regulations in order to understand the sound basis for consultation on plan making.
- 2.4 In terms of timeframes for consultation the SCI sets higher standards than the effective minimum standard laid down in regulation, e.g. 12 weeks at regulation 18 stage and 8 weeks for the regulation 19 (Publication stage) consultation. This was in recognition of the strong representation and relevance of the parish councils within the National Park. The 6 week regulatory minimum for consultation often does not provide sufficient time for parishes to meet and agree representations; hence longer consultation periods have been established.

Extract from SCI - Opportunities for involvement in the preparation of planning policy documents

Consultation on the Issues and Preferred Options document

This document will set out the issues and the reasons for selection of preferred options, and a summary of the alternatives that were considered. There will be a 12-week consultation period which will be advertised on the website and in a press notice.

Statutory consultees, local communities and other relevant stakeholders from the list at Appendix 1 will be consulted by email or letter. Public meetings/exhibitions and workshops will be arranged where appropriate. Documents will be placed on the website, and copies will be available to read at the Authority's office, and in a number of constituent authority offices and libraries within and adjoining the National Park (see Appendix 2). Representations can be made by post, fax or email; on-line response systems will be available.

All representations will be acknowledged. All the comments made will be considered in finalising documents for publication, and will be discussed with respondents if necessary to clarify or consider in more detail. A summary of representations and the Authority's responses will be prepared and made available on the website.

Publication of the draft plan

The draft plan and supporting documents will be offered for an 8-week consultation period, which will be advertised on the website and in a press notice. A Statement of Consultation will be prepared, describing how the requirements of the SCI have been met, and summarising all previous representations and the Authority's responses.

At this stage comments can only be made on the 'soundness' of the plan. Statutory consultees and other relevant stakeholders, and everybody who responded at the Preferred Options stage, will be consulted by letter or email. The documents will be placed on the website, and copies will be available to read at locations as before. Representations can be made by post or email; on-line response systems will be available. All representations will be acknowledged.

3. Consultation Process Overview

3.1 The Peak District National Park DMP has been subject to a combination of a variety of consultation methods which have played an important role in shaping the policies in this document. A range of methods have been employed including:

3.2 *September to December 2012 – an Issues and Preferred Approaches consultation document. This was the principle event satisfying the terms of Regulation 18 (Preparation of a local plan).*

3.3 The table below sets out a more complete timeline of engagement.

Date	Nature of Consultation	Who consulted
May 2012	Land Managers Forum Awareness of upcoming consultation	NFU CLA Land Owners Farmers Large Estates Utilities bodies
May 2012	Agents Forum – Awareness of upcoming consultation	Local planning Agents
May 2012	Discussion re policy issues	Derbyshire Fire and rescue
June 2012	Cross Authority meet up to learn about practical landscape delivery issues and impact on policy	Moors for the Future partnership
July 2012	Liaison meeting in advance of formal consultation	Peak Park Parishes Forum (PPPF)
Sep 2012	Annual Parishes Day launch of consultation and policy debates regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village capacity • Re-use of traditional buildings • Local needs and local connection for housing • Replacement dwellings • Employment sites (safeguarding and release) • Parking 	PPPF and wide range of parish councils
Sep 2012	High Peak radio interview	Listeners in High Peak area of Derbyshire
Sep 2012	Duty to Co-operate meeting	Tameside Borough Council
	Housing Forum on preferred approaches	Peak District Rural Housing Association Other Housing Associations Derbyshire Dales District

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

		Council
	Scoping of SA	Statutory Environmental bodies
	Scoping of HRA	Statutory Environmental bodies
24 th Sep – 17 December 2012 12 week period	Issues and preferred approaches	All specific and general consultation bodies
Oct 2012	Mid-point consultation discussion on DM policies	PPPF
25 th July 2013	Duty to Co-operate meeting	Derbyshire Dales District Council
8 th March 2013	Duty to Cooperate meeting	High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
July 2013	Report back on representations from consultation and planning ahead to parishes day	PPPF
	Authority workshop on DM policies	PDNPA Members
	Meeting/workshop on emerging evidence relating to historic farmsteads of the Peak District	Historic England
Oct 2013	Parishes Day – policy debates focussed on housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing • Barn conversions • Replacement dwellings 	PPPF and a wide range of parish councils
3 rd October 2013	Meeting/workshop on emerging evidence relating to historic farmsteads of the Peak District	Historic England
4 th September 2014	Duty to Co-operate Meeting with Barnsley	Barnsley Council
Sep 2014	Parishes Day – Debates under the theme Thriving and Vibrant communities	PPPF and a wide range of parish councils
17 th March 2015	National Trust Liaison meeting	National Trust
26 th March 2015	Duty to Co-operate meeting with Cheshire East	Cheshire East Council
Sep 2015	Parishes Day – Debates under the theme Tourism and Visitor Management	PPPF and a wide range of parish councils
24 th September 2015	Duty to Co-operate meeting	Derbyshire Dales District Council
Oct 2015	Authority meeting – approval of draft Development	PDNPA Members

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Management Policies document	
4 th December 2015	Derbyshire Dales – Housing Market Area workshop	DDDC and surrounding local planning authorities
Jan – May 2016	PDNPA member steering group to finalise draft plan for publication	Lead member representatives
15 th Feb 2016	Duty to Cooperate 2016	Kirklees Council
March 2016	Habitats Regulations Assessment undertaken	By DTA Ecology consultants
April 2016	Updated SA Scoping report	Statutory Environmental bodies
Sep 2016	Sign off under delegation by Chair of PC	
Sep 2016	Parishes consultation event pre-consultation	

4. Regulation 18 Issues and Preferred Approaches Consultation (September to December 2012)

4.1 This consultation satisfying regulation 18 stage of the regulations followed a range of other meetings and conversations with:

- parishes
- housing bodies
- farmers
- land owners
- other strategic partnerships affecting the national park

4.2 At this stage all parish councils and parish meetings were consulted, along with all constituent and adjoining councils and other statutory consultation bodies as required by regulations (See Appendix 2).

4.3 The consultation took place between Monday 24th September 2012 to Mon 17th December 2012 (12 weeks) in accordance with adopted Statement of Community Involvement. 59 people and organisations commented at this time generating several hundred separate comments. Some of these were duplicate points made by parish councils owing to support expressed for a collective response made by the Peak Park Parishes Forum.

4.4 Nevertheless this assisted the Authority in understanding the overall level of support for areas of policy and where further resources would be best directed as issues were debated and as the document began to be drafted.

4.5 A document containing the full set of responses from the 2012 consultation may be viewed on the Authority consultation website.

Issues and Preferred Approaches Consultation Methods

Method	Action Taken
Direct Consultation	Letters were sent out to all contacts on the Policy Planning database informing them of the consultation document, how to access it and how to make representations.
Hard Copies for Inspection	Hard copies of the consultation document were placed at the following locations for the duration of the consultation period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak District National Park Authority office in Bakewell;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of other local authority offices across the area (see statement of representations procedure); and • A range of other libraries across the area (see statement of representations procedure)
Online	A full copy of the Issues and Preferred Approaches document and method of submitting representations was published on the Authority's website for the duration of the consultation.
Publicity	<p>The following additional publicity was undertaken to help promote the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public notice was placed in the local press (Peak Advertiser) • A press release was issued to the local newspapers and radio (subsequent interview undertaken with High Peak radio)

Respondents to Issues and Preferred Approaches

<u>Responder number: 001</u> <u>Date received: 25/09/2012</u> <u>Responder: National Grid (Jemima Mathews)</u>	<u>Responder number: 030</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Oldham Council (Clare Moran)</u>
<u>Responder number: 002</u> <u>Date received: 01/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: Coverland UK (John Church)</u>	<u>Responder number: 031</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)</u>
<u>Responder number: 003</u> <u>Date received: 09/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: NFU (Paul Tame)</u>	<u>Responder number: 032</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)</u>
<u>Responder number: 004</u> <u>Date received: 010/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: Meltham Town Council (Sarah Armitage)</u>	<u>Responder number: 033</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)</u>
<u>Responder number: 005</u> <u>Date received: 27/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)</u>	<u>Responder number: 034</u> <u>Date received: 16/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: National Trust (Alan Hubbard)</u>
<u>Responder number: 006</u> <u>Date received: 07/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Environment Agency</u>	<u>Responder number: 035</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Chelmorton Parish Council</u>

<u>(Andrew Pitts)</u>	<u>(Mathew Lovell)</u>
<u>Responder number: 007</u> <u>Date received:09/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants)</u>	<u>Responder number: 036</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Youlgrave Parish Council (Mathew Lovell)</u>
<u>Responder number: 008</u> <u>Date received:14/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)</u>	<u>Responder number: 037</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Natural England (John King)</u>
<u>Responder number: 009</u> <u>Date received:15/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Kirklees Council (Planning Policy Group)</u>	<u>Responder number: 038</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Pauline Beswick</u>
<u>Responder number: 010</u> <u>Date received:20/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: English Heritage</u>	<u>Responder number: 039</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: CEMEX UK (Shaun Denny)</u>
<u>Responder number: 011</u> <u>Date received: 23/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell Town Council</u>	<u>Responder number: 040</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Minerals Products Association (Malcolm Ratcliff)</u>
<u>Responder number: 012</u> <u>Date received:25/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Mr Peter Simon</u>	<u>Responder number: 041</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: United Utilities (Dave Sherratt)</u>
<u>Responder number: 013</u> <u>Date received: 26/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Wardlow Parish Council (Andy Middleton)</u>	<u>Responder number: 042</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)</u>
<u>Responder number: 014</u> <u>Date received: 26/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Edale Parish Council (Nick Faulks)</u>	<u>Responder number: 043</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: John Youatt (1) note SY = Sustainable Youlgrave</u>
<u>Responder number: 015</u> <u>Date received: 30/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: The Coal Authority (Rachael Bust)</u>	<u>Responder number: 044</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)</u>
<u>Responder number: 016</u> <u>Date received: 04/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council (Anne Celnick)</u>	<u>Responder number: 045</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Emery Planning Partnership ('Various clients')</u>

