

# **BAKEWELL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2020-2035**



## **CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
1: Introduction	4
2: Consultations Pre Regulation 14	5
3: Regulation 14 consultation	16
Appendix 1: notice of Regulation 14 consultation	
Appendix 2: copy of notice in Peak Advertiser	
Appendix 3: email/letter to Schedule 1 consultees	
Appendix 4: list of Schedule 1 consultees contacted	
Appendix 5: letter to residents directly affected by proposed green spaces and development boundary extension	
Appendix 6: anonymised list of proposed green space landowners consulted by letter	
Appendix 7: addresses of residents adjacent to proposed development boundary extension consulted by letter	
Appendix 8: clubs, societies and other institutions directly consulted by email or letter	



*Consultation Event (Bakewell Town Council)*

## Introduction

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been produced in accordance with Regulation 15(1)(b) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012<sup>1</sup>.

1.2 Regulation 15(2) requires that a consultation statement must:

- (a) contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) explain how they were consulted;
- (c) summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- (d) describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

1.3 Part 2 of this Consultation Statement describes consultation events, meetings, correspondence and news articles that took place in the period leading up to the Regulation 14 consultation.

1.4 Part 3 of this Consultation Statement contains detailed results of the Regulation 14 consultation. Responses from 'Schedule 1 consultees' and members of the public are summarised with an explanation of how these responses have been addressed in the submission version of Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan (BNP).

1.5 The Appendices contain copies of consultation posters and flyers, the press notice, letters and emails.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/regulation/15>

## Part 2: Consultations pre-Regulation 14

### Background to preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan

2.1 The Town Council established the Bakewell Partnership in 2012 to encourage joined-up working between the four authorities with responsibility for the town (Bakewell Town Council, Peak District National Park Authority, Derbyshire Dales District Council and Derbyshire County Council) and a range of local interest groups.

2.2 In 2014 The Town Council agreed that a Neighbourhood Plan Working Group would also form part of the Bakewell Partnership and be responsible for producing a neighbourhood plan on its behalf. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group was made up of elected members of the Town Council and District Council, representatives of local businesses and organisations, and individual members of the public. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group undertook all the research, writing, consultation and re-writing of the neighbourhood plan, on behalf of, and reporting to, the Town Council. Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group were made available on the Town Council website.<sup>2</sup>

2.3 The Working Group was supported by 5 Sub-Groups to consider issues and develop policies for Bakewell's environment and heritage, housing, community facilities, local economy and transport and communications. The Sub-Groups have had continual dialogue with interested parties throughout the plan preparation process.

2.4 The Working Group and Sub-Groups have been closely involved with officers from the Peak District National Park Authority throughout plan preparation.

2.5 Bakewell Town Council has involved local people throughout the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan through intensive public consultation, enabling residents to understand the issues and make the decisions which will help to shape their neighbourhood.

2.6 Table 1 below shows how the pre-Regulation 14 consultation process meets the requirements of Regulation 15 (2).

2.7 A regulation 14 consultation was undertaken in February/March 2018. This was later judged to be insufficient to meet statutory requirements, but the comments received were significant in helping to shape the plan so are included in Table 1.

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.bakewelltowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.bakewelltowncouncil.gov.uk)

**Table 1: Summary of pre Regulation 14 consultation process**

Date	Form of consultation	Purpose and who consulted	Main issues and concerns	How issues and concerns considered and addressed
May 2014	Town Council Meeting	Presentation on purpose, status and development of a Neighbourhood Plan		
3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2014	Workshop event at Town Hall  open to all residents	<p>To seek residents' views through various means on a range of issues concerning the planning and management of development in Bakewell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the development boundary change?</li> <li>• What are the most important open spaces</li> <li>• What should we do about visitors and parking?</li> <li>• What should happen at the industrial sites?</li> <li>• How should the shopping area develop?</li> <li>• How do we respect historic character?</li> </ul> <p>To further understand purpose and process To recruit volunteers for Topic Groups</p>	<p>6 additional areas to for development suggested.</p> <p>Need to consider improving access to car parks to limit congestion and queues.</p> <p>Central Shopping Area may need adjusting.</p> <p>Concern about mix of shops and number of cafes.</p> <p>'A' boards and banners need enforcement.</p>	<p>Possible areas for development considered and taken forward to later consultations.</p> <p>Car park management at peak times/events accepted as issue to be addressed.</p> <p>Central Shopping Area updated in final NP.</p> <p>Policy developed to attempt to control proportion of cafes etc in shop frontages.</p> <p>'A' boards and obstructions on pavements being discussed with DCC and PDNPA.</p>

<p>27<sup>th</sup> September 2014</p>	<p>Drop-in consultation event at Bakewell Farmers' Market</p> <p>Attended by staff from National Park Authority and Neighbourhood Plan Working Group</p> <p>Open to residents and visitors</p> <p>Questionnaires handed out</p>	<p>To develop interest in the project and encourage involvement by residents and business people.</p> <p>To explain about the need to plan for growth of the town.</p> <p>Using large scale maps of the town to encourage people to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What land could be developed?</li> <li>• What land should be protected?</li> </ul> <p>Hand out Questionnaires to residents and visitors to gather views on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment sites</li> <li>• Mix of uses in the town centre</li> <li>• Car parking</li> <li>• What people like or don't like about Bakewell</li> </ul>	<p>Responses confirmed need to protect parks &amp; gardens, open areas, woodland etc from development. Several additional sites were suggested for development.</p> <p>Priority for jobs on employment land at Cintride &amp; Deepdale, but consider housing or possibly hotel, supermarket, sport.</p> <p>Residents feel town centre over-focussed on tourist trade – outdoor shops, cafes. Need more variety.</p> <p>Protect car parks; need free parking for employees.</p> <p>Visitors enjoy small town ambience but dislike parking prices, empty shops, traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Gathered information useful for PDNPA in preparation of their Development Management Plan as well as for the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Additional protection through Local Green Spaces for important landscape areas.</p> <p>Sites proposed for development were taken forward for consideration.</p> <p>Policy developed to address over-supply of cafes and takeaways.</p> <p>Car parking retained at existing level.</p> <p>Consideration given to ways to improve pedestrian movement and traffic management in town centre.</p>
<p>September 2014 forward</p>	<p>Working Group Meetings</p> <p>Press releases</p>	<p>Meetings open to public participation</p> <p>Regular updates in 'Pure Bakewell'</p>		

	Included on Town Council website	Public information		
17 <sup>th</sup> November 2014	Workshop meeting between Bakewell NP working group and officers form PDNPA	To discuss in detail the options for expansion of the development boundary that were proposed at the public events, taking into account views from NPA planning, landscape and cultural heritage officers	18 sites within or close to the edge of the Development Boundary were discussed.  Of these, 5 sites were considered to have limited potential for housing development.	Site on Shutts Lane has since been approved for housing development.  Site off Stoney Close carried forward into NP and extension to Development Boundary proposed.  Other sites not taken forward to NP.
August 2015	Business Retailers Survey – Central Shopping Area	Stratified sample based on percentage of Use Class. To obtain up to date information on retail businesses and opinions about their future	45% of respondents felt retail mix too narrow  38% said their business turnover was very seasonal	To inform consideration of retail issues in the Town Centre.  Policy developed to limit A3-A5 on frontages in CSA.
4 <sup>th</sup> & 19 <sup>th</sup> November 2015	Two open events in Town Hall	Public consultation on findings and proposals to date - 170 attendees  Leaflet delivered to all households  Questionnaires handed out – 69 general returns + 17 pedestrian/vehicle returns	Support proposed Green Spaces and additions suggested  Agree car parking sufficient but better management needed.  Concern about 'A' boards.  Safeguard relief road line.	3 Green Spaces added.  Policy retains car parking capacity. Consider better management of car parking with owners and agencies.  Encourage action to improve pedestrian movement in discussion with DCC and PDNPA.  Relief road line safeguarded in NP (later removed on DCC advice).  Policy developed to limit A3-A5 on frontages in CSA.

			<p>Retail mix unbalanced, A3-A5 dominance should be restricted.</p> <p>Support for more housing development, and a number of further areas for development were suggested.</p>	<p>Only 1 proposed housing area considered to have some limited potential.</p>
May 2016	Questionnaire	<p>Survey of housing needs undertaken through parents of children attending Infants School</p> <p>25 responses (41%)</p>	<p>96% in favour of a small development of affordable homes for local people (56% rented, 72% for sale).</p> <p>20% said current home was unsuitable because of cost, size, need to be closer to family etc.</p>	<p>Development sites for more affordable housing sought at various stages of NP process.</p>
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Derbyshire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority	expect development to include Sustainable Drainage Systems	Included in submission version
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Derbyshire Dales District Council	should be more support and flexibility shown within the plan to the delivery of housing and employment development	BNP includes 3 extension areas. Cannot be 'flexible' as this would not conform to strategic planning policy of the PDNPA
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Derbyshire Dales District Council	Town Council will need to be satisfied that BNP can provide adequate policy to guide planning decisions in the areas	BNP covers the whole of the parish and while some policies apply only to Bakewell town centre, some are

			of the Parish outside of Bakewell Town Centre.	applicable to other built areas of the town or parish-wide.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Highways England	HE's interest is safeguarding the operation of the A38 - do not consider that there will be any adverse impact upon its operation.	Noted
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Historic England	Need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the importance of those historic assets	This is achieved via ENV policies which identify and protect non-designated heritage assets.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Nathaniel Litchfield on behalf of Litton Properties	Many BNP policies repeat strategic policies	Repeat policies removed
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	DDDC	concern re non-contiguous boundary - further explanation of this approach needed. Sites identified for housing should be clearly shown	Text explains rationale for boundary, boundary expansion areas clearly identified.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Environment Agency	Need to apply flood zone sequential test	This was undertaken as part of the sustainability appraisal
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Chert mine underneath lady manners playing field	Map of old mine workings included
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1 <sup>st</sup> Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	If houses built at lady manners need safe access to town	There is requirement in DB1 for safe pedestrian and cycle access to town centre

12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Object to extension area at Ashford Road	Noted but still included
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Object to extension area at Stoney Closes	Noted but still included
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Natural England	The plan's overall approach to green infrastructure and biodiversity could be strengthened.	ENV policies strengthened including requirement for biodiversity net gain
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	DCC	ENV policies are weak, only asking that proposals 'consider' the landscape's sensitivity,	Policy rephrased and strengthened
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Nathaniel Litchfield on behalf of Litton Properties	Policy ENV3 is not sound and should be deleted. Policy ENV3 amounts to a request and is inappropriately defined as a policy.	ENV3 re-written
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Need to identify sites for housing	This would not conform to strategic planning policy.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Need to recognise need in Bakewell for market housing available at below market values.	This is achieved through policy of starter homes (H2)
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	DCC	Housing policies should refer to specialist needs	Policies amended

12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Nathanial Litchfield on behalf of Litton Properties	Policy H2 is not sound, without justification and should be deleted.	Amended.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Newholme site should be used for some form of 'affordable' housing project for elderly residents.	This is a requirement of policy CF1
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	DDDC	Policy H3: applying local connection requirements to quasi market homes is unlikely to be successful. The housing need survey 2015 does not identify this need and concludes that the main need is for affordable rent.	The government classes starter homes as affordable homes therefore the neighbourhood plan is seeking to apply the same restrictions as on other forms of affordable homes.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Nathanial Litchfield on behalf of Litton Properties	Policy H3 is not sound, without justification and should be deleted.	Amended
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident*2	ensure that some of the open market housing is 'low cost'	Achieved by requiring a proportion to be starter homes
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	it isn't clear how you define 'local'.	Policy H1 aligns with PDNPA policy where this is defined
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	NHS Property Services	CF1 There is an opportunity at the Newholme site to make more efficient use of the site,	Policy CF1 takes into account NHS estate re-organisation

			for a modern fit-for-purpose health facility, alongside conversion and/or redevelopment of parts of the site including residential, care, and other appropriate land uses.	
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident	Newholme is suitable for housing, of a variety of types and tenures, and including conversion of the existing buildings.	Included in policy CF1
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Bakewell Almshouses	Highly supportive of policy CF1. One of a very limited number of potential development sites that provide the required ease of access to town facilities.	noted
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	DDDC	Newholme. Consideration could be given to affordable housing.	Included in policy CF1
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	DDDC	Provision of Leisure and Sport provision within complement the principals and priorities identified in Derbyshire Dales Built Sports Facilities, Playing Pitch and Open Space Strategy 2017.	DDDC strategy referenced

12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation		Economy section lacks an adequate summary of the local economic situation – needs to provide context for proposed policies, drawing on available evidence which points to the need to establish the conditions to help enable the creation of better paid / longer term employment opportunities within the town beyond the tourism sector.	Neighbourhood plan focuses on those aspects of the local economy that were identified as important during the public consultations.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local residents*9	Concerned about the number of charity shops	Not a planning issue
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	DDDC	E1 would be better framed by advising of the thresholds below which such changes (retail to food/drink) will be resisted.	Policy amended to include threshold.
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Local resident/DCC	E1 might result in empty units	Policy amended to include threshold, reducing risk of this
12 Feb - 26 March 2018	1st Regulation 14 Consultation	Nathaniel Litchfield on behalf of Litton Properties	As currently worded Policy E2 does not accord with the NPPF which sets out at paragraph 26 what a local planning authority should require when considering proposals for retail, leisure and office development	Policy amended slightly but para 26 only applies to when a planning authority is considering proposals

			proposed outside of town centres that are not in accordance with an up-to-date development plan.	
--	--	--	--	--

## Part 3: Regulation 14 Consultation

3.1 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations<sup>3</sup> require that before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must:

(a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area -

(i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan

(ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected

(iii) details of how to make representations

(iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised

(b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan

3.2 A 'Regulation 14' consultation was undertaken between 15<sup>th</sup> July 2019 and 5pm on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The steps that Bakewell Town Council took to ensure compliance with Regulations were:

- Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan available to view on Bakewell Town Council Website
- Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan hard copy available to view at Bakewell Town Council office, Bakewell library and Peak District National Park Authority headquarters
- Notice of consultation (Appendix 1) published in quarter page advertisements in the fortnightly Peak Advertiser in four editions (14-17 inclusive) commencing 15<sup>th</sup> July 2019 (Appendix 2).
- Notice of consultation in direct email/letter (Appendix 3) to Schedule 1 consultees (Appendix 4).
- Notice of consultation in letters (Appendix 5) to owners of proposed local green spaces (Appendix 6)
- Notice of consultation in letters (Appendix 5) to residents adjacent to proposed Development Boundary Extension Areas (Appendix 7).

