

PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

## **CORE STRATEGY STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS**

In accordance with Regulation 30(1)(e) of the Town & Country Planning  
(Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008

**December 2010**

**Peak District National Park Authority**

Member of the English National Park Authorities Association (ENPAA)

Aldern House  
Baslow Road  
Bakewell  
Derbyshire  
DE45 1AE

Tel: (01629) 816 200

Text: (01629) 816 319

Fax: (01629) 816 310

E-mail: [customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Website: [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk)

**We are happy to provide this information in alternative formats on request where reasonable. If you require the document in one of these formats please contact: Brian Taylor, Policy Planning Manager, Peak District National Park at the address above, Tel: 01629 816303, or email [brian.taylor@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:brian.taylor@peakdistrict.gov.uk).**

## CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Pre-Submission consultation	4
Summary of main issues raised in representations:	
• General comments	5
• Chapter 2: How to use this plan	5
• Chapter 3: Introduction to the Core Strategy	6
• Chapter 4: Spatial portrait	6
• Chapter 5: Spatial and development strategy	8
• Chapter 8: General spatial policies	11
• Chapter 9: Landscapes and conservation	14
• Chapter 10: Recreation and tourism	16
• Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainable building	19
• Chapter 12: Homes, shops and community services	24
• Chapter 13: Supporting economic development	28
• Chapter 14: Minerals	30
• Chapter 15: Accessibility, travel and traffic	34
• Other	40

## Introduction

This document has been produced in accordance with Regulation 30(1)(e) of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

The statement provides details of the number of representations made on the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) during the Regulation 28 pre-submission consultation period in September and October 2010. A summary of the main issues raised by these representations is also provided.

## Pre-submission consultation

The pre-Submission Core Strategy was published for consultation on 15 September 2010, together with all other necessary documents as required by Regulations 27 and 28. Comments were invited over a six week period which closed on 26 October 2010.

Representations were sought on matters of soundness and legal compliance. Respondents were asked to say whether or not they considered the DPD to be legally compliant and sound. Where they considered the DPD (or part of it) was non-compliant or unsound they were asked to suggest how the situation might be resolved. Respondents were asked whether or not they would wish to appear in person at the Examination and if so, why they consider it necessary.

342 individual representations were made by 54 respondents. A summary of the main issues raised is presented below, together with a listing which shows to which paragraph or policy the representations related. Copies of all the representations have been submitted to the Inspector and will be taken into account during the Examination of the Core Strategy.

<b>Total number of respondents</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Total number of representations received</b>	<b>342</b>

<b>Representations considering Core Strategy</b>	
<b>Sound</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Unsound</b>	<b>232</b>

<b>Representations considering Core Strategy</b>	
<b>Legally compliant</b>	<b>328</b>
<b>Not Legally compliant</b>	<b>14</b>

## Summary of main issues raised in representations

The main issues raised in the representations in relation to each part of the Core Strategy DPD are summarised in the following pages in plan order. Each summary is followed by a listing of all the representations received in relation to paragraphs and policies within each chapter of the Core Strategy.

### General comments

Summary of main issues raised:

- In view of the Government's emphasis on brevity and conciseness, some of the supporting text could be reduced in length.

Listing of responses on *General comments*

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
Core Strategy	Christopher Cartledge	23	18	Yes	Unsound	No
Core Strategy	East Midlands Development Agency	49	298	Yes	Unsound	No
Whole plan	Ministry of Defence	66	233	Yes	Sound	No

### Chapter 2: How to use this plan

Summary of main issues raised:

- Online submission process complicates submissions.

Listing of responses on *chapter 2: How to use this plan*

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
2.1	Peter Simon	22	28	Yes	Sound	Yes

### **Chapter 3: Introduction to the Core Strategy**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The vision doesn't reflect the National Park Vision and Circular 2010 or the emerging National Park Management Plan.
- Greater weight should be given to climate change mitigation and sustainable development.
- More prominence should be given to the needs of the rural economy and rural communities.
- There must be a clear explanation of the three purposes and duties of National Parks giving a degree of equality between them.