<p><u>Responder number: 017</u> <u>Date received: 04/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Winster Parish Council</u> <u>(Rob Greateorex)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 046</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Derbyshire County Council</u> <u>(Environmental Services)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 018</u> <u>Date received: 05/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Ramblers Association</u> <u>(greater Manchester and High Peak area)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 047</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Woodland Trust (Nick Sandford)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 019</u> <u>Date received: 06/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 048</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Litton Properties (Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 020</u> <u>Date received: 06/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire</u> <u>(Graham Broome)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 049</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Severn Trent Water (James Glynn)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 021</u> <u>Date received: 07/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 050</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: John Youatt (2)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 022</u> <u>Date received: 07/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Sport England (Maggie Taylor)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 051</u> <u>Date received: 10/08/2012</u> <u>Responder: The Ramblers Association: Derby area (John Riddall)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 023</u> <u>Date received: 11/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Rowsley Parish Council (Roger Brown)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 052</u> <u>Date received: 29/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Defence Infrastructure Organisation</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 024</u> <u>Date received: 12/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 053</u> <u>Date received: 29/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 025</u> <u>Date received: 12/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 054</u> <u>Date received: 03/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: British Mountaineering Council (Henry Folkard)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 026</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 055</u></p>

<u>Date received: 13/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)</u>	<u>Date received: 07/12/12</u> <u>Responder: Nigel Johns</u>
<u>Responder number: 027</u> <u>Date received: 13/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Highways Agency (Asset Development)</u>	<u>Responder number: 056</u> <u>Date received: 12/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council (S. Bramwell)</u>
<u>Responder number: 028</u> <u>Date received: 13/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Indigo Planning (Andrew Astin)</u>	<u>Responder number: 057</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell Residents (Informal Group)</u>
<u>Responder number: 029</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell Partnership</u>	<u>Responder number: 058</u> <u>Date received: 16/12/12</u> <u>Responder: Bob White (Nottingham Community Housing Association)</u>
	<u>Responder number: 059</u> <u>Date received: 16/12/12</u> <u>Responder: Dr Martin Beer</u>

Development Management Policies – Initial Assessment of Key Issues from Consultation

4.6 Following the collation of responses an analysis was undertaken of the key issues arising based on levels of support or objection (see table below). This assisted the consideration of how best to focus stakeholder engagement.

4.7 Principally this involved a series of contacts with local housing delivery bodies, Parish Councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum (see table on page 6).

Issue No.	Title	Theme	Support/ Variance / Objection	Key issues
	Landscape and Conservation			9
1	Natural Zone	Landscape and conservation	Support	
2	Whole landscape thinking	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
3	Cumulative harm	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
4	Removing structures	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
5	Settlement limits	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√

6	Protecting open spaces	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
7	Design	Landscape and conservation	Support	
8	Conservation Areas	Landscape and conservation	Support	
9	Listed buildings	Landscape and conservation	Support	
10	Demolishing listed buildings	Landscape and conservation	Support	
11	Conversion of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
12	Location of conversions	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
13	Parks and gardens	Landscape and conservation	Support	

14	Shop fronts	Landscape and conservation	Support	
15	Outdoor advertising	Landscape and conservation	Support	
16	Agri and forestry dwellings	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
17	Agri and forestry operations	Landscape and conservation	Support	
18	Farm diversification	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
19	Cultural heritage sites and features	Landscape and conservation	Support	
20	Archaeological sites	Landscape and conservation	Support	
21	Wildlife sites	Landscape and conservation	Support	
22	Safeguarding	Landscape	Support	

	and recording	and conservation		
23	Assessing non-designated wildlife	Landscape and conservation	Support	
24	Protecting trees, woodlands and landscape features	Landscape and conservation	Support	
25	Pollution and disturbance	Landscape and conservation	Support	
26	Surface water run-off	Landscape and conservation	Support	
27	Contaminated land	Landscape and conservation	Support	
28	Unstable land	Landscape and conservation	Support	
29	Site briefs	Landscape and conservation	Support	
Housing				6

30	Addressing local need for affordable housing	Housing	Variance	√
31	Maximising affordable housing from development	Housing	Variance	√
32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Housing	Variance	√
33	Definition of local qualification	Housing	Variance	√
34	Assessing care needs	Housing	Support	
35	Replacement of agri occupancy conditions	Housing	Support	
36	Extensions and alterations	Housing	Support	

37	Replacement dwellings	Housing	Variance	√
38	Conversion of outbuildings	Housing	Variance	√
Shops, services and community facilities				0
39	Retail and services in named settlements	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
40	Change of use of shops	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
41	Retail development outside named settlements	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
42	Safeguarding sites for community facilities	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
Economy				6

43	Enabling re-use of unoccupied or underused business sites in named settlements	Economy	Variance	√
44	Exceptional B1 uses	Economy	Variance	√
45	Home working	Economy	Variance	√
46	Industrial and business expansion	Economy	Variance	√
47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Economy	Variance	√
48	Design, layout and neighbourlines of employment sites	Economy	Support	√
Recreation				0

and Tourism				
49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Recreation and tourism	Support	
50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Recreation and tourism	Support	
51	Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation	Recreation and tourism	Support	
52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Recreation and tourism	Support	
new	Hubs and Gateways	Recreation and tourism	N/A	
Utilities				2
53	Development requiring new	Utilities	Support	

	or upgraded utilities			
54	New or upgraded utility services	Utilities	Variance	√
55	Development close to utility installations	Utilities	Support	
56	Ancillary development necessary for renewables	Utilities	Support	
57	Telecomms	Utilities	Variance	√
58	Restoration of utility sites	Utilities	Support	
Minerals and waste				0
59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development	Minerals and waste	Support	

60	Small scale calcite workings	Minerals and waste	Support	
61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Minerals and waste	Support	
Transport				3
62	Reducing and directing traffic	Transport	Support	
63	Implementing road hierarchy	Transport	Support	
64	Cross park traffic	Transport	Support	
65	Public transport route enhancement	Transport	Support	
66	Railway	Transport	Support	

	construction			
67	Public transport and pattern of development	Transport	Support	
68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	Transport	Variance	√
69	Freight transport and lorry parking	Transport	Support	
70	Car parking	Transport	Variance	√
71	Coach parking	Transport	Support	
72	Traffic restraint	Transport	Support	
73	Cycle parking	Transport	Support	
74	Design criteria	Transport	Support	

	for transport infrastructure			
75	Public rights of way	Transport	Variance	√
76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Transport	Support	
77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Transport	Support	
78	Air transport	Transport	Support	
Bakewell				0
79	Development boundary	Bakewell	Support	
80	Important open spaces and CA issues	Bakewell	Support	
81	Traffic management	Bakewell	Support	

82	Car, coach and lorry parking	Bakewell	Support	
83	Public transport	Bakewell	Support	
84	Sites for industry and business	Bakewell	Support	
85	Redevelopment of Lumford Mill	Bakewell	Support	
86	Non - conforming uses	Bakewell	Support	
87	Shopping and the central shopping area	Bakewell	Support	
88	The stall market	Bakewell	Support	
89	Community, sports and art facilities in Bakewell	Bakewell	Support	

90	Scope for new hotel	Bakewell	Support	
-----------	----------------------------	-----------------	----------------	--

5. Publication Stage Reg.19 (November 2016)

5.1 The Publication Development Management Policies (DMP) document takes full account of all the representations received at the Issues and Preferred Approaches stage. Appendix 1 sets out how the representations have been collectively considered and actioned in the preparation of the Publication version.

5.2 Rather than publishing a preliminary draft document the Authority has chosen to develop the document using a process of continuing engagement. See table above on page 6. The Publication Version for consultation therefore moves the Authority on from the preferred Approach stage, incorporating amendments arising from the Issues and Preferred Approaches stage and subsequent development with parishes and member working groups.

5.3 The Publication Version also takes into changes to Government policy and law (such as Starter Homes), and has considered the findings from the final Sustainability Appraisal report.

5.4 In accordance with the regulations, the Publication version of the DMP (in effect the Authority's final version of the document at the Pre-Submission stage) will now be made available for public consultation between 18th November 2016 and 27th January 2017 (a period of 10 weeks). The Authority will be consulting the community and other stakeholders using the methods detailed in the table below.