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/637/regulation/14>

- Notice of consultation in email/letters to Bakewell clubs and societies (Appendix 8)
- Notice of consultation in letters to Riverside businesses
- Posters advertising the consultation were displayed at six locations; (Bakewell Fish and Chip Shop, Bakewell Library, Bakewell Post Office/Spar, Co-operative Supermarket, Market Place, Town Hall.)
- Six paper copies were collected from the office by enquirers or posted.

3.3 In accordance with parts (c) and (d) of Regulation 15, Table 2 below summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted in the Regulation 14 consultation, describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, how the concerns have been addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

**Table 2: Main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted in the Regulation 14 consultation and how these have been considered and addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan**

Section of BNP	Responder (and responder number)	Comment number	Summary of main issues and concerns	BTC response	Amendments to plan
<b>Abbreviations</b> DCC(1) Derbyshire County Council; DDDC(2) Derbyshire Dales District Council; LLFA Lead Local Flood Authority; BNP Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan BTC Bakewell Town Council; PDNPA Peak District National Park Authority; DEFRA Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs DMP Development Management Policies (Part 2 of PDNPA Local Plan); CS Core Strategy (PDNPA Part 1 Local Plan);					
general comment	DCC(1)	1	evidence base out of date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree that the 'Living Streets' document is old (2004) but its finding regarding the pedestrian environment are still valid. BTC saw no other opportunity, except via the NP, to attempt to implement this report.</li> <li>• BTC wish to reflect that the NP is part of an ongoing process of community consultation, of which the 'Bakewell 2012' document is a part.</li> <li>• the Experian report (2015) and the retailers survey (2015) were carried out by BTC to inform the NP.</li> <li>• acknowledge that GL Hearn report (2016) refers to specific sites that have since been developed and BNP will be amended to reflect this</li> <li>• BTC not aware of, nor has been made aware of via this consultation, any evidence that supersedes that used</li> </ul>	updated reference to employment sites that have been developed
general comment	DCC(1)	40	plan could be strengthened by making reference to dementia friendly communities	Plan aims to do this through H3 and E1	no

general comment	DCC(1)	41	makes no reference to the voluntary and community sector	para 1.7 refers to non-planning ideas that will be dealt with by the town council and other appropriate bodies. This includes the voluntary and community sector so no need to make explicit reference.	no
general comment	DCC(1)	42	no mention of improving existing housing stock	this is outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan	no
general comment	DDDC(2)	43	should be more support and flexibility shown to the delivery of housing and employment development that maintains the towns future sustainability . . this may result in Bakewell taking slightly more development (but) it is considered that having additional development on the edge of the town would be less harmful on the landscape that elsewhere in the PDNP.	Noted. BNP provides scope for significant additional development via an extended town boundary BNP cannot give more support and flexibility than PDNPA local plan otherwise it would not meet basic conditions  see also comments in housing section	no
general comment	DDDC(2)	44	BTC will need to be satisfied that the BNP can provide adequate policy to guide planning decisions in the areas of the Parish outside of Bakewell Town Centre	Noted.  BNP covers the whole of the parish and while some policies apply only to Bakewell, some are applicable parish-wide.  Where neighbourhood policies do not apply outside of the town itself, BTC is satisfied that existing Local Plan provisions are sufficient.	no
general comment	Highways England(3 )	77	considering limited level of growth and significant distance from strategic road network, do not expect any impacts	noted	no
general comment	CPRE (9)	101	the plan could be more aspirational and require all new housing developments to be zero carbon	There are several comments on this theme in the 'housing' and 'environment' chapters – cross ref to DCC comment numbers 4 and 10 and to the housing section.	re-written section 3.2-3.4 to make a more positive statement that

				<p>BTC acknowledges the importance of the issue but with regard to the specific point about housing development believes that PDNPA Core Strategy CC1 is sufficient. The inclusion of a neighbourhood policy that 'required all new housing to be zero carbon' would in effect be the same as or similar to existing strategic policy (eg as suggested by DCC comment 10). This is not necessary as it then becomes confusing for the decision-maker and has the effect of undermining the effectiveness of the strategic and local policies.</p> <p>BTC acknowledges that a more positive statement in 3.2-3.4 would be a better reflection of the community's view.</p>	more closely reflects the community's view
general comment	Coal Authority	107	no specific comment	noted	no
general comment	Bakewell resident (23)	129	date on front page and inside documents don't match	noted	amended as comment
general comment	Bakewell resident (30)	142	no mention of illegal camping	not a neighbourhood plan issue	no
general comment	Bakewell resident (31)	147	concern about referencing of old documents eg Landscape strategy which is 10 years old	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape strategy is still current</li> <li>• agree that the 'Living Streets' document is old (2004) but its finding regarding the pedestrian environment are still valid. BTC saw no other opportunity, except via the NP, to attempt to implement this report.</li> <li>• BTC wish to reflect that the NP is part of an ongoing process of community consultation,</li> </ul>	no

				<p>of which the 'Bakewell 2012' document is a part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Experian report (2015) and the retailers survey (2015) were carried out by BTC to inform the NP.</li> <li>• acknowledge that GL Hearn report (2016) refers to specific sites that have since been developed and BNP will be amended to reflect this</li> <li>• BTC not aware of, nor has been made aware of via this consultation, any evidence that supersedes that used</li> </ul>	
general comment	PDNPA (32)	148	date of plan in header needs correcting	amend	amended as comment
general comment	National Grid (35)	225	no record of any apparatus in the neighbourhood plan area	noted	no
1.0 introduction	DCC(1)	2	should include statement that the plan supports the presumption in favour of sustainable development	BNP must meet 'basic conditions', which includes the contribution to sustainable development and this will be evidenced in the basic conditions statement.	no
1.1	DCC(1)	3	amend date to 2019	agree	yes
general comment	Bakewell resident (23)	129	date on front page and para 1.1 don't match	noted	amended as comment
1.5	DCC(1)	46	amend reference to 'emerging' development plan	agree	amended as comment
1.5	PDNPA (32)	149	1.5 refers to Local Plan 2001 but this has now been replaced by the DMP	amend	amended as comment
Vision, paras 1.10-1.15	DCC(1)	4	amend vision to include specific policies and projects relating to climate change and low carbon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BNP vision is derived from consultation with local people – it cannot be imposed</li> </ul>	no

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• vision (in 1.11) does seek to achieve environmental resilience in new and existing development</li> <li>• many of the specific suggestions are outside the remit of a neighbourhood plan, eg low emission vehicles, reducing waste and litter, reduced water use</li> </ul>	
vision	PDNPA (32)	150	use bullets	noted	amended as comment
vision 1.10	PDNPA (32)	151	vibrant implies range so delete range	noted	amended as comment
Vision, para 1.11	Bakewell resident (31)	144	Bakewell needs to be more proactive about increasing biodiversity, for example in the creation of wildflower meadows in public spaces and road verges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BTC is already undertaking projects to increase biodiversity but this is not reflected in the plan</li> <li>• Agree that this should be a non-planning action decide</li> <li>• policy for biodiversity net gain is included in ENV1</li> </ul>	included as a non-planning action
vision para 1.12	PDNPA (32)	152	'while retaining heritage . . . countryside.' Already said in previous vision	noted	no
vision para 1.13	PDNPA (32)	153	whose need? local?	noted	no
Development boundary 2.1	PDNPA (32)	154	re-write to put development boundary and central shopping area in new context, ie Local Plan superseded	noted	amended as comment
2.3	DDDC(2)	48	clarify use of land newly brought into development boundary eg with site specific policies	<p>in order to conform with strategic policy the neighbourhood plan took the view that it would not allocate sites for development but instead extend the development boundary</p> <p>Add sentence to clarify why the boundary is extended - " to give scope for the sustainable growth of Bakewell in accordance with its</p>	amended as comment

				strategic role as a market town and the biggest settlement in the national Park”	
2.3	DDDC(2)	49	as the areas brought into the development boundary are effectively ‘allocations’ they should be subject to EIA/SEA	BNP, including the boundary extension process, has been subject to a full SA which incorporates a SEA.	no
Development boundary 2.3	PDNPA (32)	155	1st sentence needs re-write as local plan now superseded	noted	amended as comment
Development boundary 2.4	PDNPA (32)	156	‘extension areas’ not locations	noted	amended as comment
Development boundary 2.5	PDNPA (32)	157	already stated map 2 shows boundary	noted	amended as comment
Development boundary 2.6	PDNPA (32)	158	paragraph should explain that PDNP policies are strong and will only allow appropriate, high quality development. Section could be more descriptive with regards to how the 3 areas were decided on.	noted	amended as comment
DB1	DDDC(2)	47	land required to deliver bridge to riverside should be included in the development boundary. see map.	Development Boundary amended to include bridge to Riverside	amended as comment
DB1	DCC(1)	5	Objection to inclusion of ‘area 2’ (Lady Manners playing field) within the development boundary due to loss of recreation space.	<p>Any development proposal coming forward on this site would need to satisfy PDNPA planning policy requirements (CS HC4, DMP DMS7) that prevent loss of recreation space and require equivalent or improved facilities.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Policy CF2 would permit replacement facilities within or adjacent to the development boundary. This would allow for the relocation of Lady Manners playing fields if necessary.</p> <p>This could be made more explicit in supporting text.</p>	<p>no change to policy</p> <p>supporting text makes this more explicit</p>

DB1	DCC(1)	6	plan should include reference to surface water flooding and additional paragraph to explain flood risk	New para 2.7	amended as comment
DB1	DDDC(2)	50	need to explain reason for non-contiguous boundary	agree	amended as comment
DB1 (E2)	DCC(1)	7	wording of DB1 and E2 could be strengthened to state "any development in an area of <i>identified</i> flood risk . . . through the use of sustainable drainage systems where possible."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree this would improve plan</li> <li>• changes wording slightly from that agreed with Environment Agency</li> </ul>	amended as comment
DB1	DCC(1)	8	remove full stop after 'possible'	noted	amended as comment
DB1	Fisher German on behalf of Haddon Estate(4)	78	The extension of the development boundary as set out in Policy DB1 and Map 2 is fully supported.	noted	no
DB1	Fisher German on behalf of Haddon Estate(4)	81	of the 3 areas included within the DB, only 1 and 3 are realistically capable of housing development. site 2 is mainly sports pitches serving Lady Manners school. If this site were to be developed to any degree replacement facilities would need to be provided.	<p>Any development proposal coming forward on area 2 would need to satisfy PDNPA planning policy requirements (CS HC4, DMP DMS7) that prevent loss of recreation space and require equivalent or improved facilities.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Policy CF2 would permit replacement facilities within or adjacent to the development boundary. This would allow for the relocation of Lady Manners playing fields if necessary.</p> <p>This could be made more explicit in supporting text.</p>	no change to policy added to supporting text
DB1	Fisher German on behalf	85	land between ashford road and river wye which is identified for inclusion within the development boundary should also be considered for potential	Para 2.3 of the NP states that the development boundary needs to accommodate growth, and that the greatest need will be for affordable	no

	of Haddon Estate(4		business use in conjunction with the former cintride site...the NP should recognise the potential development options of this land and provide for flexibility ...	housing. However this does not prevent the use of site 3 (land between Ashford road and river wye) for any type of development permitted under core strategy DS1, ie affordable housing, community facilities and small scale retail and business premises. (Other strategic and neighbourhood polices seek to restrict retail development to the town centre.)	
DB1	Environment Agency (7)	96	welcome changes to policy as a result of EA comments on the sustainability appraisal	noted	no
DB1	dlp planning on behalf of Maxwell Dernie (8)	99	object to DB1 as currently drafted as there are additional sustainable options (land at Dry Hills, Bakewell) for the boundary extension that will further accommodate the growth of the settlement	noted area was considered for boundary extension but dismissed on landscape grounds as harmful encroachment into open countryside, contrary to strategic policy  part of the area referred to is proposed as a local green space	no
DB1	CPRE (9)	106	if development occurs at site 2 this would lead to a substantial extension of Bakewell – should be accompanied by measures to discourage dependency on private car by providing walking and cycling routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>policy ENV1 requires green infrastructure that restores connectivity for nature and people</li> <li>policy TC1 requires applications for development to show how the proposed scheme provides links to the wider cycling and walking network</li> <li>agree that a more explicit requirement could be included as part of DB1 or in H policies</li> </ul>	yes added to DB1