Listing of responses on chapter 3: *Introduction to the Core Strategy*

<b>Para / policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
3.7	Friends of the Peak District	20	26	Yes	Unsound	Yes
3.7	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	73	Yes	Unsound	Yes
3.7	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	144	Yes	Unsound	Yes
3.7	Anne Ashe	31	205	Yes	Sound	No
3.7	British Mountaineering Council	59	182	Yes	Sound	No
3.18	Country Landowners Association	54	125	Yes	Unsound	No
3.7	National Trust	73	336	Yes	Sound	No

### **Chapter 4: Spatial portrait**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Greater recognition should be given to the value of tourism.
- Greater control over traffic is needed.
- More encouragement for community scale renewable energy generation is needed.
- Greater flexibility is needed to achieve social housing on the back of permitting open market housing.
- Buying up open market housing and selling it on with an affordable housing occupancy condition would exacerbate already high house prices.

- Greater flexibility is needed for business to operate from the open countryside.
- Better recognition is needed of the potential to restore and make better use of old mineral sites, in consultation with local communities and recreation organisations.
- Fails to report key messages on renewable energy in PPS1 and National Parks' Vision.

Listing of responses on chapter 4: *Spatial portrait*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Agent / Respondent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
4.1	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	260	Yes	Unsound	No
4.5	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	272	Yes	Sound	No
4.8	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	259	Yes	Unsound	No
4.9	British Mountaineering Council	59	183	Yes	Sound	No
4.12	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	145	Yes	Unsound	Yes
4.13	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	146	Yes	Unsound	Yes
4.14	William Moss	8	6	Yes	Unsound	No
4.14	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	147	Yes	Unsound	Yes
4.15	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	148	Yes	Unsound	Yes
4.16	Country Landowners Association	54	126	Yes	Unsound	No
4.16	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	149	Yes	Unsound	Yes
4.17	Country Landowners Association	54	127	Yes	Unsound	No
4.18	William Moss	8	4	Yes	Unsound	No

4.25	Country Landowners Association	54	128	Yes	Unsound	No
4.28	British Mountaineering Council	59	181	Yes	Sound	No
4.29	Derbyshire County Council	47	288	Yes	Unsound	No

### **Chapter 5: Spatial and development strategy**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The landscape outcome gives insufficient weight to biodiversity and cultural heritage.
- The landscape outcome does not refer to wildlife, culture or geomorphology.
- The spatial outcome for accessibility, travel and traffic is too restrictive because it is based purely on transport modes rather than people accessing their needs.
- Policies seeking to achieve the Vision, objectives and outcomes must be positive and facilitate development.

Listing of responses on chapter 5: *Spatial and development strategy*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 5	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	100	Yes	Unsound	Yes
5.2	Peter Simon	22	43	Yes	Unsound	Yes
5.3	British Mountaineering Council	59	185	Yes	Sound	No
5.3	Friends of the Peak District	20	216	Yes	Unsound	Yes
5.3	National Trust	73	337	Yes	Sound	No
5.21	Hathersage Parish Council	23	25	Yes	Unsound	Yes

## Spatial objectives / Key Diagram

### Summary of main issues raised:

- Figure 3: Section on recreation and tourism policies needs to include the bullet point about managing off road recreation (as in figure 6 bullet point 1).
- Figures 3, 4 & 5: The bullet points on minerals are not justified by national guidance.
- Figure 5: Chatsworth should be added to the list of places named under bullet point 1 in the section headed 'Recreation and tourism policies will...'
- Figure 6: Under 'Transport policies will seek to ensure...' the 8th bullet point should read *"Gaps in the rights of way network will be filled."*