Method	Action Taken
Direct Consultation	Letters will be sent out to all contacts on the Policy Planning database informing them of the consultation document, how to access it and how to make representations.
Hard Copies for Inspection	Hard copies of the consultation document will be placed at the following locations for the duration of the consultation period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak District National Park Authority office in Bakewell; • A range of other local authority offices across the area (see statement of representations procedure); and • A range of other libraries across the area (see statement of representations procedure)

<p>Online</p>	<p>A full copy of the Development Management Policies document, Policies Map, supporting documents and method of submitting representations will be available on the Authority's website for the duration of the consultation.</p>
<p>Publicity</p>	<p>The following additional publicity was undertaken to help promote the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public notice was placed in the local press (Peak Advertiser, plus • Leek Post and Times • Macclesfield Express • Glossop Chronicle • Oldham Evening Chronicle • Sheffield Telegraph • Huddersfield Examiner <p>• A press release was also issued to the local newspapers</p>
<p>Events</p>	<p>1st September Parishes Liaison event to raise awareness of the upcoming consultation event</p> <p>24th September 2016 Annual Parishes Day presentation to raise awareness of consultation event.</p> <p>9th November 2016 attendance at Bradfield Parish Council to discuss consultation</p>

Appendix 1 – Evolution of policy taking account of responses to Issues and Preferred approaches

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
Chapter 3: Conservation		Chapter 3: Conserving and enhancing the National Park's valued characteristics	Covers the same policy areas but does not include the settlement strategy because this is covered now by the Core Strategy and there is no need to repeat that.
	Issue 2: Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions (New) Responses were at variance with the preferred approach to give parts of the Landscape Strategy SPD status. A key response from FOPD on issues 19 - 27 advocates the drawing together of factors constituting an ecosystems approach	DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes	No equivalent 2001 policy because the landscape strategy didn't exist. The new policy completely embeds the landscape strategy and action plan and valued characteristics into decision making. It considers the risk of cumulative impacts from development and it retains the potential to require removal of buildings once their functional use has gone and where there is no alternative use that would be permitted. This is a safeguard rather than a new campaign to remove buildings. It represents a cross cutting approach to landscape conservation that recognises the interconnectedness of the factors that cumulatively make up nationally significant landscape and are the reason behind national park designation
LC1 Conserving and managing the Natural Zone	Issue 1: Exceptional circumstances in which development is acceptable in the Natural Zone. There was support for the level of control proposed	DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone	New policy does not include national interest as an exceptional circumstance justifying development in NZ. The tests are otherwise the same as LC1 but there is much greater emphasis on valued landscape character and the need for any development to understand and reflect that.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC2: designated local Plan settlements		No equivalent as the Core Strategy policy DS1 achieves the same outcome of outlining a settlement strategy to concentrate development	No change to the settlement strategy in terms of numbers of villages where development is accepted in principle.
LC3: Local Plan Settlement limits	Issue 5: <i>Settlement Limits</i> . The preferred option was to add detail to previous LC3 but responses were not supportive of this option.	DMC4: Settlement Limits	The policy is largely unchanged but does require that proposals recognise and assess the impact of a proposed development on the settlement pattern in its own right but also for its contribution to landscape character. There is also greater recognition of the heritage value of settlements and the component parts of settlements including important open space. It is therefore more detailed than LC3 but adds clarity to a policy rather than making it more onerous.
LC4: Design, layout and landscaping	Issue 7: <i>Design Layout and landscaping</i> . The preferred approach was to bring forward LC4 parts (a) and (b) (iv) and (v) and consider whether Core Strategy GSP3 required expansion or explanation. General support with encouragement to include lighting schemes and outside bin storage facilities into the mix of considerations.	DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping	The new policy follows the preferred approach and does build on GSP3. It covers a wider range of things including utility services, parking, flood risk, sustainable drainage, accessibility, and also the relevance of wider landscape character. The issue of light pollution is however now dealt with by new policy DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and considers impact of light pollution on neighbours, landscape and biodiversity, recreational users e.g. enjoying dark sky landscapes.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC5: Conservation Areas	<p>Issue 8: <i>Conservation areas</i>. The preferred approach was the only approach proposed and was to bring forward detail based on LC5.</p> <p>Responses urged use of new heritage language of 'significance' and a nuanced approach to 'vernacular' which enables new vernacular and recognises the differences between different parts of the Park and between different Conservation Areas.</p>	DMC8: Conservation Areas	<p>DMC8 is largely unchanged from LC5 but brings in the new heritage language of 'significance' and contains slightly more recognition of the importance of factors such as valued street patterns and street furniture as considerations.</p> <p>The new policy does not encourage or discourage 'new vernacular' but sets out the material planning considerations for any proposal for new build.</p>
LC6: Listed Buildings	<p>Issue 9: <i>Listed buildings</i>. The preferred approach suggested updating LC6 in light of changes to the NPPF.</p>	DMC7: Listed buildings	<p>The new policy does what the preferred approach proposed. The policy introduces the term 'significance' because that is the language of heritage asset protection. Otherwise the policy is the same but the requirements for detailed information showing effect on heritage significance are outlined in supporting text and in DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings, rather than in policy DMC7.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC7: Demolition of Listed Buildings	Issue 10: <i>Demolition of listed buildings</i> . The preferred approach suggested updating LC7 in light of changes to the NPPF.	No equivalent	No policy for demolition of listed buildings brought forward but all change to listed buildings including demolition is covered by DMC7 and NPPF.
LC8: Conversion of buildings of historic or vernacular merit	Issue 11: <i>Conversion of Buildings of Historic or Architectural merit</i> . The preferred approach was to retain the intent of LC8 but replace the term vernacular merit with historical or architectural merit. Early experience of trying to use the core strategy highlighted the difficulty in defining what historic or vernacular merit actually meant particularly in the context of applications to convert buildings to open market housing. Stakeholders picked up on this and wanted clearer definition	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets	<p>The new policy is more detailed because this was felt necessary, given the huge numbers of buildings in the National Park that are either designated or non-designated heritage assets. Policy deals with the challenges involved in converting these to new uses, whilst conserving that which makes them special, including close consideration of historic landscape setting. .</p> <p>The policy also adds details to core strategy HC1 for proposals to convert to residential use. HC1 has proved contentious since core strategy adoption in 2011 because disagreement ensued over the meaning of the term ‘valued vernacular’. DMC10 clarifies that, with regard to HC1 C, ‘valued vernacular’ means ‘designated and non-designated heritage assets’. All other buildings are not classed as valued vernacular for the purposes of this plan and therefore conversion to</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>of vernacular but not necessarily it's re-casting as historical or architectural significance partly because it was felt this would prevent the option for innovative design and the next generation of vernacular buildings.</p>		<p>open market residential use is not permitted under core strategy policy HC1.</p> <p>In terms of scope for new vernacular, the clearer definition helps in so far as it, and other guidance in SPD enables applicants to find uses for their buildings, however more clearly defining the term for the purposes of applying development management conversion policies does not prevent the Authority from approving new vernacular buildings for example where the benefits from a sustainable build justify an innovative design and use of materials and where this is achieved in such a way that valued settlement form and valued landscape character is conserved or enhanced. Chapter 3 of the Design Guide: <i>New Development – designing in sympathy and Chapter 6 Sustainable Design</i> enlarge on this point.</p>
<p>LC9: Important Parks and Gardens</p>	<p>Issue 13: <i>Important Parks and Gardens</i>. The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria based on LC9 and this was seen as the only reasonable approach. There was general support but a caution that the wording may prevent flexibility needed for estate management</p>	<p>DMC9: Registered Parks and Gardens</p>	<p>New and old policies are the same</p>

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	(Chatsworth) and an offer to help re-word policy and text		
LC10: Shop Fronts	Issue 14: <i>Shop fronts</i> . The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria based on LC10 and possibly supplement that with an SPD. The idea of an SPD was supported by EH (now HE) and the National Trust.	DMS4: Shop Fronts	New and old policies are the same but the Authority has decided to adopt SPD on Shop Fronts.
LC11: Outdoor Advertising	Issue 15: <i>Outdoor Advertising</i> . The preferred approach was to bring forward LC11. There was stakeholder support for the preferred option with a caution that some of the wording of LC11 might prevent the Park boundary signs used	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising	New and old policy is the same and it's not considered necessary to change the wording.
LC12: Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings.	Issue 16: <i>Agricultural, forestry or other rural enterprise workers dwellings</i> . The preferred approach was to retain LC12 but with the added	DMH4: Essential Worker dwellings	The new policy supporting text contains a wider definition of essential worker to include worker housing for rural enterprises that are operationally dependant on the land i.e. the business is essential to land management as opposed to the business needing or wanting to operate from

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>ability to restrict to sizes permitted for affordable housing to reduce risk of loss onto the open market, and retain the homes as more affordable and recyclable to those in housing need. The Authority also wanted the ability to refuse further worker dwellings where worker dwellings had been recently sold off. Stakeholders did not support such a size restriction and questioned the value of an affordable home in an unsustainable location, which is where many farms are. Stakeholders wanted a wider definition of essential worker for other rural enterprises to be consistent with the term used in the Core Strategy HC2. The use of legal agreements wasn't questioned, but caution was expressed that this should be only where necessary i.e. where conditions couldn't</p>		<p>countryside for other reasons such a neighbour amenity or to secure space to grow.</p> <p>No list of acceptable or unacceptable rural enterprises is given but the Authority states that most rural enterprises are not operationally dependent on the land and therefore most do not fit within the group of businesses for which worker housing would be acceptable in principle.</p> <p>In response to stakeholder concerns there is no restriction on size or construction costs as the test is the likely sustainable income of the business to support the property (which would in effect limit the size and cost anyway).</p> <p>There is no policy provision to refuse a worker dwelling on the grounds that a worker dwelling has recently been sold out of the business (frustrating as this is to the Authority)</p> <p>Legal agreements will be used to secure worker occupancy because this has proved necessary with all forms of development where restricted occupancy is a necessary planning outcome. The use of legal agreements is covered by DMH11 and retains strict legal requirements to prevent sale of houses out of the business and enable other plan uses to be addressed. In the event that other uses cannot reasonably be addressed by</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	achieve the required planning outcome. There was a feeling that legal agreements should not be used to dictate future uses. The idea of preventing replacement worker dwellings where others were sold off was rejected.		the worker dwelling, which may be the case where the size of dwelling is, for conservation and enhancement reasons, above that which would be required for affordable housing, the Authority may remove the legal agreement or not enforce it.
LC13: Agricultural or forestry operational development	Issue 17: <i>Agricultural or forestry operational development</i> . The only approach considered reasonable, and therefore the preferred approach was to bring forward LC13 but clarify what we meant by close the main group of buildings with regard to preferred location for new development. There was general support for this approach but a request that we consider widening to include biodiversity and soils	DME1: Agricultural or forestry operational development	DME1 incorporates the tests to be applied to applications for new agricultural buildings. This is felt necessary given the high levels of applications received for new agricultural buildings and the tendency for the buildings applied for to be considerably bigger and potentially more intrusive in the landscape. In terms of what we mean by close to the main group of buildings, the new policy covers this by stating in addition to the criteria LC13 (i) and (iii) that buildings should be close to <u>the farmstead</u> or main group of buildings and not <u>be in isolated locations</u> requiring obtrusive access tracks roads or services. (underlined is new wording. The need to avoid obtrusive tracks and services means that the applicant would need to look to existing building groups first in any cases so it is considered this is sufficient policy guidance. The issue of biodiversity and soils and the potential for development to harm them is picked up in DMC14: Pollution and disturbance.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC14: Farm diversification	<p><i>Issue 18: Farm diversification.</i> The preferred approach was to retain strict control over types of business permitted for diversification reasons because of the threat to national park landscapes from allowing any type of business to operate from the protected landscape. There was recognition by the Authority that landscape setting was particularly important. There were objections to this approach amongst parish councils and the NFU but support from FOPD.</p>	DME2: Farm Diversification	<p>Policy DME2 is far more encouraging of farm diversification and the buildings that may be necessary to enable that to happen. It also invites applications for new buildings where the proposal involves removal of buildings of poor quality and fit in poor locations. This recognises the scope to use existing building groups not simply through re-use of existing buildings but by careful integration of new buildings where appropriate to the form of the farmstead and its setting. The policy is therefore more encouraging but retains a strong conservation imperative which prevents inappropriate non farming business development and expansion on farms.</p>
LC15: Historic and cultural heritage sites and features	<p><i>Issue 19: Historic and cultural heritage sites and features.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policy criteria from LC15 and add detail from historic farmsteads word and landscape character work. There was only support for this approach.</p>	DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings	<p>Rolling of two policies into one with clear requirements for any applicant proposing development that impact on heritage assets and their settings</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC16 Archaeological sites and features	<i>Issue 20: Archaeological sites and features.</i> The preferred approach was to retain LC16 criteria in new policy. There was only support for the preferred approach plus a request to incorporate new heritage language (significance etc)	DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings	Rolling of two policies into one with clear requirements for any applicant proposing development that impact on heritage assets and their settings
LC17: Sites features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	<i>Issue 21: Sites features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance.</i> The preferred approach was to retain LC17 criteria in new policy and incorporate climate change impacts into the range of considerations. There were no issue specific responses	DMC6: Scheduled monuments DMC12: Sites features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Issue not previously covered Policy updated to recognise the various legislation that already gives protection to large areas of the Park. These laws won't be affected by Brexit before this development plan is adopted. Climate change was not included as is covered by other policy and SPD
LC18: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests when development is acceptable	<i>Issue 22: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests when development is acceptable.</i> The preferred approach was to bring	DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests	Requires no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity and links the Biodiversity Action Plan to policy. Brings cumulative impact into the equation as well