DB1	Bakewell resident (12)	113	<p>object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>small plot</li> <li>steep bank</li> <li>flood zone</li> <li>sewage pipe</li> <li>cost of excavation</li> <li>public footpath</li> <li>danger to children of fast flowing water</li> <li>people polluting river and disregarding wildlife health and safety</li> <li>nearby sites with existing planning permission which will generate light and noise pollution</li> <li>close proximity of residents to industrial development</li> <li>heavy goods traffic on A6 and need for new junction with A6</li> <li>loss of privacy and overhearing presence to residents of Lakeside</li> <li>impact of landscape and wildlife</li> </ul>	<p>Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.</p>	no
DB1	Bakewell Resident (14)	119	<p>object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>problematic access onto A6</li> <li>loss of amenity</li> <li>loss of habitat, including mature trees</li> <li>public footpath crosses site</li> <li>noise pollution already a problem and would be exacerbated by more development</li> </ul>	<p>Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.</p>	no
DB1	Landowner (15)	120	<p>proposed development boundary extension at area 1 (Stoney Closes) should be amended to include adjacent land, as this satisfies the criteria for extension and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is of limited agricultural or habitat value</li> </ul>	<p>Agree that the narrative of site assessment suggests the land could be included but on balance it is considered that this area is important for the setting of the town (its</p>	no

			<p>is potentially available for development  illogical to exclude – surrounding land is substantially developed  limited landscape value and visual synergy with proposed extension area as southern stone wall boundary is shared  accords with narrative of site assessment (site 15)</p>	<p>beauty) and should be designated green space for that reason.</p>	
DB1	Bakewell resident (22)	127	<p>object to inclusion of area 3 within the development boundary because:  loss of amenity – nowhere to play plus increased noise  impact on wildlife including wild flowers, insects, kestrels, sparrow hawks, heron, owls  damage to ash trees  flooding and natural spring  over development of the area  increase in traffic accessing A6  public footpath</p>	<p>Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.</p>	No
DB1	Bakewell resident (24)	133	<p>Object to the inclusion of area 1 (Stoney Closes) for following reasons:  conflicts with stated vision  conflicts with duty of a national park  conflicts with PDNPA management plan  no consideration given to underutilised buildings and brownfield sites  survey of Bakewell infants parents not representative  site is not close enough to local amenities  conflict with adjacent lgs designation – area is also 'setting for the town'  will add to traffic congestion</p>	<p>These reasons are either non material or material but refuted because of the assessment process undertaken for sites.</p>	No
DB1	Bakewell resident (25)	134	<p>object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons:  haven for wildlife</p>	<p>Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to</p>	No

			main walk to Ashford exacerbate existing noise pollution if business use devalue homes on Lakeside and at top on A6	justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.	
DB1	Severn Trent Water (26)	135	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With exception of site 3 there does not appear to be any significant hydraulic sewer flood risk or capacity related issues associated with the development areas. Site 3 is upstream of a location where we are aware of historical reports of flooding. Once more detail of proposals in this area are formulated; it is advised we are notified so we can make a more detailed assessment.</li> <li>• The sites appear to have sustainable options to discharge surface water to meaning they would not discharge run-off into the foul/combined network, thus have a minimal impact.</li> <li>• Due to the context of the area and conservation relating to the Peak District the overall development yield per site would likely be low, thus have a minimal impact.</li> </ul>	noted DB1 amended to include requirement for SUDS (DCC comment 7) cross ref comment 137 re H1 and H2 SUDS is requirement of PDNPA CC5	amended re SUDS requirement as DCC comment 7
DB1	Severn Trent Water (26)	136	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• careful design should be utilised to ensure any flood water of a fluvial nature is kept out of and away from future sewerage assets</li> </ul>	noted	no
DB1	Bakewell resident (27)	138	Object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons: loss of amenity and play space noise pollution light pollution over development increase in traffic accessing A6 leading to danger	Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal	No

			loss of wildlife – insects, water voles, frogs, toads, hedgehogs, birds, tawny & barn owls, birds of prey, goldcrests, herons public footpath disruption by construction under occupancy of already available homes in Bakewell	planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.	
DB1	Bakewell resident (28)	139	Object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons: traffic issues and need for another exit onto A6 loss of habitat loss of ash trees public footpath loss of privacy noise and disturbance children have played here for generations	Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.	No
DB1	PDNPA (32)	159	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• capitalise 'Extension Area'</li> <li>• River Wye</li> <li>• formatting</li> </ul>	noted	yes amended as comment
DB1	Bakewell resident (33)	221	Object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons: loss of privacy local wildlife increase traffic going onto A road footpath crossing the site	Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.	no

DB1	Natural England (34)	223	welcome inclusion in policy to take account of flood risk and 10 m buffer	noted	no
DB1	Bakewell resident (36)	226	Object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons: wildflowers hedgehogs/kestrels/owls loss of ash trees loss of play space need for another entrance and exit onto A6	Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.	No
DB1	Bakewell resident (37)	227	Object to the inclusion of area 3 within development boundary for the following reasons: loss of amenity and play space increased noise and light pollution increased traffic impact on wildlife and environment including natural springs, owls, kestrels, etc impact on trees doesn't meet purposes of a national park public footpath crosses site lack of access to services and worse ranked in site assessment	Site assessment for area 3 already acknowledges the shortcomings with the site but these are not enough in themselves to justify re-drawing the boundary to exclude it. The development plan enables various uses for sites inside the boundary but this does not mean they will all be suitable. The normal planning application process will determine which uses are suitable and which aren't.	No
Environment & Heritage general comment	Historic England (21)	126	area covered by the NP includes a number of important designated heritage assets –important that the strategy safeguards those elements which contributes to the significance of these assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>noted</li> <li>this is achieved through ENV1-4</li> </ul>	no
Environment & Heritage general comment	PDNPA (32)	160	There are various photos not referenced: p.16, p25, map on p30, census data p34, p37	noted	amended as comment

Environment & Heritage general comment	Natural England (34)	222	note that the environment policies have been strengthened and clarified	noted	no
Environment & Heritage para 3.2	PDNPA(3 2)	161	lower case plan. Vision ref is 1.10	noted	amended as comment
3.3	DCC(1)	9	question assertion that BNP has limited role with regard to sustainability - "BNP should offer clear and unequivocal vision for Bakewell that . . . will help shape and guide Local Plan development and other plans, planning policies and investment decisions . . ."	There are several comments on this theme in the 'housing' and 'environment' chapters – cross ref to DCC comment numbers 4 and 10, CPRE comment 101 and to the housing section.  BTC acknowledges that a more positive statement in 3.2-3.4 would be a better reflection of the community's view.	amended as comment  re-written section 3.2-3.4 to make a more positive statement that more closely reflects the community's view
Environment & Heritage para 3.4	PDNPA(3 2)	162	The NP wishes to support the approach to sustainable buildings, renewable energy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions as set out in . . .	noted	amended as comment
Environment & Heritage para 3.4	PDNPA(3 2)	163	reads as though polices are SPD not CS	noted	amended as comment
Environmental resilience 3.2-3.4	DCC(1)	10	BNP should include policy that seeks to ensure renewable energy generation technologies are required in new buildings. New Policy ENV 5 proposed	There are several comments on this theme in the 'housing' and 'environment' chapters – cross ref to DCC comment numbers 4 and 10, CPRE comment 101 and to the housing section.	no new policy  re-written section 3.2-3.4 to make a more positive statement that

				<p>BTC acknowledges the importance of the issue but with regard to the specific point about a new policy for renewable energy generation believes that PDNPA Core Strategy CC1 is sufficient. The inclusion of a neighbourhood policy ENV5 ‘requiring all new development to implement the 4 steps in the energy hierarchy’ would in effect be the same as or similar to existing strategic policy CC1. This is not necessary as it then becomes confusing for the decision-maker and has the effect of undermining the effectiveness of the strategic and local policies.</p> <p>BTC acknowledges that a more positive statement in 3.2-3.4 would be a better reflection of the community’s view.</p>	more closely reflects the community’s view
ENV1	Environment Agency (7)	98	welcome changes to policy as a result of comments given as part of sustainability appraisal	noted	no
ENV1	PDNPA (32)	164	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A i check punctuation</li> <li>• B could this requirement be strengthened?</li> <li>• and submit with a planning application?</li> </ul>	noted	amended as comment
ENV1B	DCC(1)	11	reference should be to a landscape and visual impact assessment rather than a landscape character assessment. Any LIVA should be undertaken in accordance with a proven methodology eg guidelines produced by Landscape Institute.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree – amend B to “Developers are encouraged to undertake a local landscape and visual impact assessment in accordance with a proven methodology” (reference landscape institute).</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/technical-resource/landscape-visual-impact-assessment/">https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/technical-resource/landscape-visual-impact-assessment/</a></p>	amended as comment

ENV1/ENV2	DCC(1)	12	questions necessity of both policies requiring street trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ENV1 requirement is in context of Bakewell setting, ENV2 requirement is in context of Bakewell's special character</li> </ul>	no
ENV1	Bakewell resident (30)	141	Issue of A boards is not a major issue	BTC consider that it in an issue	no
Bakewell setting 3.5- 3.14	DCC(1)	13	<p>no mention of light pollution. Dark skies are an important aspect of character and light pollution can have negative effects on fauna. Suggest new policy:</p> <p>“Development where planning permission is required must limit, and where possible, reduce the impact of light pollution from externally visible light sources. Proposals to introduce new lighting into areas that do not presently have artificial lighting will be resisted unless it is demonstrated that this is required for road and/or pedestrian safety.</p> <p>External lighting should be designed to reduce the impact on dark skies, avoiding excessive use of up-lighting or the unintentional illumination of adjacent areas.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree</li> <li>new clause added to ENV1</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Environment & Heritage para 3.21	PDNPA (32)	165	Neighbourhood plan policies . . .	noted	amended as comment
ENV2	PDNPA (32)	166	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>B and with these documents</del> or</li> <li>building for life requirement could be made stronger</li> <li>needs to be clear if housing or all development</li> <li>C does this include conversions?</li> </ul>	noted	amended as comment
3.22	PDNPA (32)	167	remove reference to SSSI and local green space, remove speech marks from 'non-designated'	noted	amended as comment
P19	PDNPA (32)	168	reference images	noted	amended as comment