### Listing of responses on *Spatial objectives / Key Diagram*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Fig. 3	English Heritage	38	68	Yes	Unsound	No
Fig. 3	Friends of the Peak District	20	155	Yes	Unsound	Yes
Fig. 3	Campaign for National Parks	55	176	Yes	Sound	No
Fig. 3	Lafarge Cement UK	52	235	No	Unsound	Yes
Fig. 3	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	261	Yes	Unsound	No
Fig.3	Derbyshire County Council	47	290	Yes	Unsound	No
Fig. 4	Friends of the Peak District	20	157	Yes	Unsound	Yes
Fig. 5	Litton Properties / Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners	28	34	Yes	Sound	Yes
Fig. 5	Friends of the Peak District	20	156	Yes	Unsound	No
Fig. 5	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	262	Yes	Unsound	No
Fig. 6	Friends of the Peak District	20	219	Yes	Unsound	No

Fig. 8	Friends of the Peak District	20	218	Yes	Unsound	Yes
Figures 3,4,5,6	National Trust	73	338	Yes	Unsound	Yes

### Policy DS1: Development Strategy

#### Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy lacks flexibility to meet the needs of businesses both in the countryside, and in Bakewell.
- The policy should distinguish between Bakewell and other settlements by use of a settlement hierarchy.
- The policy doesn't give sufficient scope for development of social and economic benefit to the community and the economy.
- The policy excludes those who do not live in the 63 listed settlements or in a neighbouring settlement.
- The policy discriminates against those wishing to build an affordable home on an already owned plot – whether inside or outside a settlement.
- The policy does not represent a sustainable pattern of development for the future given downward trends in public transport provision.
- The policy offers insufficient scope for conversion of buildings outside settlements.
- Demand should take into account the ability of the 'local' area to provide/sustain employment, where new property is being sought by those in employment.
- The definition/application of "on the edge of a LP settlement" should be reviewed; a clearer definition would be "within" or "outside".
- Site allocation would avoid uncertainty over site selection.
- Design, density and layout of more affordable housing must complement and not harm adjoining property and the surrounding area.
- Focusing new development in Bakewell is the most sustainable option.

#### Listing of responses on *Policy DS1: Development strategy*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
DS1	Sheffield City Council	18	23	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Litton Properties / Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners	28	35	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	50	Yes	Unsound	No
DS1	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	74	Yes	Unsound	Yes

DS1	The Tissington Estate / Thomas Redfern	41	83	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Martin Robeson Planning	48	95	Yes	Unsound	Yes
DS1	United Utilities	56	112	Yes	Unsound	No
DS1	United Utilities	56	113	Yes	Unsound	Yes
DS1	Country Landowners Association	54	129	Yes	Unsound	No
DS1	Ian Baseley Associates	62	192	Yes	Unsound	No
DS1	Peak Park Parishes Forum	60	207	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Indigo Planning Limited	65	229	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	263	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Kirklees Council	50	309	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Ken Fawcett	72	331	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Ken Fawcett	72	332	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Ken Fawcett	72	333	Yes	Sound	No
DS1	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	101	Yes	Unsound	Yes
DS1	National Trust	73	339	Yes	Unsound	Yes

## **Chapter 7: Introduction to Core Policies**

Summary of main issues raised:

- As worded it could be interpreted that there is no requirement for large scale development to address sustainable development and climate change issues

Listing of responses on *Chapter 7: Introduction to Core Policies*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
7.2	National Trust	73	340	Yes	Unsound	No

## **Chapter 8: General Spatial Policies**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The Sandford Principle is quoted incorrectly in text outside of the policy.
- The definition of major development is not clear.

Listing of responses on *Chapter 8: General spatial policies*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 8	Kirklees Council	50	310	Yes	Sound	No
8.1	Campaign for National Parks	55	177	Yes	Unsound	No
8.1	Campaign for National Parks	55	178	Yes	Sound	No
8.1	Campaign for National Parks	55	179	Yes	Unsound	No
8.2	National Grid	67	234	Yes	Unsound	No
8.9	Indigo Planning Limited	65	230	Yes	Sound	No

8.21	William Moss	8	1	Yes	Unsound	No
------	--------------	---	---	-----	---------	----

Policy GSP1: Securing National Park purposes and sustainable development

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy does not adequately reflect the National Park Vision and Circular 2010.
- The policy does not correctly deal with the issue of major development.