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	forward policy based on LC18. There were no issue specific responses		
LC19: Assessing the nature conservation importance of sites not subject to statutory designation	<i>Issue 23: Assessing the nature conservation importance of sites not subject to statutory designation.</i> The preferred approach was to update LC19 and Local Plan appendix 10. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests	Part G of the new policy requires an assessment of the nature conservation importance of a site.
LC20: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development	<i>Issue 24: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LC20 as policy rather than SPD supplementing Core Strategy LC1. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development	Policy updated to make it clear that loss of these features as a result of development should only be permitted as an exceptional circumstance. The onus is placed on the applicant to justify the development's impact on trees and woodlands. It is an explicit requirement that trees are protected during the course of the development.
LC21: Pollution and disturbance	<i>LC25: Pollution and disturbance.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LC21 as policy and update based on NPPF and NPVC.	DMC14: Pollution and disturbance	Updated policy that includes, as well as specifics on the types of pollution covered, a wider consideration of impacts including impacts on dark skies for example. This is more explicit than the old policy which simply specified valued characteristics without saying what they were.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	There were no issue specific responses.		Other designations are also brought into policy such designations as Source Protection Zones and Water Protection Zones which weren't recognised when the 2001 policy was adopted
LC22: Surface water run off	<i>Issue 26: Surface water run-off.</i> Preferred approach was to update policy in light of Water Management Act 2010 and fact that NPAs no longer the consenting authority for sustainable urban drainage systems. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC14: Pollution and disturbance	New policy on pollution and disturbance picks up the issue of impact of development on the water environment in its many forms.
LC23: Flood risk areas	No issue highlighted	No equivalent	No policy needed because Core strategy CC5 deals with the issue.
LC24: Contaminated Land	<i>Issue 27: Contaminated Land.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward a policy like LC24. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land	Rolling of two policies into one to address issues 27 and 28
LC25: Unstable land	<i>Issue 28: Unstable land.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward a policy like LC25. There were no issue specific	DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land	Rolling of two policies into one to address issues 27 and 28

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	responses		
Chapter 4: Housing		Chapter 6: Housing	The main shift is a greater recognition of the challenges to community vibrancy from a lack of affordable housing and a greater encouragement towards making use of existing buildings and groups of buildings to explore forms of accommodation that can both meet the needs of communities and the need to conserve and enhance built environments.
LH1: Meeting local needs for affordable housing	<i>Issue 30: Addressing local needs for affordable housing.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward an updated LH1 to reflect the Core Strategy. The response was mixed. Parishes wanted us to consider reasonable need as justification for new housing (as opposed to proven need) and they want clarity on what can and can't be brought forward by a private developer (as opposed to an RSL) The want us to permit housing for an ageing population. The NFU assurance that worker dwellings would	DMH1: New Affordable Housing	Core Strategy HC1 covers the same ground but DMH1 clarifies that new affordable housing is justified where there is a proven need for the dwelling and the housing is within prescribed floor area limits. The supporting text to DMH1 clarifies that individuals can build schemes of affordable housing provided there is a proven need. The level of proof required is made easier by recognition of the many methods of obtaining information (so not restricted to housing need surveys or choice based lettings register but allows all other methods of gathering information on need to be considered) This is considered to make the burden of proof more reasonable. The text recognises that there may be justification for elderly person's accommodation even where those persons are often home owners on the grounds that their financial means does not afford them a more suitable house if they don't exist and communities want to retain family networks

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	still be possible within policy.		including the older generation. Policy DMH4 updates Local plan policy LH2 in respect of agricultural workers.
LH2: Definition of people with a local qualification	Issue 33: Definition of people with a local qualification. The preferred option was to keep the local connection as it is now rather than strengthen or weaken it. The response did not support the preferred option and officers took this back to the member steering group	DMH2: First occupation of new affordable housing and DMH3 Second and subsequent occupation of affordable housing (The occupancy cascade)	Based on discussions with members and parishes following the consultation the Authority has decided to retain the same local qualification. This enables flexibility from a policy position of strength. The new policies confirm the definitions that have operated throughout the previous local plan period and especially since the housing SPG was adopted in 2003. The cascade mechanism is unchanged from that which has operated since 2009 when it was slightly relaxed in response to RSLs troubles filling property and the void times that resulted.
LH3: Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	<i>Issue 35: Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions.</i> The preferred approach was to retain a position as set down in LH3. The response was generally supportive but there was less support to try and recycle the houses to local need or holiday occupancy in the event of agricultural need	DMH11: Section 106 agreements	The new policy covers the circumstances under which a legal agreement restricting occupancy would be temporarily or permanently lifted and retains the requirement that the houses are retained for future agricultural worker use and in the intervening period that they be used to address a local need or holiday use i.e. meet other plan needs that would be permitted but not be given over to demands for open market housing use which isn't a plan objective and wouldn't be permitted.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	changing either temporarily or permanently.		
LH4: Extensions and Alterations to dwellings	<i>Issue 36: Extensions and alterations.</i> The preferred approach was to refresh the criteria used in LCH4 to encompass extensions to the curtilage and to consider clarifying the issue of extensions in regard to affordable housing. The response was generally supportive but there was dislike for the idea of restricting growth of affordable homes.	DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and SPD Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide	<p>New policy covers the same ground but brings in control where extension of the curtilage is/would lead to undesirable change to landscape. Supporting text to DMH1 clarifies that extensions to affordable housing may be permitted provided the floorspace in the policy does not exceed the upper limit for 3 bed houses (the limit above which we could not sustain the argument that the house could remain affordable in perpetuity for those in housing need) This means we have accepted the argument that affordable houses can grow to accommodate family needs but by small proportion and within limits.</p> <p>New SPD gives greater guidance to encourage better schemes.</p>
LH5: Replacement dwellings	<i>Issue 37: Replacement dwellings.</i> The preferred approach was to retain policy LCH5 but not restrict replacement to small substandard pre-fabricated houses. Responders sought re-assurance that non designated heritage	DMC9: Replacement dwellings	<p>The main change is the removal of the requirement to replace with same size building, but the introduction of a significant enhancement test before larger replacements are acceptable. This recognises the difficulties in applying the 'same size' test, when many sites and locations could take a larger building and conserve and enhance the site and setting. The policy now clearly protects heritage assets, but also now</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	assets wouldn't be lost. They wanted no arbitrary size limits and they urged that the opportunity for more sustainable build was taken, along a request for space for a new vernacular and a shift away from slavish devotion to design guide houses.		enables replacement of one with more than one in DS1 settlements provided it is justified for the enhancement it provides and provided it addresses an evidenced need for affordable housing.
LH6: Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings to ancillary residential uses	<i>Issue 38: Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings to ancillary residential uses.</i> The preferred approach was to amend the criteria established in LH6 to bring about greater definition and control	DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilages of existing dwellings by conversion or new build	The new policy recognises the potential to provide accommodation within groups of buildings either by conversion or new build. Previously we did not make the potential for new build clear.
LH7: Gypsy caravan sites	No issue	No equivalent policy	Core Strategy HC3 covers this issue so there is no longer a need for a local plan policy.
Chapter 5: Shops Services and Community Facilities		Chapter 7: Shops, services and community facilities	
LS1: Retailing and services in Local Plan Settlements	<i>Issue 39: Retailing and services in Local Plan Settlements.</i> The preferred approach was to	DMS1 Shops, professional services and related activities in Core Strategy named	The new policy works alongside Core Strategy HC5 and there is little change other than the removal of the protection for convenience shops