3.23	PDNPA (32)	169	punctuation	noted	amended as comment
page 21	PDNPA (32)	171	name of building	noted	amended as comment
ENV3	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	91	We consider that proposed Policy ENV3 is unsound as it is not consistent with national policy concerning non-designated heritage assets (paragraph 197). The proposed policy does not reference the need to consider the impact on the significance of the asset nor does it take into account that need for a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The policy requirement is disproportionate to the level of significance of non-designated heritage assets undermining the requirements of national policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need to reference how this 'local list' would work with DMP DMC policies</li> <li>• suggest " Policy DMC5 F(ii) of Peak District National Park Authority's Part 2 Local Plan (Development Management Policies) applies to all applications for development affecting the heritage assets, or their setting, listed in paragraph 3.23."</li> </ul>	amended as comment
ENV3	PDNPA (32)	170	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•need to consider under DMP DMC 5, esp re development that might cause harm</li> <li>•how would a developer demonstrate this – via a heritage statement?</li> </ul>	see above	amended as comment
3.25 bullet 1	PDNPA (32)	172	bullet 1 former local plan or DMP	noted	amended as comment
3.25 bullet 2	PDNPA (32)	173	bullet 2 Landscape Strategy and Action Plan	noted	amended as comment
Local Green Spaces map	DCC(1)	14	map orientation	noted	amended as comment
ENV4	Natural England (34)	224	Natural England is concerned at the omission of Manners Wood Local Green Space. It is described in the Ancient Woodland Inventory as ancient replanted woodland. DMC13 'Protecting Trees , woodland or other landscape features ' of the Peak District National Park Local Plan states that other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include as LGS on advise of NE</li> </ul>	amended as comment

			permitted. Designation as a Local Green Area gives weight to this policy.		
ENV4	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	92	Proposed Policy ENV 4 designates land as Local Green Space and includes the access road for the Riverside Business Park (Site 1). However, Paragraph 99 of the Framework requires that the designation of land as Local green Space be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. It is noted that part of this designation is subject to extant planning permission NP/DDD/1017/1068 and makes up an area of land to be developed for car parking to serve the approved development. Therefore, designating this area as Local Green Space is unsound as it conflicts with the Framework and the approved planning permission.	LGS amended to exclude bridge, car parking and passing places.	yes amended as comment
ENV4	dlp planning on behalf of Maxwell Dernie (8)	100	object to inclusion of site 29 (land at Dry Hills) as local green space due to lack of evidence to support designation, that land is in private ownership and land could be included within Policy DB1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BTC consider than the area meets the lgs criteria due to its beauty, recreation value and wildlife</li> <li>• public ownership is not a requirement</li> </ul>	no
ENV4 Map 7 Appendix 7 LGS Map 20	Bakewell resident landowner (17)	122	boundary of LGS 20 should be amended due to use of part of the land as private garden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree</li> <li>• BTC to comment</li> <li>• LGS amended to omit residential curtilage</li> </ul>	yes amended as comment
ENV4 Map 7 Appendix 7 LGS Map 26	Bakewell resident landowner (20)	125	object to inclusion of lgs 26 because: rough grazing land of no historical, recreational or wildlife value no public access not visible from the town or any roads in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BTC agree that it does not comply with criteria for green space</li> </ul>	yes, removed as green space

			not part of setting of town outside the conservation area left-over land from the surrounding and more dominating Castle Hill development		
ENV4	PDNPA (32)	174	needs rewording to comply with new NPPF	noted  2012 NPPF said "By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances."  2019 NPPF does not have this statement  BTC would like to keep the strongly worded policy as green space designation in a neighbourhood plan is the community's best expression of what is important to them and consider that there are other sites more suitable for the 'exceptional' forms of development that could be permitted in green spaces	kept policy wording but explained why needed due to special circumstances of a national park
Housing 4.1	DDDC(2)	51	reference to DDDC(2) being responsible for housing should be clarified	noted	amended as comment
Housing para 4.2	DCC(1)	15	no mention of Derbyshire Dales Local Plan which counts development in PDNP as a contribution towards its overall housing need	noted	amended as comment
Housing para 4.3	Fisher German on behalf	79	housing needs survey in appendix 8 evidences clear need for a small development of open market housing	the appendix 8 survey is an informal survey of a small group of residents (parents with children	changed title of appendix 8 and cross

	of Haddon Estate(4)			at the infants school) therefore its findings cannot be given great weight	referenced to DDDC HNS
Housing para 4.3	PDNPA (32)	179	footnote references	noted	amended as comment
Housing para 4.4	PDNPA (32)	177	use bullets	noted	amended as comment
Housing para 4.4	PDNPA (32)	178	delete 'bakewell . . . take this into account'. Not relevant as all areas must do this	noted	amended as comment
Housing	DCC(1)	16	overall approach supported	noted	no
Housing 4.6	DCC(1)	17	do not support playing field as a site suitable for housing (as per comment 5)	<p>Any development proposal coming forward on this site would need to satisfy PDNPA planning policy requirements (CS HC4, DMP DMS7) that prevent loss of recreation space and require equivalent or improved facilities.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Policy CF2 would permit replacement facilities within or adjacent to the development boundary. This would allow for the relocation of Lady Manners playing fields if necessary.</p> <p>This could be made more explicit in supporting text.</p> <p>Added to supporting text in DB1</p>	Added to DB1 Supporting text
Housing 4.6	DDDC(2)	52	would be beneficial if the plan provided further and more specific guidance on type and nature of development that may be considered acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>para 2.3 acknowledges that the greatest need will be for housing. Strategic policy CS DS1 permits affordable housing, community facilities and small scale business premises. (NB retail would not be appropriate on sites outside Bakewell central shopping area)</li> </ul>	no

Housing 4.6	DDDC(2)	53	would assist planning for housing if an indication of capacity and timescales was stated	The Development Boundary is an indicator of capacity and the neighbourhood plan has a shelf life after which time it should be reviewed so there is a timescale. However capacity allied to a timescale does not mean all available land should be built on within the life of the plan so it is not obvious why this would assist planning for housing anyway. Only a target allied to capacity and a timescale would do that and the neighbourhood plan is not target driven.	no
Housing 4.6	DDDC(2)	54	if through the site selection process there have been constraints identified it would help if these detailed in the policy	constraints are set out in para 2.6 and the maps in appendix 3 and appendix 4	no
Housing 4.6	DDDC(2)	55	an accompanying EIA/SEA may be required to provide the appropriate evidence base for the plan	a full SA incorporating SEA has been completed and agreed by statutory consultees	no
Housing para 4.6	PDNPA (32)	180	former local plan	noted	amended as comment
Housing 4.7	DDDC(2)	56	need to ensure that definitions of affordable accord with revised definitions under NPPF 2019	BNP takes PDNPA view on starter homes which differs from NPPF and PDNPA plan is considered sound. Compatibility with NPPF 2019 is tested via basic conditions statement.	no
Housing para 4.9	PDNPA (32)	181	appendix 8	noted	amended as comment
Housing H1 and H2	Severn Trent Water (26)	137	so long as surface water is drained sustainably i.e. to a watercourse, soakaway or via a designated surface water sewerage system then the risk that future development poses to the existing sewerage network is minimal. This is assuming the total yield of the development is small and in line with the context of the Peak District National Park.	noted DB1 amended to include requirement for SUDS (DCC comment 7) requirement for SUDS is also in CC5	SUDS referenced in amendment to DB1

			We would suggest that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems are utilised on any new development to help reduce the overall sites run-off rates and mitigate any increase in flood risk from the development.		
Housing Policy H1	DDDC(2)	57	Development Boundary for Bakewell is drawn tightly. Plan should provide further guidance re how increased affordable housing provision will be delivered over the Plan's lifetime, as limited scope within DB as drawn and policy H1 strictly resists development outside the boundary. Neighbourhood Plan should include flexibility to allow some affordable homes outside the DB and define areas where this would be acceptable.	<p>This would be contrary to DMP DMB1 which states "the future development of Bakewell will be contained within the development boundary".</p> <p>This does differ from the approach for other settlements which permits development 'inside or on the edge of' but neighbourhood plans can be slightly different to adopted local plans without undermining them. Neither the PDNPA plan nor the neighbourhood plan seek to increase affordable housing provision above that which is justified by need and can be delivered within the capacity of Bakewell to accommodate it (capacity as judged by the overall pattern of development, the character and setting of buildings and the character of the landscape). The suggestion that more housing should be spread further than the development boundary is not justified in the context of National Park purposes.</p>	no
Housing Policy H1	DDDC(2)	58	where the document states 'Local Lettings Plan' it is considered that it is referring to the PDNPA's 'Local Lettings Policy/ Section 106 Agreements which would restrict local occupancy to those with a local connection. A Local Lettings Plan is something different and it recommended that further consideration to the wording of this policy is made. If the NP wishes to enforce the National Parks local	noted	amended as comment

			connection policy then this should be included within the Plan and made clear that this approach would be taken forward and secured through the use of S106 Planning Obligations.		
Housing H1	DCC(1)	18	supported	noted	no
Housing H1	Fisher German on behalf of Haddon Estate(4)	82	it is recommended that greater flexibility is included in policy H1	There is no need for more flexibility to H1 but H2 does offer more flexibility for different models of housing delivery that reflect local community wishes whilst not undermining PDNPA adopted policy	no
Housing H1	PDNPA (32)	182	“comply with the local lettings plan and the floorspace requirements of DMP DMH1* footnote”	noted	amended as comment
Housing pg 31	PDNPA (32)	175	new title ‘market homes and starter homes on previously developed sites’	noted	amended as comment
Housing pg 31 Footnote 17	PDNPA (32)	176	footnote 17 - and adjacent parishes in accordance with DMP appendix 3	noted	amended as comment
Housing 4.11-4.18	Fisher German on behalf of Haddon Estate(4)	80	In order to bring forward affordable and market housing, development must be viable. Allowing a mix of affordable, starter and local market homes on all sites within the DB will bring greater potential for successful delivery. The limited amount of brownfield sites stifles the ability to deliver market and starter homes.	The neighbourhood plan must be in conformity with strategic policy. PDNPA Core Strategy policy H1 states “provision will not be made for housing solely to meet open market demand.” There is no target for delivery and no compulsion on the planning authority or the neighbourhood plan to deliver general market need. The NPA’s position has been tested at examination into the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document and found to be a justified means of housing delivery. Cross subsidy would raise the hope value on land and squeeze affordable housing to that justified by viability. This is an inefficient	no

				use of land and would worsen overall affordability of housing in the town.	
Housing para 4.12	DDDC(2)	59	Market housing will be bought by the highest bidder and therefore not necessarily a local person.	policy is not aiming to restrict to local occupancy but to prevent use as holiday accommodation	no
Housing para 4.12	DDDC(2)	60	NP needs to be satisfied that the policy approach to housing is viable	Policies for housing in Bakewell address housing need and the boundary extension creates capacity for further housing to address future needs. The provision of housing is not target driven.	no
Housing para 4.12	DDDC(2)	61	Evidence to support the inclusion of a requirement for homes to remain as primary residences is weak	It might help to include the latest figures for homes not lived in permanently (2011 census does this though would need to be qualified that not all of these would be in holiday home use.) This may not be considered strong enough evidence to justify the policy but it is a policy the NPA supports if the NP can justify it and have it agreed by an Inspector.	amended as comment
Housing para 4.12	PDNPA (32)	184	" . . . provided <del>can better</del> should help	noted	amended as comment
Housing para 4.12	PDNPA (32)	185	delete "houses will be . . .holiday rent" and replace with "new market housing will therefore be subject to a primary residence clause so they are lived in full time and to prevent their use for r holiday rent."	noted	amended as comment
Housing para 4.14	PDNPA (32)	186	Re-write "The government classes starter homes as affordable homes, and the Bakewell community see a need for Starter Homes, so the policy will safeguard homes built under this policy for people with a strong local connection. This restricts occupancy of starter homes in perpetuity so that they benefit the local population and would happen with all other forms of	noted	amended as comment

			affordable housing classed as affordable and built in Bakewell under PDNPA housing policies.”		
Housing para 4.15	PDNPA (32)	187	delete para (say same in 4.14)	Not deleted but section re-written for clarity	Section re-written for clarity
Housing para 4.18	PDNPA (32)	188	move to start of section on starter homes	noted	amended as comment
Housing H2	DCC(1)	19	requirement that starter homes must comprise at least 50% of total dwellings permitted will preclude delivery of other types of affordable housing	This is true and the risks are understood by BTC. The NPA’s main aim on these sites is enhancement of the site and setting and affordable housing will rarely be achieved due to most sites yielding few extra dwellings overall. However the policy is strongly supported by the community and PDNPA are happy to support.	no
Housing Policy H2	DDDC(2)	62	<p>policy title should be ‘residential development’</p> <p>intention of policy is understood but applying local connection requirements to quasi market homes is unlikely to be successful.</p> <p>HNS does not identify this need - main need is for affordable rent.</p> <p>Any new residential development that is not controlled by a Registered Provider would be subject to the primary occupancy clause and thus complement affordable rent schemes, as they are likely to be reduced in value compared to open market properties.</p> <p>Government definition of a first time buyer with a maximum age of 40, plus the additional restriction of</p>	<p>see comment 183 re title</p> <p>Local connection requirements reflect local people’s desire for different rungs on the housing ladder and recognises that not all need an affordable home.</p> <p>This policy is not responding directly to the housing need survey but recognising that there are other models of delivery that the local community will benefit from. The local intelligence on this may be tested at examination but the approach is supported by PDNPA.</p> <p>Re the comment concerning control by a registered provider, it is not clear whether this is a criticism that they would be owner occupied</p>	no

			<p>the PDNPA local connection would impact on the initial and future purchase price, affordability and lender confidence.</p> <p>Reference to 'at least 50% starter homes on a brownfield site' could equate to a sizeable number of homes. The pool of people able to purchase these 'starter homes' would be very limited, as might potential lenders both for the developer and the purchaser.</p>	<p>rather than rented or praise that the primary residence clause will reduce the market value somewhat.</p> <p>Restrictions may well affect lender confidence but it is what the community wants and PDNPA are supportive.</p> <p>Consultation for the neighbourhood plan showed that many local residents felt that they would neither qualify for an affordable home from a housing provider nor be able to afford a home on the open market. Starter Homes are a possible solution to this and PDNPA are supportive. The issue of lending to developer and purchaser is understood and BTC is aware of such potential barriers, however this is not a problem that the plan can solve. Writing policy to suit financiers and developers is not a priority in the National Park given the no target position.</p>	
Housing policy H2	Fisher German on behalf of Haddon Estate(4)	83	Policy H2 should be revised to allow a mix of affordable, starter and local market housing on sites within the development boundary (not restricted to brownfield) but all housing, including market housing, would be limited to persons having lived in Bakewell parish or the adjacent parishes for a minimum of 10 yrs in the last 20.	This is incompatible with the National Park's policy, which was deemed sound in 2018.	no
Housing Policy H2	Litton Property (6)	93	no housing can be brought forward on a viable basis - does not give attention to smaller sites within the town	The prevailing value of market housing means that even at a discount there will still be decent margins for developers delivering these 'sub market' types of housing. DB1 permits housing development on smaller sites within the town, subject to other policies	no