*Listing of responses on Policy GSP1: Securing National Park purposes and sustainable development*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
GSP1	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	75	Yes	Unsound	No
GSP1	Natural England	57	116	Yes	Sound	No
GSP1	Friends of the Peak District	20	159	Yes	Unsound	Yes
GSP1	Friends of the Peak District	20	160	Yes	Unsound	Yes
GSP1	National Trust	73	341	Yes	Sound	No

Policy GSP2: Achieving enhancement of the National Park

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy gives stronger criteria on enhancement than conservation and the logic for this isn't clear.

*Listing of responses on Policy GSP2: Achieving enhancement of the National Park*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
GSP2	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	76	Yes	unsound	Yes
GSP2	Natural England	57	117	Yes	Sound	No

GSP2	National Trust	73	342	Yes	Sound	No
------	----------------	----	-----	-----	-------	----

Policy GSP3: Development Management principles

Summary of main issues raised:

- The Core Strategy does not address the issue of land instability.
- Plain English would help understanding of this policy particularly in relation to the use of terms like ‘living conditions’.

Listing of responses on *Policy GSP3: Development Management principles*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request
GSP3	The Coal Authority	37	67	Yes	Unsound	No
GSP3	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	77	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy GSP4: Securing planning benefits

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy is illegal because it can’t deliver what is intended.
- Any schedule that includes levies on farm and other businesses would damage the rural economy and exemptions for these should be specified now.
- The policy doesn’t ensure sustainable development either through design and/or renewable energy technologies.

Listing of responses on *Policy GSP4: Securing planning benefits*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
GSP4	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	78	No	Unsound	Yes
GSP4	Country Land & Business Association	54	130	Yes	Unsound	No
GSP4	Friends of the Peak District	20	158	Yes	Unsound	Yes

## **Chapter 9: Landscapes and conservation**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Some clarification and additions are needed for the list of valued characteristics.

Listing of responses on *chapter 9: Landscapes and conservation*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 9	Derbyshire County Council	47	283	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 9	Kirklees Council	50	311	Yes	Sound	No
9.6	William Moss	8	2	Yes	Unsound	No
9.15	National Farmers Union	35	58	Yes	Unsound	No
9.15	Staffordshire County Council	63	194	Yes	Unsound	No
9.15	Staffordshire County Council	63	200	Yes	Sound	No
9.33	William Moss	8	3	Yes	Unsound	No
9.37	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	275	Yes	Unsound	No
9.41	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	265	Yes	Sound	No

## **Policy L1: Landscape Character and valued characteristics**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The rigour of the policy is beyond PPS in requiring development to conserve and enhance (as opposed to conserve or enhance).
- The exacting protection of the Natural Zone, and the inclusion of farms and farm land, will prevent wind turbines in locations that may be viable.
- There is no need for the Natural Zone at all in light of Landscape Strategy.

- The protection of the landscape and valued characteristics restricts flexibility to those who require development for social or economic reasons.

*Listing of responses on Policy L1: Landscape Character and valued characteristics*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
L1	National Farmers Union	35	57	Yes	Unsound	No
L1	Natural England	57	118	Yes	Sound	No
L1	Country Land & Business Association	54	131	Yes	Unsound	No
L1	Friends of the Peak District	20	172	Yes	Unsound	Yes
L1	Anne Ashe	31	203	Yes	Unsound	No
L1	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	102	Yes	Unsound	Yes
L1	National Trust	73	343	Yes	Sound	No

Policy L2: Site of biodiversity or geodiversity importance

Summary of main issues raised:

- Policy should not protect all layers of site of biodiversity importance equally; a hierarchy is needed whereby some are more important than others.
- The policy should specifically reference sites of regional and local biodiversity and geodiversity importance.
- The policy does not reference the importance of ecological networks, climate change or providing a strategic approach to biodiversity habitat enhancement and creation.