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	widen the protection given to Castleton and Hartington to all LC2 (now DS1) settlements. There was no response	settlements	in Castleton and Hartington, which didn't preclude change of use within A use class and only related to new development. The policy applies to all DS1 settlements equally.
LS2: Change of use of a shop to any other use.	<i>Issue 40: Change of use of a shop to any other use.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward LS2. There were no responses	DMS2 Change of use of shops, community services and facilities	Policy is widened and gives greater clarity on the marketing required under Core Strategy HC4 before the Authority would consider the loss of shops and other community facilities to other uses. This is intended to protect communities against the loss of valued services whilst leaving the door open to change of use if the evidence justifies it. The policy works alongside Core Strategy HC4.
LS3: Retail development outside Local Plan Settlements	<i>Issue 41: Retail development outside core strategy named settlements.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria of LS3. There was support for the preferred approach provided it isn't too strict on what can be sold	DMS3 Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements	Policy remains the same i.e. to discourage retail use outside of settlements other than in a few select circumstances, and even then, the retail activity must remain ancillary to the main business. The aim remains to prevent the establishment or growth of retail units in unsustainable locations because the tendency is for these to want to grow in that location rather than move to settlements or retail parks.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LS4:Community facilities		DMS2: Change of use of shops, community services and facilities; and DMS7 Retention of community recreation sites or sports facilities	Policies works with Core Strategy HC4. Collectively, policies give a high level of protection to community buildings, and encourage replacement of one community use with another rather than outright loss.
LS5: Safeguarding sites for community facilities	<i>Issue 42: Safeguarding sites for community facilities.</i> The preferred option was to safeguard sites on the proposals map and provide a policy to capture those not known at time of plan adoption. There was no response	DMS6: Safeguarding sites for community facilities	No change to LS5.
Chapter 6: Economy		Chapter 4: Farming and Economy	Change of chapter title because policies for farming (barring the essential worker policy) are included under the broad area of economic policies rather than under Conservation policies. This recognises that farming, whilst critical to land management practice and conservation of the National park landscapes, is first and foremost a business.
LE1: Employment Sites in the Hope Valley	<i>No issue</i>	DME3: Safeguarding employment sites	The plan continues to safeguard a strategic level of employment sites for predominantly B1, B2, B8 uses but gives scope for other uses alongside B uses provided the B uses remain the predominant use.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LE2: Exceptional permission for Class B1 employment uses	<i>Issue 44: exceptional permission for B1 employment uses.</i> The preferred approach is to retain LE2 criteria. The response was mixed with a call to protect more business space and provide live work units on the one hand, and a call for a more flexible approach based more on impact on neighbour amenity than landscape considerations on the other.	DME5: Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 settlements	The policy is unchanged except for the inclusion of cultural heritage significance and the requirement that new development does not have adverse impact on that.
LE3: Home working	<i>Issue 45: Home working</i> The preferred approach was to retain an approach based on LE3 to manage the activity and prevent unsuitable work activity where it harms buildings landscape or neighbour amenity. The response was limited with a request that the Authority consider policy that provides for live work units (in effect a proactive encouragement for such facilities)	DME6: Home working	The Authority investigated whether there was any demand for live work units by consulting the economic development officers of the largest constituent authority by population (Derbyshire Dales) There was no evidence of latent demand for live work units and officers were nervous that such development would be used as the first step towards turning small living space into large living space by discontinuance of the business element. There is still scope to include such units on mixed schemes of housing and business space subject to demand and design and legal agreements to ensure the relationship between the living and working space can be retained. The new policy is

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
			therefore the same as the old policy.
LE4: Industrial and Business Expansion	<i>Issue 46: Industrial and Business expansion.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LE4. The response was limited with a request for a more encouraging suite of policies that protects viable sites to allow small business to expand within the area and makes clear where business can grow	DME7: Expansion of existing industrial and business development where it is not ancillary to agricultural business.	Essentially unchanged with criteria for proposals inside DS1 settlements and criteria for proposals outside DS1 settlements. The Authority's policies give in principle support to business development in DS1 settlements and support the protection of a strategic level of employment space. Policy does not distinguish between local firms and other firms in terms of acceptability of development since local firms can employ people from anywhere and the use once established cannot be limited to local firms.
LE5: Retail uses in industrial and business areas	<i>Issue 47: Retail uses in industrial and business areas.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LE5. There was no response.	DMS3 Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements	DMS3 covers the scope for retail activity in business areas and outside DS1 settlements. DMR1 protects against the development of shops on camping and caravan sites where development of such a use would significantly undermine the same shop in a nearby village. This means that policy can permit shops where they would add to the range of facilities available to a community, or where the Authority considers both shops can co-exist with neither threatening the others viability.
LE6: Design layout and neighbourliness of employment sites, including haulage depots	<i>Issue 48: Design layout and neighbourliness of employment sites, including haulage depots.</i> The preferred approach	DME9: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	No change

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	was to bring forward LE6. There was no response.		
Chapter 7: Recreation and Tourism		Chapter 5: Recreation and Tourism	
LR1: Recreation and Tourism Development	No issue explored	No equivalent policy	Recreation Zones were dispensed with by the Core Strategy and a move to landscape character assessment as a means of determining suitability of proposals.
LR2: Community recreation sites and facilities	No issues explored	DMS6: Safeguarding sites for community facilities	No change
LR3: Touring camping and caravan sites	<i>Issue 49: Touring camping and caravan sites.</i> The preferred approach is to retain policy criteria based on LR3 and mop up any issues not covered by Core Strategy RT3. There was no response	DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites	New policy outlines exceptional circumstances under which other structures such as pods and yurts might be acceptable development
LR4: Holiday chalet developments	No issue	DMR1 Touring camping and caravan sites	As above
LR5: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	<i>Issue 50: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites.</i> Preferred approach is to	DMR2 Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	No change

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	retain policy based on LR5. There was no response		
LR6: Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	<i>Issue 51: Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation.</i> The preferred approach is to retain a policy based on LR6. There was no response	DMR3 Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	No change
LR7: Facilities for keeping and riding horse	<i>Issue 52: Facilities for keeping and riding horses.</i> The preferred approach is to retain a policy based on LR7 but include criteria to secure simpler design standards for stabling. There was no response	DMR4 Facilities for keeping and riding horses	No change
Chapter 8 Utilities		Chapter 10 Utilities	
LU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure	<i>Issue 53: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure.</i> The preferred approach was bring forward policy based on LU1. The response	DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure	No change as no development of a scale that requires detailed loading requirements in policy

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	was supportive with an urge to include any new 'loading' requirements into policy for gas supply purposes		
LU2: New and upgraded facilities	<i>Issue 54: New and upgraded facilities.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward a policy based on LU2. The response was mixed on this with calls for clear guidance on landscape impact where wires can't be undergrounded and calls for clarity between policies DMU2 and proposed policy	DMU2: New and upgraded utilities services	New policy doesn't include a reference to overhead power lines, which were in any case an exception for which the least environmental impact was to be sought. It does however say that infrastructure should be placed underground. This is important since it is counterproductive to permit renewable energy infrastructure in the Park if the transmissions lines required cannot be installed in a way that protects landscape character. The policy does not refer to new reservoirs either, which responds to a major utilities company response that the policy shouldn't rule them out.
LU3: Development close to utility installations	<i>Issue 55: Development close to utility installations.</i> The preferred approach is to supplement Core Strategy GSP3 Development Management Principles. There was little response and no objection	DMU3: Development close to utility installations	DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping policy of the Development Management Policies document picks up the need for all new development including utilities infrastructure to be designed in sympathy with the landscape. For safety reasons, DMU3 specifically protects the close environs of utilities infrastructure irrespective of landscape character. There was no response that warranted a different approach to that preferred.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LU4: Renewable energy generation	<i>Issue 56: Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation.</i>	No policy required a matter covered by other policies and SPD.	CC2 of the Core Strategy and the SPD for Climate change and sustainable building plus DMU2 cover this area
LU5: Telecommunications infrastructure	<i>Issue 57: Telecommunications infrastructure.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria based on policy LU5. Responses urged that telecoms infrastructure should, under NPPF, be supported.	DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure	LU5 is brought forward as DMU4 but the new policy requires more information from applicants to justify their proposals for telecommunications infrastructure in terms of the need and to justify in terms of impact it would have on landscape character. The 2013 Code of Best Practice on Mobile network development is recognised in supporting text.
LU6: Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	<i>Issue 58: Restoration of utility infrastructure sites.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LU6. There was only support for this approach.	DMU5: Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	No change
Chapter 9 Minerals		Chapter 11: Minerals and waste	
LM1: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral activity and	<i>Issue 59: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development).</i> The preferred approach is to	DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and waste development on amenity; and DMMW3: The impact of Minerals and Waste Development on the	These two new policies pick up LM1 but not LM9 which is picked up in part by DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare (with regard to removal of plant and machinery after work has ceased) but also by a restated policy DMMW8 for ancillary mineral development.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	combine the contents of LM1 and LM9 into one policy. There was one supportive response.	Environment	Overall DM policies have been rationalised where possible, leaving those policies considered most pertinent to day to day development management needs.
LM2: Reclamation of minerals sites to an appropriate after use	No issue raised	No equivalent policy	Core Strategy MIN1: Mineral Development B. covers requirements for restoration.
LM3: Provision of aggregate minerals	No issue raised	No equivalent policy	The supporting text to Core Strategy MIN 1 outlines the capacity for aggregates and the expectations for delivery alongside mention of regional aggregate working parties and their role in apportionment of mineral reserves to particular parts of the area formerly known as the east Midlands region.
LM4: New aggregate extraction	<i>No issue raised</i>	DMMW1 – the justification for mineral and waste development	DMMW1 supplements Core Strategy MIN1.
LM5: 10 year land banks for aggregates	<i>No issue raised</i>	DMMW1 – the justification for mineral and waste development	The supporting text to Core Strategy MIN 1 outlines the capacity for aggregates and the expectations for delivery alongside mention of regional aggregate working parties and their role in apportionment of mineral reserves to particular parts of the area formerly known as the east Midlands region.
LM6: Building stone and roofing slate	<i>No issue raised</i>	None required	Core Strategy MIN3 covers this issue