Housing H2	PDNPA (32)	183	new heading "market homes and starter homes on previously developed sites"	noted	amended as comment
Housing H2	PDNPA (32)	189	delete B rewrite D "Open market housing and starter homes will be restricted . . ." E reference appendix 3 of DMP G does this include roof alterations/loft conversions? These are different use class to extensions so use class should be specified renumber policies	noted	amended as comment
Housing 4.19	PDNPA (32)	190	delete 'where any combination of these impairments"	noted	amended as comment
Housing 4.23	PDNPA (32)	191	'planning policies which safeguard <u>land</u> .	noted	amended as comment
Housing 4.23	PDNPA (32)	192	Delete " Most existing . . . close to the town centre" and replace with " Access to most existing housing and potential sites for housing (eg proposed extensions to the Development Boundary) is problematic for elderly or disabled people on foot or using a mobility scooter due to the steepness of the slopes and the narrowness of the pavements on the main roads. Where sites come forward for residential schemes that are on flat land close to the town centre, they must contribute to meeting the needs of the town's aging and disabled population."	noted	amended as comment
Housing H3	DDDC(2)	63	a broader policy on specialist needs would be more appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>could also include reference to 'specialist needs' including those related to age and disability</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Housing H3	DDDC(2)	64	NP should identify sites within the town that would be suitable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the NP does not allocate sites, in line with strategic policy</li> <li>allocating sites removes the ability to deliver 100% affordable housing since this can only reasonably be achieved on exceptions sites.</li> </ul>	no

				Allocations would immediately raise hope value on sites and squeeze out social housing providers.	
Housing H3	DDDC(2)	65	Lifetime homes to be amended. Its equivalent is Building regs 2010 M4(2) and M4(3)	• noted and agree	amended as comment
Housing H3	DCC(1)	20	reference to 'Lifetime Home standards should be removed and the appropriate Building Regulations ref inserted (Part M4 (2) and M4 (3)	• noted and agree	amended as comment
Housing H3	DCC(1)	21	policy should reference best practice design standards such as BREEAM or Building for Life 12	• Building for Life standard is referenced in Policy ENV 2	no
Housing H3	DCC(1)	22	should include energy efficiency standard	• see response to CPRE comment 101 on page 2	no
Housing H3	DCC(1)	23	should reference biodiversity net gain	• biodiversity net gain is a general requirement under policy ENV1	no
Housing H3	PDNPA (32)	193	change title Housing for Aged and Disabled People	agree, also refer to comment 63 re 'specialist needs'	amended as comment
Community Facilities paras 5.2-5.3	DCC(1)	24	update figures from latest school census	• Steering Group (PL) to obtain up to date figures	amended as comment
Community Facilities para 5.5	DCC(1)	25	CA protection only applies to trees above 75mm at 1.5 m above ground level	noted	Added 'mature'
Community Facilities para 5.10	PDNPA (32)	194	redeveloped or <b>demolished</b>	noted	amended as comment
Community Facilities para 5.16	Bakewell resident (16)	121	site should be identified for a community centre in the upper part of Bakewell (Moorhall/Highfield Drive area)	• plan does not identify specific sites but policy CF2 requires that they are inside the development boundary	no
Community Facilities para 5.16	DDDC(2)	67	para 5.16 referencing strategy is welcomed	• noted	no
Community Facilities	NHS Property	231	NHSPS supports the overall aim of the policy. It supports the redevelopment of the site where it has	• BTC acknowledges that a planning application is likely to be in advance of the	amended para 5.8

Policy CF1	Services (29)		<p>been demonstrated that the community and employment uses are no longer required at the site. Within the paragraph A of the policy it is stipulated that redevelopment of the site shall include the provision of community and/or employment uses. However, this is not consistent with the wording of paragraph B point i which requires an assessment of demand for community and employment uses at the site.</p> <p>To ensure flexibility in the future development of the site, it is suggested that paragraph B i is altered in line with the wording of paragraph A of the policy. The alteration of the wording will therefore be in line with the overall aim of the policy which is to see the most appropriate development come forward at the site.</p> <p>The new policy would therefore read as:  (B) Redevelopment of Newholme Hospital will be supported subject to:  (i) an assessment of demand for community and/or employment uses and re-provision on site;</p> <p>The overall aim of the policy and its supporting text is to ensure any development of the site does not hinder the Listed Buildings, Conservation Area and the vitality and viability of Bakewell Town Centre. NHSPS is supportive of this aim and of the need to prepare a masterplan for a comprehensive redevelopment of the site. The policy has also been worded to allow for flexibility when delivering a potential mixed use scheme which is supported.</p>	<p>neighbourhood plan being made but still wish to have a policy for any future development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community wish to see a community use on the site</li> <li>• community would prefer to see an employment use that was also serving a 'community use' eg health services</li> <li>• re-write para 5.8 to better explain policy context (see PDNPA comment)</li> </ul>	<p>reviewed NHS comment in light of other changes made</p>
Community Facilities Policy CF1	DCC(1)	26	<p>supportive of approach</p> <p>amend policy to further protect the trees on site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• noted.</li> </ul> <p>(B) (ii) refers to enhancement of landscaping. If minded to could separate this to;</p>	<p>amended as comment</p>

				v) A comprehensive landscape assessment with enhancement proposals shall support any redevelopment proposal in accordance with policy ENV1 and ENV2.	
Community Facilities Policy CF1	DDDC(2)	66	NP preference for employment uses then affordable housing is welcomed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>noted</li> </ul>	no
Community Facilities Policy CF1	Litton Property (6)	94	more flexibility needed to bring forward housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>policy would permit housing</li> <li>Policy is in general conformity with Core Strategy policy HC4: <i>Provision and retention of community services and facilities</i>. But neighbourhood policy identifies employment as a preferred use to social housing given that it is a community/employment asset.</li> </ul>	No
Community Facilities CF1	PDNPA (32)	195	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>needs to reference para 7.27 of DMP re wider estate re-organisation</li> <li>should it require community and employment use first</li> <li>what about starter homes and the requirements of policy H2 (as per para 5.9)</li> <li>what about policy H3 (as per para 5.9)</li> </ul>	Agree re para 7.27 of the DMP. Policy needs to reference back to policy H2 and H3 regarding suitable housing types.	amended as comment
Community Facilities 5.15	PDNPA (32)	196	strategic policy requires new use to be community use	<p>PDNPA DMS7 requires the new use of community recreation sites and sports facilities to meet another community need and to supply evidence of reasonable of attempts to secure such a use.</p> <p>Neighbourhood policy has no requirement for new use to be a community use and under DS1 could potentially be 'small scale retail and business premises' as well as affordable housing and community facilities'</p>	<p>yes</p> <p>(deleted policy CF3)</p> <p>rewritten 5.15 to refer to DMS7 and cross ref to DB1</p>

				Neighbourhood Policy undermines strategic policy  delete policy CF3	
Community Facilities Policy CF2	DCC(1)	27	policy should include explicit statement re energy efficiency, green infrastructure, biodiversity and SUDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed policy would re-state CS CC1. it is not the purpose of neighbourhood plans to re-state strategic policy</li> <li>green infrastructure and net gain for biodiversity is a general requirement under policy ENV1</li> <li>Reference back to Policy ENV1, Core Strategy policy CC1 and Climate Change SPD in supporting text.</li> <li>DB1 has requirement for SUDS</li> </ul>	amended supporting text (not policy) as suggested
Community Facilities Policy CF2	DDDC(2)	68	policy supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>noted</li> </ul>	no
Community Facilities CF2	PDNPA (32)	197	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development of new facilities?</li> <li>agreed by who?</li> <li>link to existing pedestrian and cycle paths?</li> </ul>	noted	amended as comment
Community Facilities pg40	PDNPA (32)	198	reference <b>Bakewell</b> golf course	noted	amended as comment
Community Facilities CF3	PDNPA (32)	196	strategic policy requires new use to be community use	<p>PDNPA DMS7 requires the new use of community recreation sites and sports facilities to meet another community need and to supply evidence of reasonable of attempts to secure such a use.</p> <p>Neighbourhood policy has no requirement for new use to be a community use and under DS1</p>	<p>deleted policy</p> <p>cross referenced to para 5.15</p>

				could potentially be 'small scale retail and business premises' as well as affordable housing and community facilities'  Neighbourhood Policy undermines strategic policy	
Community Facilities Policy CF3	DCC(1)	28	policy should include explicit statement re energy efficiency, green infrastructure, biodiversity and SUDS		policy deleted (see comment 32)
Economy general comment	Bakewell resident (38)	228	plan needs updating re Aldi, new bridge and 'agreed plans for Newholme'	noted	amended as comment
Economy general comment	Bakewell resident (38)	229	plan needs to address empty shops, charity shops, business rates and improve retail experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>flexible approach to primary and non-primary shopping areas creates best opportunity for creating a vibrant retail mix</li> <li>neighbourhood plan has no control over rates or the number of charity shops</li> </ul>	no
Economy para 6.1	DDDC(2)	69	<p>Economy section lacks an adequate summary of the local economic situation. This would provide the context for proposed policies, drawing on available evidence which points to the need to establish the conditions to help enable the creation of better paid / longer term employment opportunities within the town beyond the tourism sector.</p> <p>NP shows little recognition of role and benefit of visitor economy - recommended that policies are included within the Plan to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Neighbourhood Plan is written in the context of the PDNPA Core Strategy spatial objectives for the economy which aim to support business start-up and development where it creates high skill high wage jobs in DS1 settlements, which include Bakewell. Strategic policy safeguards the best employment sites in Bakewell and allows mixed use on the lower quality sites. These aspirations go beyond tourism.</li> <li>BTC focus is on those aspects of the local economy that are of concern to</li> </ul>	no

			provide support for the protection and growth of the visitor economy.	<p>local residents as expressed in the consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If DDDC have further evidence to support the neighbourhood plan's approach that would be most welcome.</li> </ul>	
Economy para 6.3	PDNPA (32)	199	update to reflect that minor changes have been made to the DMP	noted	amended as comment
Economy para 6.4	PDNPA (32)	200	plan making stages <i>revealed</i>	noted	amended as comment
Economy para 6.7	PDNPA (32)	201	delete costa, outdoor clothing	noted	amended as comment
Economy para 6.8	PDNPA (32)	202	delete 'too many more . . . population'	noted	amended as comment
Economy para 6.9	PDNPA (32)	203	to support ' <i>this part of the central shopping area</i> '	noted	amended as comment
Economy para 6.12	DCC(1)	29	need to clarify guidance in relation to empty units and how additional frontages should be taken into account	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree, see notes re comment 206. Guidance to be amended and clarified</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Economy para 6.17 (1)	DCC(1)	30	update description of Cintride site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Economy para 6.17 (1)	Bakewell resident (23)	130	update reference to Aldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Economy para 6.17(1)	Fisher German on behalf of Haddon Estate(4)	84	support is given to the identification of the former cintride site land for business use (see also comment 84 re DB1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>noted</li> </ul>	no

Economy para 6.17(2)	Bakewell resident (31)	145	access to the estate by very large vehicles is a major concern	noted	no
Economy 6.17 (4)	DDDC(2)	71	The supporting text and/or map needs to be updated to reflect D2N2 funding approval to support delivery of a new access / infrastructure. Furthermore to ensure that the evidence and supporting justification for the policy is included, PDNPA Core Strategy policies promoting economic development / B Class use should also be quoted in the supporting text for completeness.	agree	amended as comment
Economy para 6.17 (4)	Bakewell resident (23)	131	update to reference D2N2 funding for bridge	• agree	amended as comment
Economy para 6.17 (4)	Bakewell resident (31)	145	picture does not reflect current run down state of road verge and boundary fence. Plan should not present rose tinted view	noted picture is from 2018 so recent images in final document will be changed	no
Economy para 6.16	DCC(1)	31	Hearn report is out of date	• Hearn report was commissioned by PDNPA. 2016 is not unreasonable.	no
Economy policy E1	DDDC(2)	70	policy would be better framed by advising of the thresholds below which such changes will be resisted  concern that the policy could lead to vacancy issues without appropriate criteria / timescales defined to secure similar uses e.g. the impact on demand for convenience provision with the town centre will not be fully understood until the edge of centre Aldi store has been operational for 18 months / 2 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy does refer to thresholds.</li> <li>• Do not consider there to be a need to weaken policy stance. Historically there are low shop vacancy levels in Bakewell (although anecdotally this is increasing at the time of writing, Nov 2019). A few empty shops is the norm to account for turnover. A flexible approach is maintained for the Bakewell Central Shopping Area outside of the primary shopping area.</li> <li>• Could consider removing final clause re non town centre uses as these may be acceptable in some circumstances</li> </ul>	<p>last clause removed as in some circumstances non main town centre uses may be acceptable</p> <p>amended E2 'protected' to 'primary'</p>