*Listing of responses on Policy L2: Site of biodiversity or geodiversity importance*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
L2	Sheffield Area Geology Trust	19	27	Yes	Unsound	Yes
L2	Natural England	57	119	Yes	Sound	No

L2	Country Land & Business Association	54	132	Yes	Unsound	No
L2	Staffordshire County Council	63	193	Yes	Unsound	No
L2	National Trust	73	344	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy L3: Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, artistic or historic significance

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy isn't locally distinctive and the requirement to conserve and enhance goes beyond PPS requirements.

*Listing of responses on Policy L3: Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, artistic or historic significance*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
L3	English Heritage	38	69	Yes	Unsound	No
L3	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	264	Yes	Unsound	No
L3	National Trust	73	345	Yes	Unsound	Yes

**Chapter 10: Recreation and tourism**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Protection of the special qualities of the National Park needs to include sustainable development.
- Sustainable economic development must be part of the approach.
- Some recreational activity needs to be controlled rather than just positively managed.
- Chalets are supported and opposed in equal measure.
- Affordable housing should be considered as first use in conversions.

Listing of responses on *chapter 10: Recreation and tourism*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 10	East Midlands Development Agency	49	299	Yes	Unsound	No
10.1	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	266	Yes	Sound	No
10.2	East Midlands Development Agency	49	300	Yes	Unsound	No
10.3	British Mountaineering Council	59	186	Yes	Sound	No
10.7	British Mountaineering Council	59	187	Yes	Sound	No
10.12	Peter Simon	30	124	Yes	Unsound	No
10.12	Friends of the Peak District	20	215	Yes	Unsound	No
10.12	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	267	Yes	Unsound	No
10.13	British Mountaineering Council	59	188	Yes	Sound	No
10.14	Hugh Wright	30	123	Yes	Unsound	No
10.14	British Mountaineering Council	59	189	Yes	Sound	No
10.14	Derbyshire County Council	47	291	Yes	Unsound	No
10.21-10.23	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	273	Yes	Unsound	No
10.26	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	274	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy RT1: Recreation, environmental education and interpretation

Summary of main issues raised:

- Part A is contrary to PPG13 because it leads one to think that anything that can't be accessed by public transport will be classed as unsustainable and won't get planning permission.
- Part B goes beyond the requirements of PPS4 and PPS7.
- Part C is contrary to PPS4 Policy EC6.2c and Policy EC12.1, and PPS7 paragraph 31(i).

Listing of responses on *Policy RT1: Recreation, environmental education and interpretation*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
RT1	Country Land & Business Association	54	133	Yes	Unsound	No
RT1	Staffordshire County Council	63	195	Yes	Sound	No
RT1	National Trust	73	347	Yes	Sound	No

Policy RT2: Hotels, bed and breakfast and self catering accommodation

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy does not seem to acknowledge the possibility of non-traditional buildings being used for hotels, B & B etc, or explain why.
- Restricting new hotel accommodation to only one location, Bakewell, is not justified because elsewhere the strategy states the importance of supporting economic development – particularly tourism and facilities to encourage visitors – as long as there are no harmful impacts on the landscape.

Listing of responses on *Policy RT2: Hotels, bed and breakfast and self catering accommodation*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
RT2	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	79	Yes	Unsound	No
RT2	The Tissington Estate / Thomas Redfern	41	84	Yes	Sound	No
RT2	Staffordshire County Council	63	196	Yes	Sound	No

RT2C	Rock Mill Business Park / Silson Planning Services	36	63	Yes	Unsound	No
RT2	National Trust	73	348	Yes	Unsound	No

### Policy RT3: Caravans and Camping

Summary of main issues raised:

- Part B is too restrictive and doesn't allow for exceptional cases where such development could be accommodated without adverse impact on the landscape.