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LM7: Limestone removal from opencast vein mineral sites	<i>No issue raised</i>	None required	Core Strategy MIN 1 and MIN2 already prevent removal of limestone from vein mineral opencast sites.
LM8: Small scale calcite workings.	<i>Issue 60: Small scale calcite workings.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward a policy based on LM8. There was only support for this approach.	DMMW1	DMMW1 supplements Core Strategy MIN1.
LM9: Ancillary mineral development	<i>Issue 59: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development).</i> The preferred approach is to combine the contents of LM1 and LM9 into one policy. There was one supportive response.	DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development	See rationale under LM1 above and also in part by DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare (with regard to removal of plant and machinery after work has ceased)
LM10: Producing secondary and recycled materials	No issue raised	DMMW1: The justification for mineral development;	The policy changes from one that specifies conditions required for working secondary and recycled materials to one that specifies that secondary or recycled materials will only be permitted where evidence of viability and need justifies working taking into account existing

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
			availability of secondary or recycled materials.
Chapter 10: Waste Management		Chapter 11: Minerals and waste	Minerals and waste rolled into one chapter
LW1: Sustainable waste management	No issue raised	DMMW1: The justification for mineral development.	The policy criteria in DMMW1 cover the same ground as LW1.
LW2: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	<i>Issue 61: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward LW2 criteria and combine with those assessing environmental impact of mineral working. The response was generally supportive with one objection to the approach on waste (driven by disagreement with the Authority's Core Strategy CC policy for anaerobic digesters)	DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and waste development on amenity; and DMMW3: The impact of Minerals and Waste Development on the Environment	Suggested changes related to Core Strategy CC3 and CC4 rather than LW2 so were not taken on board in constructing DMMW2 and DMMW3.
LW3: Reclamation of waste disposal sites to an acceptable after use	No issue	DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare	
LW4: Household waste recycling centres	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4 give the same policy coverage
LW5: Recycling of construction	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
and demolition waste		Facilities	Management and DMMW4 , but no provision for facilities to process construction or demolition waste unless justified by a Site Waste Management Plan (which only applies to construction projects with a cost upwards of £300,000)
LW6: Waste transfer stations and waste processing facilities	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4
LW7: Disposal of Waste from construction or restoration projects	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4
LW8: Disposal of domestic, commercial, industrial and other non-inert waste by landfill at new sites	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4
LW9: Disposal of inert, domestic, commercial, industrial and other non-inert waste by land raising	No issue	DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare	No change to presumption against land raising
Chapter 11 Transport		Chapter 9: Travel and Transport	
LT1 Implementing the road hierarchy: the main vehicular network	<i>Issue 62 Reducing and directing traffic.</i> The preferred approach is to develop a more restrictive approach to travel planning building on core strategy T1b to deter	No equivalent but DMT1 makes it clear that new roads or rail lines or upgrades to existing routes will not be permitted unless there is compelling national need and	Core Strategy T1 and T2 covers this

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	cross park traffic, incorporating the signage element of LT1 in an SPD and mapping the road hierarchy. The response was positive	that need cannot be accommodated by reasonable alternative means	
LT2: Implementing the road hierarchy: very minor roads	<i>Issue 63: Implementing the road hierarchy: very minor roads.</i> The preferred approach is to include text to supplement core strategy objectives. The approach is supported	No equivalent	Core Strategy T2 covers this adequately so no additional text is included in the Development Management document.
LT3: Cross-Park: road and rail	<i>Issue 64: Cross-Park traffic: road and rail.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria based on LT3a. The approach is supported	DMT1: Cross Park infrastructure	The new policy is categorical that new road and rail schemes or significant upgrades are not accepted in principle but it does outline the circumstances in which development may be permitted as an exception to the principle. This includes a requirement to demonstrate national need for development as well as long term environmental and economic benefit to the National Park.
LT4: Safeguarding land for road schemes	No issue	No equivalent	The core strategy removed the safeguarded status of land for improvement of the A57/A628; the A628/A616; and an A6 to A619 relief road at Bakewell.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LT5: Public transport: route enhancement	<i>Issue 65: Public transport: route enhancement.</i> The preferred approach is bring forward LLT5 criteria to build on core strategy T1. The approach is supported	No equivalent	General policies, such as T3: Design of transport infrastructure, cover this so there is no need for a specific local plan policy
LT6: Railway construction	<i>Issue 66: Railway construction.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria based on LT6. The approach is generally supported apart from by Chatsworth Estate for which there was exploration of options for improving public transport (see Issue 68)	DMT3: Railway construction	New policy is much tougher in terms of environmental benefits required of any new development.
LT7: Public transport and the pattern of development	<i>Issue 67: Public transport and the pattern of development.</i> The preferred approach is not to bring forward development management policy as its felt that the core strategy adequately covers this	No equivalent	Core Strategy DS1 directs most new development to a range of settlements to make it as easy as possible to justify retention of existing services or introduction of new services. There is no specific development management policy.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	issue. The approach was supported		
LT8: Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	<i>Issue 68: Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth.</i> The preferred approach was to not bring forward policy specific to these sites and places because of the options that exist for park and ride onto the Monsal Trail and the inability of current policy to provide public transport routes to Chatsworth and the availability of alternatives.	No equivalent	No requirement for a Bakewell and Chatsworth specific policy for public transport
LT9: Freight transport and lorry parking	<i>Issue 69: Freight transport and lorry parking.</i> The preferred approach is to combine LT9 and former structure plan T7. The approach is supported.		Core Strategy T4 covers this area of policy with regard to freight transport and the approach has not changed

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
<p>LT10: Private non-residential (PNR) parking LT11: Residential Parking LT12: Park and ride</p>	<p><i>Issue 79: Car parking.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policies LT10 to LT12 and LT14 and LT15 and add different parking standards to reflect size of a development and alternative means of access to a service. The preferred approach will not name potential locations of new car parks as had been done for LT15. There was some support for the approach but a caution to avoid negativity towards new car parking, and accept that most visitors come by car.</p>	<p>DMT6 : Visitor parking DMT7: Residential off street parking No equivalent to LT12 – some link to DMT3, otherwise under DMT5 Business Parking</p>	<p>New policy includes a standard for spaces per unit within the policy Core Strategy T7 maintains the encouragement to Park and ride schemes but unlike LT12 it doesn't include limits on the size of schemes that may be permitted.</p>
<p>LT13: Traffic restraint measures</p>	<p><i>Issue 72: traffic restraint.</i> The preferred approach is to rely on the core strategy strategic principles and promote traffic restraint initiatives as necessary. The approach was supported</p>	<p>No equivalent</p>	<p>Core Strategy policies T3 Design of transport infrastructure brings the emphasis back to designing in sympathy with national park purposes when new infrastructure is proposed for any reason including achieving a reduction in speed of traffic.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LT14: Parking strategy and parking charges	<p><i>Issue 79: Car parking.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policies LT10 to LT12 and LT14 and LT15 and add different parking standards to reflect size of a development and alternative means of access to a service. The preferred approach will not name potential locations of new car parks as had been done for LT15. There was some support for the approach but a caution to avoid negativity towards new car parking, and accept that most visitors come by car.</p>	DMT5, DMT6, DMT7	<p>These policies cover operational and non-operational parking i.e. business parking (operational); parking not directly required by business (non-operational); and residential off street parking (that provided for dwelling units) Unlike LT14, new policies no longer places size thresholds on car parks but retain a presumption against new or enlarged car parks that aren't exclusively required by businesses or residents.</p>
LT15: Proposals for car parks	<p><i>Issue 79: Car parking.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policies LT10 to LT12 and LT14 and LT15 and add different parking standards to reflect size of a development and alternative means of access to a service. The</p>	No equivalent	<p>The new plan does not create a policy presumption for new car parks (as was previously done by naming places where they would be accepted in principle)</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	preferred approach will not name potential locations of new car parks as had been done for LT15. There was some support for the approach but a caution to avoid negativity towards new car parking, and accept that most visitors come by car.		
LT16: Coach Parking	<i>Issue 71: Coach Parking.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward LT16. There was support for the approach.	No equivalent	Core Strategy T7 covers this issue and retains the potential for coach parking within environmental capacity to deliver it.
LT17: Cycle parking	<i>Issue 73: Cycle parking.</i> The preferred approach is to retain the policy principle of LT17 but deal with it alongside provision for horse riders and pedestrians the approach is supported.	No equivalent	The general thrust of core strategy policies T1 T3 and T6 is to encourage and facilitate use of sustainable modes of transport wherever possible so there would be a presumption in favour of cycle parking within development where that can be achieved within conservation purposes.
LT18: Design criteria for transport infrastructure	<i>Issue 74: design criteria for transport infrastructure.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward detailed	DMT1, DMT2 Access and design criteria	Core Strategy: T3 Design of Transport Infrastructure plus the new policies DMT1 and DMT2 stress the need for high quality design in tune with the valued characteristics of the National Park with the statutory requirements for safe