			No revisions to the policy have been made to reflect these comments (that were made previously) and it is recommended that amendments are required to avoid potential vacancy issues due to inadequate demand for A1 (e.g. adequate marketing exercise). More consideration needs to be given to the detail of policy E1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E2 (2) delete protected and change to primary</li> </ul>	
Economy Policy E1	Litton Property (6)	95	restrictions proposed contrary to NPPF that directs that planning policies should take a positive approach to town centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPPF, chapter 7, para 85, states that policies should make clear the range of uses permitted in such locations as primary shopping area, as part of a positive strategy. Policy E1 and the supporting text clearly set out the reasons for the primary shopping area as a positive strategy for maintaining a good supply for A1 retail provision.</li> </ul>	No
Economy E1	PDNPA (32)	204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make 'The central shopping area . . . on page 45' part of supporting text.</li> <li>• delete 'in order to protect . . . the following provisions'</li> <li>• Suggest: "Proposals for non-A1 uses within the Primary Shopping Area will be normally be allowed provided that the proportion of A1 retail along the shopping frontage does not fall below 70%. Where this proportion is already below 70% proposals for non-A1 uses will normally be resisted."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• noted</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Economy pg 45	PDNPA (32)	205	title should be Shopping Frontages	No, map also shows boundary of central shopping area	no
Economy 6.11-6.16	PDNPA (32)	206	how is frontage measured, how is a neighbouring frontage defined? Possible to include a sketch diagram to illustrate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need to change text in 6.13 and heading for table. "Applicants would be expected to provide up to date information in support of an application"</li> </ul>	amended as comment

				<p>and define the frontage to which the application relates, in agreement with the LPA.. The table below is for indicative purposes only showing current town centre uses along streets (not frntages.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table “Land use in Bakewell Primary shopping area” (remove text in brackets)</li> </ul>	
Economy 6.12	PDNPA (32)	207	<b>Where there are.</b> Delete ‘to ensure they are not unduly disadvantaged.	noted	amended as comment
Economy 6.17	PDNPA (32)	208	‘with an additional site (Aldi) included by the Neighbourhood Plan’	noted	amended as comment
Economy 6.17(1)	PDNPA (32)	208	this sounds out of date. Should be updated to refer to Aldi. Update plan.	noted	amended as comment
Economy supporting text para 6.19	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	90	The supporting text for Policy E2 (paragraph 6. 19) sets out a figure for additional available employment land in Bakewell which includes 0.3 hectares on Riverside Business Park. However, we consider that this figure does not take into account that the site has a range of complex physical and environmental constraints including historical assets, flood risk and ecology, each of which imposes significant limitations on development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The last Hearn report (2016) stated Riverside had approx. 1ha left for developing, however, through adding in various factors and constraints this was reduced in PDNP report to 0.3ha. It is acknowledged in this report that Riverside already has a high intensity of use, we could amend to state that the 0.3ha is only indicative?</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Economy policy E2	DCC(1)	32	policy supported	noted	no
Economy policy E2	DDDC(2)	72	Previous comments provided by the District Council remain valid and no revisions to policy wording appear to have been undertaken. Whilst understanding the objective, part C of the policy remains restrictive. The	It is not appropriate to be less restrictive. We have a positive approach to the town centre with a central shopping area and primary shopping area in accordance with creating a positive town centre strategy as supported by the NPPF.	no

			<p>policy already establishes the requirement to retain B Class as the predominant use and viability issues need to be considered when schemes come forward to enable this to be delivered</p> <p><i>(previous comments are “Policy E2: Employment Sites: whilst understanding the objective, part C of the amended policy remains restrictive. The policy already establishes the requirement to retain B Class as the predominant use and viability issues need to be considered when schemes come forward to enable this to be delivered”)</i></p>	<p>BTC has justified its approach and it is coherent with PDNPA policy so there is no reason to grant greater flexibility in policy.</p>	
Economy Policy E2 (B)	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	86	<p>Part B of Policy E2 is unsound. Appropriate protection of the viability and vitality of centres is achieved by the policies set out within the Framework. Neighbourhood plans should not seek to reiterate these policies.</p> <p>Part B of the policy does not accord with paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Framework which requires an impact assessment for retail and leisure applications over 2,500 m<sup>2</sup> outside town centres. Applications should be refused where they fail to satisfy the sequential test or are likely to have a significant adverse impact on centres. Part B of the policy is unsound as it provides an unreasonable additional restriction on alternative uses on employment sites which is not supported by sound evidence or justification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• neighbourhood policy is not re-iterating NPPF policy</li> <li>• paragraphs 89 and 90 relate to the assessment of an application, not policy writing</li> <li>• The Neighbourhood Plan adds detail relevant to the local circumstance and is justifiably restrictive.</li> </ul>	no
Economy Policy E2(C)	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	87	<p>The requirement for retail development associated with an industrial or business unit to be mainly restricted to the sale of goods produced on the unit is achieved by Part A of DMP Policy DMS 3 (Retail development</p>	<p>The NP adds detail relevant to the local circumstance and is justifiably restrictive.</p>	no

			outside Core Strategy Policy DS1 settlements). Neighbourhood plans should not seek to reiterate these policies. Indeed, we consider that this is unsound as the policy provides an added restriction which does not comply with part (d) of paragraph 81 of the Framework which requires that planning policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. Part C of the policy is also not accompanied by any sound evidence to justify its inclusion.		
Economy Policy E2 (D)	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	88	We consider that this is unsound. Whilst Litton accept that the river corridor should be afforded protection, to have a 10m buffer for development may not be appropriate in all circumstances. Therefore, each application should be assessed on its own merits in accordance with policies set out in the development plan and the Framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• policy includes this requirement due to comments received (from PDNPA ecologist) as part of the sustainability appraisal of the draft plan</li> <li>• A 10 m buffer in policy is a precautionary approach to development in the river corridor but as with every policy, if a specific application justifies deviation from this 10m policy criteria it could still be approved.</li> </ul>	no
Economy Policy E2 (F)	Lichfields for Litton Property Group (5)	89	Part F repeats part (b) of paragraph 160 of the Framework. Neighbourhood plans should not seek to repeat these policies. We therefore recommend that part F of Policy E2 should be deleted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• policy includes this requirement due to comments received (from Environment Agency) as part of the sustainability appraisal of the draft plan</li> </ul>	no
Economy Policy E2	Environment Agency (7)	97	welcome changes to policy as a result of EA comments on sustainability appraisal	noted	no
Economy E2	PDNPA (32)	210	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Sites 1-4 as <del>The sites described above and</del></li> <li>• A Site 1 states it should only be used for B1 or other B uses provided residential amenity is not adversely</li> </ul>	Bullet 2: Clause A does not state 'provided residential amenity is not adversely affected' as 3 of the sites are also safeguarded by policy DME3 which does not have this requirement.	Amended as per bullet points 1,3,4,5

			affected. So different to the other 3 sites. Expand A to make consistent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•B Where a mix of uses is sought</li> <li>•D use 'site 4' and 'site 1'</li> <li>•E use 'arboriculture report' . . .</li> </ul>		
Economy	DCC(1)	33	historical assets could be used to boost income from visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outside remit of the neighbourhood plan</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications general comment	CPRE (9)	102	the plan should support a network of quiet lanes	Quiet lanes approach only really works on unclassified / c class roads with light traffic use. Opportunities within the Parish very limited. Would require DCC involvement.	no
Transport and Communications general comment	CPRE (9)	103	electric vehicle charging points should be developed in public car parks	This approach is being developed in DDDC car parks in Bakewell. Could include a statement in 'ideas for Better Bakewell' to give support for principle.	amended as comment
Transport and Communications general comment	CPRE (9)	104	residents can take a fresh look at how they use their cars eg through 'Mobility as a Service' or car clubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MaaS may offer opportunities, but could actually increase car use...Uber etc with empty car journeys en-route to pick up</li> <li>• not planning issue</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications general comment	DCC(1)	34	BTC are concerned about buses but do not refer to bus services in the NP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• bus services are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications general comment	Castle Drive Residents (11)	111	access road to Station Road industrial estate not adequately maintained or gritted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not planning issue</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications general comment	Bakewell Resident (13)	114	need junction markings between Aldern Way & Baslow Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not planning issue, not received any other comments about this</li> </ul>	no

Transport and Communications general comment	Bakewell Resident (13)	117	overnight camping by motorhome users	• not planning issue, not received any other comments about this	no
Transport and Communications general comment	Bakewell Resident (13)	118	provide crossing on Baslow Road	• not planning issue, not received any other comments about this	no
Transport and Communications general comment	Bakewell resident (30)	140	Bakewell has major traffic problem yet no solutions proposed Living Street report from 2000 not implemented	Agree some traffic issues, unsure how major. No Air Quality (AQ) problems at current time in relation to AQ management. There are issues with queuing traffic, but possibly no worse than other Derbyshire Dales Market towns. DCC would be the proponents of any traffic management scheme, not sure how severe it is compared with elsewhere in county, and therefore priority. Most transport issues outside control of neighbourhood plan	no
Transport and Communications 7.7	PDNPA (32)	211	update on this footbridge	No update necessary	no
Transport and Communications 7.13	PDNPA (32)	212	reference to paragraph number not correct	noted	amended as comment
Transport and Communications ideas pg 58/59	PDNPA (32)	213	Ideas for a brilliant Bakewell: Pavement and Road Improvements – makes several references to the provision of raised platforms at junctions. Does this mean ‘speed bump style raised areas’? These are urbanising structures and may conflict with Conservation Area. Consultation with Conservation Team would be advised to ensure that any solutions are in keeping and appropriate.	expand para 7.11 to explain that these are ideas not solutions, a basis for discussion & will be built in accordance with the built heritage tradition and conservation area requirements	amended as comment

			<p>Pedestrian crossings at old post office – whilst understanding the preference for zebra crossings, the numbers of pedestrians using the crossings, plus the number of vehicles may make this an unsafe option.</p> <p>Matlock Street – reference to separation of bus stops – would be dependent on amount of available space / pavement width. They would still need to be located quite close together to allow them to be identified by users as paired stops.</p>		
<p>Transport and Communications ideas page 59</p>	<p>Bakewell resident (23)</p>	<p>132</p>	<p>Pudding Shop and taxi rank. This section needs to make it clear that removing 4 parking spaces and replacing them further along at the unused taxi rank (1 space) would result in a net loss of 3 spaces along this stretch of road. I have already made this point several times previously but all you have done in response to my comments is to change the original word "relocate" to "replace". This does not convey the message to the reader that it would result in the loss of 3 parking spaces along this stretch of road. It seems as if you are being deliberately vague in the hope that the public might not notice the proposed reduction in parking spaces. Perhaps you fear that this might not be a popular measure? Please just be honest with the public and make them properly aware of the full implications of your proposals. If you are unwilling to make appropriate changes to the wording of this section, I will be making a complaint to the Peak Park about the way you have handled the matter when the Neighbourhood Plan goes before the PDNP Authority for consideration.</p>	<p>amend text as comment is correct in that 4 spaces could not be replaced. Add sentence to explain that this would be undertaken in context of a review of short-term parking which would look to ensure no overall loss.</p>	<p>amended as comment</p>

Transport and Communications ideas page 59	Bakewell resident (38)	230	There is a comprehensive action plan for pavement and road improvements. However, I would propose that the Plan reviews moving the pedestrian crossing on Matlock Street (near the Cookshop) to slightly further down the road to avoid congestion backing up on the roundabout.	Would be for DCC to consider, but would need to take account of the desire line for crossing and any impact on the Granby road junction	no
Transport and Communications TC1	PDNPA (32)	216	•part A(i) does not make any reference to provision for cyclists as well as pedestrians, this should be added?	noted	amended as comment
Transport and Communications Ideas pg 61	Bakewell Resident (13)	116	footpath in Wynne Meadow should be put on definitive map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not something that BTC can promote at this time</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications 7.13	PDNPA (32)	217	NPPF ref now para 106 not 40	noted	yes amended as comment
Transport and Communications Parking 7.12-7.19	Bakewell visitor (18)	123	smiths island car park closes at 5 access is not a public road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>smiths island privately operated</li> <li>DCC responsibility to consider making a public road</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications para 7.13	DCC(1)	35	update ref to NPPF 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree</li> </ul>	amended as comment
Transport and Communications para 7.14	DDDC(2)	73	As stated previously more could be achieved (regarding parking issues) however this issue this isn't considered further in the Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>parking was considered and it was decided that the current level is adequate</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications para 7.14	Bakewell worker (19)	124	should include the word 'most' before bank holidays'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>noted</li> </ul>	amended as comment

Transport and Communications para 7.15	Castle Drive Residents (11)	108	parking problems also from Burre Close to Castle Drive. Residents permit should be extended to these areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be easily addressed through a residents parking scheme at a cost per permit to each household requiring one.</li> <li>• residents need to apply to DDDC</li> <li>• not a matter for the neighbourhood plan</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications para 7.15	Castle Drive Residents (11)	109	parking problems from Burre Close to Castle Drive exacerbated by people parking for work, need scheme of reduced fee or free parking for workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be easily addressed through a residents parking scheme at a cost per permit to each household requiring one.</li> <li>• residents need to apply to DDDC</li> </ul> not a matter for the neighbourhood plan	no
Transport and Communications para 7.15	Castle Drive Residents (11)	110	parking problems from Burre Close to Castle Drive exacerbated by people using Monsal Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be easily addressed through a residents parking scheme at a cost per permit to each household requiring one.</li> <li>• residents need to apply to DDDC</li> </ul> not a matter for the neighbourhood plan	no
Transport and Communications para 7.15	Castle Drive Residents (11)	112	lost revenue from tourists not paying for car parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not planning issue</li> </ul>	no
Transport and Communications para 7.15	Bakewell resident (13)	115	need to restrict free parking in Aldern Way, Castle Mount Drive & Crescent & Burre Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be easily addressed through a residents parking scheme at a cost per permit to each household requiring one.</li> <li>• residents need to apply to DDDC</li> </ul> not a matter for the neighbourhood plan	no
Transport and Communications para 7.18	PDNPA (32)	218	refers to the coach drop-off point. Whilst understanding the point raised, the issue will occur where there are coach passengers with limited mobility – the ABC coach park is some distance from the town centre, and may be demanding for those unable to walk far.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BTC to consider ABC parking is suitable for those with limited mobility</li> </ul>	no

Transport and Communications Policy TC2	DDDC(2)	74	Point A is overly negative and would benefit from redrafting. Point B considers cycle parking which is welcomed however there may also be a role for the Neighbourhood Development Plan to recognise the importance of cycling tourism and the benefits this brings to the visitor economy of Bakewell. The proximity to the Monsal trail and the White Peak Loop can be seen as an opportunity.	note comments but consider that policy is sound given the judgement that current parking levels are sufficient  could amend para 7.19 to recognise the importance of cycling	policy remains same but supporting text amended
Transport and Communications Policy TC2	PDNPA (32)	219	•include 'The provision of' new cycle racks	agree	amended as comment
Transport and Communications para 7.20-7.23	DCC(1)	36	support changes from previous draft	• noted	no
Transport and Communications para 7.22	PDNPA	220	refers to the removal of safeguarding for the Bakewell Relief Road – it should include a reference to where this removal is given – paragraph 15.15 PDNP Core Strategy (2011).	• noted	amended as comment
Transport and Communications Policy TC3	DDDC(2)	75	The District Councils previous comments remain relevant; no revisions to the policy have been made. This policy supports the ambition to reopen the railway; however it is not clear how this policy as drafted will assist in the determination of planning applications. The addition of criteria or objectives may assist in this instance.  <i>(previous comment "This policy supports the ambition to reopen the railway, however it is not clear how this policy as drafted will assist in the determination of planning applications")</i>	• noted • policy is consistent with strategic policy	no

TC3	Bakewell resident (31)	143	do not support policy as it is not possible to create a new recreation route of equal or better quality	noted the decision to support was finely balanced	no
Transport and Communications 7.26.7.28	DCC(1)	37	strengthen preamble	agree pre-amble could be more supportive	amended as comment
Transport and Communications Policy TC4	DCC(1)	38	strengthen policy	agree – see below	amended as comment
Transport and Communications Policy TC4	DDDC(2)	76	The District Councils previous comments remain relevant, whilst supported in principle the policy as drafted remains vague and could be more proactive in its approach as to how high speed broadband provision will be enabled.  <i>(previous comment “To make the sentence a land use policy, DCC(1) would suggest that ‘efforts’ should be replaced by ‘proposals’ “)</i>	change ‘efforts to’ to ‘proposals for’ . .	amended as comment
Transport and Communications	DCC(1)	39	no reference to low emission vehicle infrastructure. suggest new policy	This approach is being developed in DDDC car parks in Bakewell. Could include a statement in ‘ideas for Better Bakewell’ to give support for principle.  ref CPRE comment 103	amended as comment

3.4 The table below summarises the changes to policies between the Regulation 14 consultation version and the Regulation 15 submission version of Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan. The changes made are a result of comments made during the Regulation 14 consultation and as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Policy Number	Policy as drafted for Regulation 14 Consultation	Policy as drafted for Regulation 15 Submission	Summary of changes including assessment of significance of change
DB1  Development Boundary	<p>Future development of Bakewell will be contained within the Development Boundary as indicated on Map 2.</p> <p>Any development on land between Ashford Road and River Wye (extension area 3) should include a 10m buffer to the bank of the Wye.</p> <p>Any development in an area of flood risk will need to be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users,</p>	<p>A. Future development of Bakewell will be contained within the Development Boundary as indicated on Map 2.</p> <p>B. Any new residential or industrial development within the Extension Areas should facilitate attractive, safe pedestrian and cycle routes to the town centre.</p> <p>C. Any development in an area of identified flood risk will need to be safe for its lifetime, taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere.</p>	<p><b>No change</b></p> <p><b>Minor change:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for reasons of clarity</li> <li>• to add detail</li> <li>• to make policy more effective</li> </ul> <p><b>Significant change:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strengthened/weakened to significant degree</li> <li>• intent or effect is significantly changed</li> </ul> <p><b>Deleted</b></p> <p>Added requirement for pedestrian and cycle routes</p> <p>Strengthened protection with regard to flooding</p> <p><i><b>Minor changes.</b> The proposed boundary and the development permissible within that boundary are unchanged.</i></p>

	<p>without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce overall flood risk</p>	<p>D. Development should reduce overall flood risk through the use of sustainable drainage systems where possible.</p> <p>E. Any development on land between Ashford Road and River Wye (Extension Area 3) should include a 10m buffer from the river bank.</p>	
<p>POLICY ENV1 Protection and Enhancement of Bakewell's Setting</p>	<p>POLICY ENV1 Protection and Enhancement of Bakewell's Setting</p> <p>A. Development will be supported within the development boundary where it:</p> <p>(i) respects the landscape's sensitivity and capacity to accommodate additional development, and; (ii) includes ecologically appropriate landscaping and the provision of street trees of an appropriate scale, form and species, favouring native trees in less formal settings, and; (iii) provides green infrastructure appropriate to the size of the development, restoring and enhancing connectivity for nature and people, and; (iv)</p>	<p>A. Development will be supported within the development boundary where it:</p> <p>(i) respects the landscape's sensitivity and capacity to accommodate additional development; and</p> <p>(ii) includes ecologically appropriate landscaping and the provision of street trees of an appropriate scale, form and species, favouring native trees in less formal settings; and</p> <p>(iii) provides green infrastructure appropriate to the size of the development, restoring and enhancing connectivity for nature and people; and</p>	<p>Clause added to require light pollution to be minimised.</p> <p>Requirements for landscape character assessment made more specific.</p> <p><b>Minor changes.</b></p>

	<p>secures measurable net gains for biodiversity</p> <p>B. Developers are encouraged to undertake a local Landscape Character Assessment</p>	<p>(iv) secures measurable net gains for biodiversity; and</p> <p>(v) limits, and where possible reduces the impact of light pollution from externally visible light sources.</p> <p>B. Developers are encouraged to undertake a local landscape and visual impact assessment in accordance with a proven methodology and submit this with a planning application.<sup>4</sup></p>	
<p>POLICY ENV2 Protection and Enhancement of Bakewell’s Special Character</p>	<p>A. Development in Bakewell will be expected to contribute positively to the quality of the built environment and public realm, including by the provision of new street trees of an appropriate scale, form and species.</p> <p>B. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the siting, design, layout and landscaping of the proposal align with</p>	<p>A. Development in Bakewell will be expected to contribute positively to the quality of the built environment and public realm, including by the provision of new street trees of an appropriate scale, form and species.</p> <p>B. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the siting, design, layout and landscaping of the proposal</p>	<p>Requirements for a building for life assessment clarified.</p> <p><b>Minor change.</b></p>

<sup>4</sup> For example <https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/>

	<p>the principles embedded in the National Park Design Guide<sup>6</sup> and, where applicable, the Detailed Design Guide for Shopfronts<sup>7</sup>, the Supplementary Planning Document for Extensions and Alterations<sup>8</sup>, the Conservation Area Appraisal and the A-board Guidance Note<sup>9</sup>, and with these documents as may be amended.</p> <p>C. New housing development must be designed to:</p> <p>(i) contribute to local character by retaining and creating a sense of place appropriate to its location;</p> <p>(ii) take advantage of existing topography, landscape features, habitats, buildings, orientation and micro-climate;</p>	<p>align with the principles embedded in the National Park Design Guide<sup>5</sup> and, where applicable, the Detailed Design Guide for Shopfronts<sup>6</sup>, the Supplementary Planning Document for Extensions and Alterations<sup>7</sup>, the Conservation Area Appraisal and the A-board Guidance Note<sup>8</sup>, or as may be amended.</p> <p>C. New housing development must be designed to:</p> <p>(i) contribute to local character by retaining and creating a sense of place appropriate to its location;</p> <p>(ii) take advantage of existing topography, landscape features,</p>	
--	---	--	--

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0013/90211/designguide.pdf](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0013/90211/designguide.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/528632/PDNP-ShopFronts-DesignGuide-2015-06.pdf](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0008/528632/PDNP-ShopFronts-DesignGuide-2015-06.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/528631/PDNP-AlterationsExtensions-DesignGuide-2015-06.pdf](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/528631/PDNP-AlterationsExtensions-DesignGuide-2015-06.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix 10

	<p>(iii) define and enhance streets and spaces.</p> <p>Developers are strongly encouraged to support proposals with a Building for Life assessment.</p>	<p>habitats, buildings, orientation and micro-climate;</p> <p>(iii) define and enhance streets and spaces.</p> <p>D. Applications for housing development comprising 10 or more units should include a Building for Life<sup>9</sup> assessment.</p>	
<p>POLICY ENV3 Protection of Non-designated Heritage Assets</p>	<p>Planning applications for development affecting non-designated heritage assets, including those listed in para 3.23, must clearly demonstrate how these will be conserved and where possible, enhanced.</p>	<p>Policy DMC5 of the Peak District National Park Authority Part 2 Local Plan (Development Management Policies) applies to all applications for development affecting the heritage assets, or their setting, listed in paragraph 3.23.</p>	<p>Clarified relationship with strategic policy and gives greater weight to the protection of the non-designated heritage assets listed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Minor change.</b> <i>The intent of the policy – to require the significance of the non-designated heritage to be considered – remains the same.</i></p>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.builtforlifehomes.org/>

POLICY ENV4 Local Green Spaces	The areas shown together in Table 1 and identified on Map 7 below Table 1 are designated as Local Green Spaces, where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances.	The areas shown together in Table 1 and identified on Map 7 below Table 1 are designated as Local Green Spaces, where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances.	<b>No change.</b>
POLICY H1 Provision of Affordable Housing	POLICY H1 Provision of Affordable Housing  The Neighbourhood Plan supports the development of new affordable housing within the development boundary of a range and number to address local need. All resulting affordable housing units will be required to demonstrate that they comply with the local lettings plan <sup>13</sup> ensuring the homes go to people with a local connection	The Neighbourhood Plan supports the development of new affordable housing within the development boundary of a range and number to address local need. All affordable housing units must comply with Policy DMH1, DMH2 and DMH3 of the Peak District National Park Authority Part 2 Local Plan <sup>10</sup> .	Amended to reference PDNPA policies rather than a 'local lettings plan'.  <b>Minor change.</b>
POLICY H2 Market Homes and Starter Homes on Previously Developed Sites	A. Open market housing development on brownfield sites and previously developed land where re-development would enhance the built environment will be permitted.	A. Open market housing development on brownfield sites and previously developed land where re-development would enhance the built environment will be permitted.	Title changed, paragraphs renumbered  Deleted 'old' B  Re-wrote new 'C' to include market homes  Section F re-written to clarify that roof alterations (to prevent loft conversions) are also included

<sup>10</sup> Policy DMH1 addresses local housing need in terms of size and type of houses built and DMH2 and DMH3 in terms of who they are let and re-let to.