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	criteria based on LT18 and LT19. The approach was supported		access etc. recognised within the statutory constraints imposed by National Park designation and the responsibilities placed on statutory highways authorities by the Environment Act.
LT19: Mitigation of wildlife severance effects.	No issue as covered under issue 74	DMT2C: Access & Design Criteria	Core Strategy T3 requires mitigation measures where development has to sever a wildlife corridor, but such development is in any case discouraged by DMC11 part F. DMT2C states that appropriate & sympathetic measures including wild bridges or cut and cover tunnels, will be provided where transport infrastructure results in wildlife severance.
LT20: Public Rights of Way	<i>Issue 75: Public rights of way.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria based on LT20 but seek alternative alignments for Trans Pennine and Monsal Trail. The approach was supported	DMT4: Development affecting public right of way	New policy DMT4 repeats old policy but also requires better linkage to the rights of way network and better facilities for those wishing to link into the rights of way network. Alternative alignments have not been agreed for the Trans Pennine or Monsal Trails in the period between 2012 and Development Management Policies document production so no new routes are safeguarded in the plan. DMT4D provides new criteria for the introduction of new multi-user routes.
LT21: Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.	<i>Issue 76 Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria	DMT4D – partly covers this	New policies don't specify particular routes for improvement (as LT21 had) but Core Strategy T6 includes provisions protecting established routes from new development that would compromise

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	based on LT21b and LT17. The approach was supported		their transport function. The trails are all protected with clarity that future rail use could only happen if the continuity of these routes can be assured through suitable re alignment if necessary. T6 also protects the only inland waterway used for leisure purposes (the Huddersfield Narrow Canal) Core Strategy: T3 Design of Transport Infrastructure plus the new policies DMT1 and DMT2 stress the need for high quality design in tune with the valued characteristics of the National Park with the statutory requirements for safe access etc recognised within the statutory constraints imposed by National Park designation and the responsibilities placed on statutory highways authorities by the Environment Act. This applies to provision for access by horse, bike, or foot. DMT4D provides new criteria for the introduction of new multi-user routes.
LT22: Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	<i>Issue 77: Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty.</i> The preferred approach is to retain the criteria of LT22 but frame it as design criteria to be considered across all development types with the objective to improve access for people with	DMT2: Access and Design criteria; DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way	New policy DMT2 makes it clear that new or improved access must be safe and achievable for all people. New policy DMT4 makes it clear that where rights of way are diverted or altered through development the change should result in improved access for people with special needs, including disability

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	mobility difficulty. The approach was supported.		
LT23: Air Transport	<i>Issue 78: Air Transport.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward the Core Strategy preferred approach T11, which built on LT23 by adding detail. The approach was supported	DMT8 Air Transport	New policy DMT8 covers drones and model aircraft as well as the traditional forms such as helicopters. It also protects not just all valued characteristics but specifies that where bird and wildlife populations would be adversely impacted upon, the activity will be restricted.
Chapter 12: Bakewell		Chapter 8: Bakewell	
LB1: Bakewell's development boundary	<i>Issue 79: Bakewell's Development boundary.</i> The preferred approach is to review the boundary and have policy based on LB1. Responses in respect of the boundary agree the need for review and in some area new extensions are suggested	No policy, but Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan to identifies the boundary and in accordance with Core Strategy DS1 a development boundary will be retained and is shown on the DMP document proposals map.	No change in the principle, but the boundary has been altered to reflect the housing aspirations of the town, by agreement with the NPA that the change does not undermine the development plan.
LB2: Important Open Spaces in Bakewell	<i>Issue 80: Important open spaces in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to agree open spaces with the community (under NP process) Responses included suggestions for additional spaces to be	No new development plan policy, but the emerging neighbourhood plan has a policy protecting Local Green Spaces in addition to the important open spaces retained by the Conservation Area appraisal and covered by	No equivalent policy but under the Neighbourhood Plan process the community has identified identify Local Green Spaces complying with criteria for LGS designation as set down in NPPF. The LGSs identified do not undermine the development plan expectations for development in Bakewell.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	protected, some of which flow beyond the current settlement boundary, so it will be necessary to consider such areas in the context of the wider Bakewell Parish as opposed to just those spaces within a development boundary.	DMC12: Conservation Areas	
LB3: Traffic management in Bakewell	<i>Issue 81: Traffic management in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward any aspects of LB3 that aren't covered by general policies. There was support for continued enhancement of the town, including specific initiatives to aid traffic management.	DMT2: Access and design criteria	No DM policy but the emerging neighbourhood plan process has seen the community produce policy to enhancement traffic management in the town. The change is in the list of projects to be tackled with partners under TC1 and the wish to safeguard the line of a Bakewell relief road under TC3.
LB4: Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell	<i>Issue 82 Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell</i> No preferred approach was offered and the community were invited to suggest preferred approach	DMT5: Operational Parking DMT6: Non-operational parking DMT7: Residential off street parking	Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC2: Vehicle Parking adds local flavour to the Park wide policies.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	Responses indicate a desire to rethink the provision of parking in the town including thoughts on linking the Smiths Island car park to the ABC		
LB5: Public Transport in Bakewell	<i>Issue 83: Public Transport in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to specifically safeguard the line of the Matlock to Buxton railway. There was broad agreement for the safeguarding of parking at Bakewell Station and for improvements to bus stops in the town	No policy for public transport generally or in Bakewell	Neighbourhood Plan does not propose policies for public transport
LB6: Sites for general industry or business development in Bakewell	<i>No issue:</i> Mixed views are expressed on the preferred uses for the employment sites at Ashford Road and Cintride, e.g. the Civic Society state a desire for employment sites to be protected whereas the Town Council appear happy for other uses to be explored.	Core Strategy E1 allows for new sites and buildings for business development in Bakewell	There are no plan proposals for additional business sites because Ashford Road (Deepdale) and Land adjoining the Cintride factory have been largely developed or have permissions in place (though the land adjoining Cintrides remains a potential source of employment space in spite of the extant permission for an Aldi store) The neighbourhood plan policies Econ 4, and Econ 5 set down the communities aspirations for existing business sites such as Riverside Business Park and Torne Valley site on the A6. These are in conformity with the development plan.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>Overall there may be some appetite for an overall shrinkage in the area deemed necessary for B1 and B2 uses in favour of a mixture of other uses, but this needs careful consideration owing to the low overall potential for such high quality sites in the National Park.</p>		
<p>LB7: Re-development at Lumford Mill</p>	<p><i>Issue 85: Re-development at Lumford Mill.</i> In light of the relative lack of success of LB7 in encouraging re-development, no preferred approach is offered. Responders viewed this as an opportunity to recast the site but need to consider the Lumford and Riverside Business Park areas alongside other employment sites to give an overview on the town's business land as a whole.</p>	<p>No local plan equivalent because Core Strategy E1 protects the business use as the predominant use whilst offering scope for enhancement possibly through mixed use. There is no development management policy however.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood plan policies Econ 5 sets down the community's aspirations for Riverside Business Park. (Lumford Mill) This is in conformity with the development plan. The other neighbourhood plan policies consider the future of this site in the context of other employment sites and the 'health' of the central shopping area.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LB8: Non-conforming uses in Bakewell	<i>Issue 86: Non-conforming uses in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach was to rely on GSP2. There was support to rely on GSP2 regarding non-conforming uses.	None needed	Core Strategy General Spatial Policy GSP2 replaces Bakewell specific policy.
LB9: Shopping in Bakewell	<p><i>Issue 87: Shopping in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to retain the central shopping area but reserve policy options until further community work is done</p> <p>There was concern over the dominance of café uses. There was support to bring forward greater control in the Central Shopping Area, e.g. over the no. of A3 uses in any one street.</p> <p>Need to consider the impact of changed PD regs with the possibility of using article 4 powers within the Central Shopping Area.</p>	Core Strategy DS1 seeks to protect the range and integrity of the Central Shopping Area and HC5 prevent significant out of centre retail development and allows food and drink premises provided it doesn't undermine the role or character of the area including its vitality and viability. There is no development management policy	Neighbourhood Plan policy Econ 1 seeks to prevent further change of use away from A1 to A3 in the Central Shopping Area, which is more proactive than simply limiting the uses of new development, which are few and far between in Bakewell central shopping area.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012</i>	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>Bakewell Civic Society would like the Torne Valley site included within the CSA.</p> <p>There was a request to fully consider the planning reasons for restricting town centre uses. For example, has an increase in café uses been at the detriment of the health of the centre? and is there a shortage of shops ?</p>		
LB10: Bakewell stall market	<p><i>Issue 88: Bakewell stall market.</i> No preferred approach is offered. There is widespread support to extend the scope of the market area.</p>	No development plan equivalent	No specific policy but principle of use of the central shopping area is established so no need for policy. No neighbourhood plan policy is proposed.
LB11: Community, sports and arts facilities in Bakewell	<p><i>Issue 89: Community, sports and arts facilities in Bakewell</i> No preferred approach is offered There is support to retain policy.</p>	DS1 does the job so no need for a development management policy	Neighbourhood Plan proposes replacement of sports education and other community facilities if development enabled by the change of boundary is otherwise acceptable but would lead to loss of such facilities. The objective is no net loss of facilities in the event of change of use e.g. to housing
Range of uses not tied to previous Local plan policies			
	Issue 3: cumulative harm	No local plan policy to replace	Cumulative impact was not part of previous policy