	<p>B. All such housing will be restricted by legal agreement to primary full time occupancy remaining in perpetuity on subsequent sales.</p> <p>C. Starter Homes must comprise at least 50% of the total dwellings units permitted, with market housing or other enabling development being accepted only to the level necessary, as verified by an independent viability assessment undertaken by a Chartered surveyor, if necessary commissioned by the NPA but in all cases at the applicant’s expense, which must include land purchase at values reflecting the policy constraint on re-development.</p> <p>D. Starter Homes will be restricted by legal agreement to primary full time occupancy remaining in perpetuity on subsequent sales.</p> <p>E. Starter Homes will be restricted by legal agreement to people who have lived in</p>	<p>B. Starter Homes must comprise at least 50% of the total dwellings units permitted, with market housing or other enabling development being accepted only to the level necessary, as verified by an independent viability assessment undertaken by a Chartered surveyor, if necessary commissioned by the NPA but in all cases at the applicant’s expense, which must include land purchase at values reflecting the policy constraint on re-development.</p> <p>C. Market Homes and Starter Homes will be restricted by legal agreement to primary full time occupancy remaining in perpetuity on subsequent sales.</p> <p>D. Starter Homes will be restricted by legal agreement to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people who have lived in Bakewell parish or the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor changes.</b></p>
--	---	---	------------------------------

	<p>Bakewell parish or the adjacent parishes for a minimum of 10 years in the last 20 years and are first time buyers under the age of 40.</p> <p>F. Starter Homes must be built within the following floorspace thresholds:<sup>18</sup></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Number of bed spaces</td> <td>Maximum</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gross Internal Floor Area (m2)</td> <td>One person</td> </tr> <tr> <td>39</td> <td>Two persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>58</td> <td>Three persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70</td> <td>Four persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>84</td> <td>Five persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>97</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>G. Starter Homes will have permitted development rights for extensions removed.</p>	Number of bed spaces	Maximum	Gross Internal Floor Area (m2)	One person	39	Two persons	58	Three persons	70	Four persons	84	Five persons	97		<p>adjacent parishes for a minimum of 10 years in the last 20 years<sup>11</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• first time buyers under the age of 40.</li> </ul> <p>E. Starter Homes must be built within the following floorspace thresholds:<sup>12</sup></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>Number of bed spaces</b></td> <td><b>Maximum Gross Internal Floor Area (m2)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>One person</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Two persons</td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Three persons</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Four persons</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Five persons</td> <td>97</td> </tr> </table>	<b>Number of bed spaces</b>	<b>Maximum Gross Internal Floor Area (m2)</b>	One person	39	Two persons	58	Three persons	70	Four persons	84	Five persons	97	
Number of bed spaces	Maximum																												
Gross Internal Floor Area (m2)	One person																												
39	Two persons																												
58	Three persons																												
70	Four persons																												
84	Five persons																												
97																													
<b>Number of bed spaces</b>	<b>Maximum Gross Internal Floor Area (m2)</b>																												
One person	39																												
Two persons	58																												
Three persons	70																												
Four persons	84																												
Five persons	97																												

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix 3 of PDNPA Part 2 Local Plan

<sup>12</sup>Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard DCLG March 2015

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/524531/160519\\_Nationally\\_Described\\_Space\\_Standard\\_Final\\_Web\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524531/160519_Nationally_Described_Space_Standard_Final_Web_version.pdf)

		<p>F. Starter Homes will have permitted development rights for extensions, including roof alterations, removed.</p>	
<p>POLICY H3 Specialist Housing</p>	<p>(A) New residential schemes (whether new build or conversion, greenfield or brownfield, open market or social/affordable) that are proposed on reasonably flat locations with relatively easy access to commercial and social facilities within the town centre, must contribute to meeting the housing needs of the town’s ageing and disabled population.</p> <p>(B) The number of such homes within a proposed residential scheme, as well as their size and design, will either:</p> <p>(i) be determined in conjunction with the local housing authority with reference to an up to date housing needs survey; or,</p>	<p>(A) New residential schemes (whether new build or conversion, greenfield or brownfield, open market or social/affordable) that are proposed on reasonably flat locations with relatively easy access to the town centre, must contribute to meeting specialist needs and the needs of the town’s ageing population.</p> <p>(B) The number of such homes required within a proposed residential scheme will be determined in conjunction with the local housing authority with reference to the housing needs assessment.</p> <p>(C) The homes so required must meet either M4(2) (accessible and adaptable</p>	<p>Referred to ‘specialist needs’ rather than ‘disabled’.</p> <p>Simplified how to determine the number of such homes.</p> <p>Aligned standards to Building Regulations.</p> <p><b>Minor changes.</b></p>

	<p>(ii) in the event that no up to date evidence exists, meet current Lifetime Home20 standards in 10% of housing on sites of 10 dwellings or more, or comprise at least one home on sites of less than 10 dwellings.</p>	<p>dwellings), and/or M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings) of the Building Regulations.</p>	
<p>POLICY CF1 Newholme Hospital</p>	<p>(A) Redevelopment of Newholme Hospital shall include the provision of community and/or employment uses unless it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for these within Bakewell or that special circumstances justify otherwise.</p> <p>(B) Redevelopment of Newholme Hospital will be supported subject to:</p> <p>(i) an assessment of demand for community and employment uses and re-provision on site;</p> <p>(ii) a heritage and landscape assessment detailing enhancements to the listed buildings, consideration of non-listed</p>	<p>(A) Applications for the redevelopment of the Newholme Hospital site must be accompanied by a heritage and landscape assessment detailing enhancements to the listed buildings, consideration of non-listed buildings for their heritage value, and landscaping of the site.</p> <p>(B) Redevelopment of the Newholme Hospital site shall include the provision of community facilities (subject to the NHS wider estate reorganisation programme in accordance with paragraph 7.27 of the Peak District National Park Authority Part 2 Local Plan) and/or meet another community need such as:</p>	<p>Redrafted for clarity.</p> <p>Omitted the need for employment uses.</p> <p>Referenced PDNPA DMP Policy para 2.27.</p> <p>Removed need for assessment of demand for community and employment uses.</p> <p>Referenced H policies of Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Significant change.</b></p>

	<p>buildings for their heritage value, and landscaping of the site;</p> <p>(iii) provision of affordable dwellings;</p> <p>(iv) reference to an up to date housing needs survey to support the provision of a mixture of housing types and affordable dwellings on site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing (in accordance with Policy H1)</li> <li>• Starter Homes (in accordance with H2)</li> <li>• Homes that meet specialist needs and the needs of the town's ageing population (in accordance with Policy H3)</li> </ul>	
POLICY CF2 Development of Community, Sports and Arts Facilities	Proposals for the development of community, sports and arts facilities to meet agreed local needs shall be located within the Development Boundary, or in the case of playing fields, within or adjacent to, the Development Boundary. All facilities should make provision for access for all and link to pedestrian and cycle paths where possible.	Proposals for the development of new community, sports and arts facilities shall be located within the Development Boundary, or in the case of playing fields, within or adjacent to, the Development Boundary. All facilities should make provision for access for all and link to existing pedestrian and cycle paths where possible.	Amended for clarity.  <b>Minor changes.</b>
POLICY CF3 Retaining Playing Fields	Developments resulting in the loss of playing fields and sports facilities will not be supported unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced		Policy replicated existing strategic policy.

<p>and Sports Facilities.</p>	<p>by equivalent or improved quality facilities. Any new replacement facilities should be operational prior to the loss of the existing facilities and should be in a location that enables equivalent or improved access for the town’s residents.</p>		<p><b>Deleted</b></p>
<p>Policy E1 Bakewell Central Shopping Area and Primary Shopping Area</p>	<p>The Central Shopping Area and Primary Shopping Area are identified on Map 8. Shopping Frontages are defined on page 45.</p> <p>In order to protect the vitality and viability of shopping facilities and the essential retail character of Bakewell, proposals to change use within the Primary Shopping Area will be determined in accordance with the following provisions:</p> <p>1 Proposals for non-A1 retail uses within the Primary Shopping Area will normally be resisted where a proposal would result in the proportion of A1 retail length along that shopping frontage falling below 70%. Where this proportion is already below 70% proposals for non-A1 uses will normally be resisted.</p>	<p>Proposals for non-A1 retail uses within the Primary Shopping Area will normally be allowed provided that the proportion of A1 retail length along that shopping frontage does not fall below 70%. Where this proportion is already below 70% proposals for non-A1 uses will normally be resisted.</p>	<p>Re-written for clarity, simplicity.</p> <p>Explanatory text moved from policy to background.</p> <p>Positively framed.</p> <p>Intent of remains the same.</p> <p><b>Minor changes.</b></p>

	<p>2 Non main town centre uses will not normally be permitted within the identified Protected Shopping Area.</p>		
<p>POLICY E2 Employment Sites</p>	<p>A. The sites described above and shown on Maps 9-13 are designated as employment sites and safeguarded for predominantly B Class employment uses.</p> <p>B. Where flexibility is sought and deemed necessary to aid development, it will only be granted if it is not likely to put at risk the viability, vitality and character of the Central Shopping Area.</p> <p>C. A Class uses will only be permitted as on-site sales from a B Class unit, and must be ancillary to the unit's primary B Class use.</p> <p>D. Any development permitted at the 'Riverside' and 'former Cintride' sites must maintain and where possible enhance the continuity and integrity of the river corridor,</p>	<p>A. The sites shown on Maps 9-13 are designated as employment sites and safeguarded for predominantly Use Class B employment uses.</p> <p>B. Where a mix of uses sought and deemed necessary to aid development, it will only be granted if it is not likely to put at risk the viability, vitality and character of the Central Shopping Area.</p> <p>C. A Class uses will only be permitted as on-site sales from a B Class unit, and must be ancillary to the unit's primary B Class use.</p> <p>D. Any development permitted at sites 1 and 4 must maintain and where possible enhance the continuity and integrity of</p>	<p>(B) replaced 'flexibility' with 'mix of uses'.</p> <p><b>Minor change.</b></p>

	<p>including associated watercourses. Any new development should not be within a 10m buffer zone from the river bank.</p> <p>E. Any application for development at Site 1 ('former Cintrides') should be accompanied by a survey of the health of the mature trees (that are subject to Tree Preservation Order number 88), demonstrate in the design and layout of any proposal how the health and longevity of the trees will be maximised, and include suitable landscape planting to perpetuate and enhance tree cover on the site.</p> <p>F. Any development in an area of flood risk will need to be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce overall flood risk</p>	<p>the river corridor, including associated watercourses. Any new development should not be within a 10m buffer zone from the river bank.</p> <p>E. Any application for development at Site 1 should be accompanied by an arboriculture report, demonstrate in the design and layout of any proposal how the health and longevity of the trees will be maximised, and include suitable landscape planting to perpetuate and enhance tree cover on the site.</p> <p>F. Any development in an area of flood risk will need to be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce overall flood risk</p>	
<p>POLICY TC1 Improvements</p>	<p>A. Applications for development must, where applicable:</p>	<p>A. Applications for development must, where applicable:</p>	<p>TC1 Ai added 'cyclists'.</p>

<p>for Non-Car Users</p>	<p>i. demonstrate how accessibility and movement for pedestrians, wheelchairs, pushchairs and mobility scooters is supported ii. include physical measures to reduce vehicle parking on pavements iii. include provision of delivery parking where possible.</p> <p>B. The provision, maintenance and signing of safe pedestrian routes will be supported, including a new footpath and cycle links towards Ashford avoiding the A6, and the continuation of the Monsal Trail to Rowsley. Where appropriate to its scale and location, applications for development should show how the proposed scheme intends to provide links to the wider cycle and walking network and access to public transport.</p> <p>C. Development proposals which provide positive design to lessen the impact of traffic on people, cyclists and the town centre environment will be supported.</p>	<p>i. demonstrate how accessibility and movement for cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchairs, pushchairs and mobility scooters is supported</p> <p>ii. include physical measures to reduce vehicle parking on pavements</p> <p>iii. include provision of delivery parking where possible.</p> <p>B. The provision, maintenance and signing of safe pedestrian routes will be supported, including a new footpath and cycle links towards Ashford avoiding the A6, and the continuation of the Monsal Trail to Rowsley. Where appropriate to its scale and location, applications for development should show how the proposed scheme intends to provide links to the wider cycle and walking network and access to public transport.</p> <p>C. Development proposals which provide positive design to lessen the impact of traffic on people, cyclists and</p>	<p><b>Minor change.</b></p>
--------------------------	--	---	-----------------------------

		the town centre environment will be supported.	
POLICY TC2: Car and Cycle Parking	<p>A. New development which would lead to a net decrease in public or private car parking will be strongly opposed.</p> <p>B. Cycle parking racks in the town centre are supported, providing they do not adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area or obstruct the pavements.</p>	<p>A. New development which would lead to a net decrease in public or private car parking will be strongly opposed.</p> <p>B. The provision of cycle parking racks in the town centre is supported, provided the character of the Conservation Area is not harmed and pavements are not obstructed.</p>	<p>TC2 B added 'the provision of'.</p> <p><b>Minor change.</b></p>
POLICY TC3: Re-opening the Matlock – Buxton Railway	Reinstatement of the Matlock to Buxton railway is supported, subject to thorough investigation of the impact on the Monsal Trail and the creation of a new recreation route and local green space of equal or better quality	Reinstatement of the Matlock to Buxton railway is supported, subject to thorough investigation of the impact on the Monsal Trail and the creation of a new recreation route and local green space of equal or better quality.	<b>No change.</b>

<p>POLICY TC4: Broadband</p>	<p>Efforts to enable faster and more reliable communications infrastructure throughout Bakewell will be encouraged and supported</p>	<p>(A) Proposals for superfast broadband infrastructure are supported.</p> <p>(B) All new developments should provide access to superfast broadband infrastructure.</p>	<p>Positively framed as a land use policy.</p> <p>Added new clause making provision a requirement of development.</p> <p><b><i>Significant change.</i></b></p>
----------------------------------	--	---	--