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>as a material consideration (New) There was no stakeholder response on this issue</p>	<p>but new DMC1: <i>Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes</i> states that an assessment of development must include an assessment of cumulative impact of existing or proposed development including outside the National Park boundary</p>	<p>but now has profile through inclusion in policy.</p>
	<p>Issue 4: <i>removing non-traditional structures from the countryside once their use has ceased (new)</i> Statutory bodies NE and EH (HE) supported the approach towards removing structures but landowners and estate owners who responded did not support the approach</p>		<p>Core Strategy GSP2: <i>Enhancement of the National Park</i> provides the policy hook to require removal of buildings and DMC1 <i>Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes confirms this</i> as something the Authority wants the option to require where a <i>building or structure is no longer needed or being used for the purposes for which it was approved and its continued presence or use is considered by the Authority, on the evidence available to it, to be harmful to the valued character of the landscape.</i> This makes the circumstances in which removal would be required very clear and it is not expected that this would be used in many circumstances because of the concerns voiced by landowners in 2012. It does however set down expectations for use of the building so it does indirectly restrict the wider use of buildings permitted for agricultural purposes.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p><i>Issue 6: Protecting important open spaces.</i> The preferred approach was to identify them and show them on the proposals map. There was support for this approach</p>	<p>Proposal map will show open spaces</p>	<p>Important open space previously only showed on inset maps of conservation areas</p>
	<p><i>Issue 12: The need for clearer guidance on acceptable new uses for traditional buildings of historic or architectural merit in different locations. (new)</i> The preferred approach was to introduce spatial guidance that says what uses might be appropriate in what locations. There was general support and a request that this be dealt with alongside issue 11</p>	<p>Supporting text to DMC10 picks up the spatial guidance concept and also clarifies scale of different uses most appropriate to particular types of building in particular locations.</p>	<p>This is a development of current policy recognising the difficulty experienced in bringing forward good quality conversions in some locations. (a Barns Conversion SPD will help further and is ready to be brought forward on adoption of the development management policy document)</p>
	<p><i>Issue 29: Use and Scope of site briefs (new)</i> The preferred approach was to use them selectively as necessary to bring forward development of difficult sites. The approach was supported</p>	<p>None since GSP2E already allows for them</p>	<p>No change to current approach</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p><i>Issue 31: Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings (new)</i> The preferred approach is not to set thresholds of size of scheme above which affordable housing would be required but work it through on viability assessments , employing specialist advice where necessary . there was generally support for this approach though one developer asked for more certainty in policy</p>	<p>DMH6 specifies that the level of affordable housing required will be subject to viability</p>	<p>No change to current approach</p>
	<p><i>Issue 32: preventing abuses of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing (new).</i> The preferred approach is to use legal agreements and conditions as necessary to ensure optimum re-development of sites and buildings and prevent piecemeal applications or site subdivision. There was general support for the approach but a caution that subdivision of</p>	<p>Supporting text explains that applications which would undermine /prevent the scope for development in line with national park purposes and plan objectives will be resisted.</p>	<p>Reference to the potential problem and strong statements that the Authority will resist attempts to prevent proper re-development of land is a new part of the plan. It recognises the difficulties experienced in trying to achieve optimum planning outcomes and how those difficulties are more sharply focussed when such re-development opportunities are scarce and the benefits can prevent pressure on other more valued national park land. The matter of subdivision is addressed in policy DMH10 in so far as it relates to buildings and residential use, but subdivision of land cannot ordinarily be prevented through the planning</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	land can't be prevented by planning system.		system (unless conditions have previously been used to prevent it e.g. in relation to ancillary dwelling uses relationship with main dwelling house) Nevertheless sub division can change the planning status of land and that in itself can be a deterrent.
	<i>Issue 34: Assessing care needs. (new)</i> The preferred approach is to work to County Council standards when need is evidenced and consider care needs as a legitimate form of housing need. The approach is supported.	No specific policy	No change to the established policy
	<i>Issue 43: Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements (new).</i> The preferred approach was to apply core strategy strongly and develop criteria to be followed before release of business land was supported. The approach was generally supported but there was some thought to protect sites on	DME3 identifies safeguarded sites whilst DME4 identifies criteria and marketing test to be applied before the Authority agrees to loss of business space to other uses	The policies protect a wide range of sites in Bakewell and Hope valley but also set clear tests to be met before business space is forsaken for other uses. This responds to a strategic need to protect a level of business space, a community desire to remain living working villages and a developer desire to optimise best use of space.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	plan		

Appendix 2 – Contacts at Regulation 18 Issues and Preferred Approaches Stage

Statutory bodies

Specific consultation bodies as set out in regulations

Coal Authority

Environment Agency

Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)

Natural England

Network Rail

Highways Agency,

a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the local planning authority's area (see following list)

Mobile Operators Association and Mono Consultants (representing people to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus in the area,

Primary Care Trusts (see following list)

Persons to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989([11](#)) (see following list)

Persons to whom a license has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986([12](#)) (see following list)

Sewerage undertakers (see following list)

Water undertakers (see following list)

Homes and Communities Agency

Constituent and adjoining authorities

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
 Cheshire East Council
 Derbyshire County Council
 Derbyshire Dales District Council
 East Staffordshire Borough Council
 High Peak Borough Council
 Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council
 North East Derbyshire District Council
 Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
 Sheffield City Council
 Staffordshire County Council
 Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
 Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
 Tameside MBC

Abney and Abney Grange
 Alstonefield CP
 Ashford CP
 Bakewell Town Council
 Ballidon CP & Bradbourne CP
 Bamford CP and Thornhill CP
 Barlow CP
 Baslow and Bubnell CP
 Beeley CP
 Birchover CP
 Blackwell in the Peak CP
 Blore with Swinscoe CP
 Bonsall CP
 Bosley CP
 Bradfield CP
 Bradwell CP

Parish Councils

Langsett CP
 Little Longstone CP
 Litton CP
 Longnor CP
 Lyme Handley CP
 Macclesfield Forest & Wildboarclough PM
 Meltham CP
 Middleton and Smerrill CP
 Middleton by Wirksworth CP
 Monyash CP
 Mossley Town Council
 New Mills CP
 Northwood and Tinkersley CP
 Offcote and Underwood CP
 Onecote CP
 Outseats CP

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Brampton CP	Over Haddon CP
Brassington CP	Peak Forest CP
Butterton PC	Pilsley CP
Calver CP	Pott Shrigley CP
Chapel en le Frith CP	Quarnford CP
Charlesworth CP	Rainow CP
Chelmorton CP	Rowsley CP
Chinley, Buxworth and Brownside CP	Saddleworth CP
Chisworth CP	Sheen CP
Curbar CP	Sheldon CP
Dunford CP	South Darley CP
Eaton, Alsop and Newton Grange CP	Stanton CP
Edale CP	Stocksbridge CP
Edensor CP	Stoney Middleton CP
Elton CP	Sutton CP
Eyam CP	Taddington CP
Fawfieldhead CP	Thorpe CP
Fenny Bentley CP	Tideswell CP
Flagg CP	Tintwistle CP

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Foolow CP	Tissington CP and Lea hall CP
Froggatt CP	Wardlow CP
Gratton CP	Waterhouses CP
Great Longstone CP	Wetton CP
Grindleford CP	Whaley Bridge CP
Grindon CP	Wincle CP
Hartington Middle Quarter CP	Winstar CP
Hartington Upper Quarter CP	Wormhill CP
Hassop CP	Youlgreave CP
Hathersage CP	Castleton CP
Hayfield CP	
Highlow and Offerton PM	
Hollinsclough CP	
Holme Valley CP	
Holmesfield CP	
Holymoorside and Walton CP	
Hope CP	
Ilam CP	
King Sterndale CP	

Detailed contact list

Indigo Planning Limited

Kirkwells town planning & sustainable development consultants

Lafarge Cement

Lake District National Park Authority

Litton Properties Ltd

Local Access Forum

Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park Authority

Loxley Valley Protection Society

Mexichem

Mineral Products Association

Ministry of Defence

Aggregate Industries UK

Mobile Operators Association

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Mono Consultants Ltd
	Moorlands Together LSP
	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
	National Farmers Union (NFU)
	National Grid
	National Grid c/o AMEC
Alsop Rivendale	
ASDA	
Bakewell Access Group	
Bakewell & District Civic Society	National Trust
Bakewell & Eyam Community Transport	Natural England
Bakewell and District Historical Society	
Bleaklow Industries Ltd	Network Rail
Bonsall Energy Group	New Forest National Park Authority
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority	North Staffordshire PCT
British Aggregates Association	North York Moors National Park Authority
British Mountaineering Council	Northern Rail
British Telecommunications plc	Northumberland National Park Authority
British Waterways	Nottingham Community Housing Association

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Oldham LSP
	PDRHA c/o Midlands Rural Housing Housing
	Peak Park Parishes Forum
Broads Authority	RWE npower
Cairngorms National Park Authority	Silson Planning Services
Campaign for National Parks	Eryri National Park Authority (Snowdonia)
Cemex UK Materials Limited	South Downs National Park Authority
Central & Eastern Cheshire PCT	South Yorkshire & North East Derbyshire Area Ramblers
Central & Eastern Cheshire PCT	
Centrica plc	SPACE
Chatsworth House Trust	Sport England
	Sports England
	Staffordshire CC
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	Staffordshire Historic Building Trust
Cheshire Community Action	Staffordshire Moorlands Community & Voluntary Services
Cheshire Constabulary	Staffordshire Police
Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
Community Council of Staffordshire	
Council for British Archaeology	Stagecoach East Midlands

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Stockport MBC
	Sustainable Bakewell cic
Country Land and Business Association	Sustainable Bakewell cic
Dartmoor National Park Authority	
Department for Transport	Sustainable Youlgrave
Department for Transport Rail group	SUSTRANS
Derbyshire Aggregates Ltd	
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce	Tameside MBC
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee	Tarmac Ltd
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee	The Coal Authority
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils	The Planning Cooperative
Derbyshire Coalition for Inclusive Living	The Planning Inspectorate
	The Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester & High Peak)
Derbyshire Dales CVS	The Ramblers Association (New Mills & District Group)
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service	The Woodland Trust
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	
Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust	TM Travel Ltd
Derbyshire Mental Health Service NHS Trust	Trent Barton

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Derbyshire Sport	UK ANPA
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust	United Utilities
East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
East Midlands Housing Association	Yorkshire Water
Electricity North West Ltd	
ENPAA	
Environment Agency	
Environment Agency Midlands Region	
E.ON UK plc	
Equity Housing	
Exmoor National Park Authority	
Fisher German LLP	
Forest Enterprise	
Freight Transport Association	
Friends of the Peak District	
Geoplan Limited	
GL Hearn	
Glebe Mines Ltd	

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Guinness Northern Counties Housing
Association

High Peak CVS

Highways Agency

Highways Agency East Midlands

Home Builders Federation

Hope Valley Access