Listing of responses on *Policy RT3: Caravans and Camping*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
RT3	Country Land & Business Association	54	134	Yes	Unsound	No
RT3 B & C	Greg Potter	61	121	Yes	Unsound	Yes
RT3	National Trust	73	349	Yes	Sound	No

### **Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainable building**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The chapter needs to better reflect the changing emphases stressed in the Foreword and emerging from the current (autumn 2010) consultations for the refreshed NPMP especially in respect of climate change.

Listing of responses on *chapter 11: Climate change and sustainable building*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 11	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	276	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 11	East Midlands Development Agency	49	306	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 11	Forestry Commission	71	330	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 11	National Trust	73	369	Yes	Unsound	No
11.4	Derbyshire County Council	47	292	Yes	Unsound	No
11.5	Anne Ashe	31	206	Yes	Sound	No
11.5	Friends of the Peak District	20	214	Yes	Unsound	Yes
11.8	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	245	Yes	Unsound	No
11.9	Friends of the Peak District	20	213	Yes	Unsound	Yes
11.9	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	246	Yes	Unsound	No
11.14 - 11.18	Friends of the Peak District	20	212	Yes	Unsound	Yes
11.17	Peter Simon	22	45	Yes	Sound	No
11.25	Friends of the Peak District	20	211	Yes	Unsound	Yes
11.27	Friends of the Peak District	20	210	Yes	Unsound	Yes
11.29	Friends of the Peak District	20	227	Yes	Unsound	Yes

11.31	Friends of the Peak District	20	228	Yes	Unsound	Yes
11.32	Peter Simon	22	46	Yes	Sound	No
11.32	National Trust	73	351	Yes	Unsound	No
11.52	Anne Ashe	31	204	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy CC1: Climate change mitigation and adaptation

Summary of main issues raised:

- Part F exemptions unjustifiably water down part D.
- Part F standard is too high especially for converted buildings.
- Part F term 'all development' is not consistent with PPS22.
- Part F threshold in F is too high and won't apply to most development since it will under 1000sqm.
- Part F standards are unjustified when we could use BREEAM and COSH targets.
- Part F gives no mention to mitigation.
- Part G target is unjustified in being less than the Buildings Emission Rate.

Listing of responses on *Policy CC1: Climate change mitigation and adaptation*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
CC1	Country Land & Business Association	54	135	Yes	Unsound	No
CC1	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	151	Yes	Unsound	Yes
CC1	Friends of the Peak District	20	164	Yes	Unsound	No
CC1	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	320	Yes	Unsound	No
CC1	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	103	Yes	Unsound	Yes

CC1	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	315	Yes	Unsound	No
CC1	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	318	Yes	Sound	No
CC1	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	317	Yes	Unsound	No
CC1	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	319	Yes	Unsound	No
CC1	National Trust	73	350	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy CC2: Low Carbon and renewable energy development

Summary of main issues raised:

- Policy is contrary to PS22 and other parts of the Core Strategy.
- Policy should include biomass and solar panels, which Peak District farmers are looking at as renewable energy development.
- Policy should allow medium as well as small scale wind turbines because there are places where these would be acceptable in landscape terms.
- Only permitting 'small scale' offers little flexibility and is economically less viable.
- A blanket ban on wind turbines in Natural Zone is not supported by evidence.

Listing of responses on *Policy CC2: Low Carbon and renewable energy development*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
CC2	National Farmers Union	35	59	Yes	Unsound	No
CC2	Natural England	57	115	Yes	Sound	No
CC2	Country Landowners Association	54	136	Yes	Unsound	No
CC2	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	152	Yes	Sound	Yes
CC2	Friends of the Peak District	20	163	Yes	Unsound	Yes

CC2	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	250	Yes	Sound	No
CC2	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	251	Yes	Unsound	No
CC2	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	252	Yes	Sound	No
CC2	Kirklees Council	50	312	Yes	Sound	No
CC2	National Trust	73	352	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy CC3: Waste Management – domestic, industrial and commercial waste

Summary of main issues raised:

- Anaerobic digestion plants at a community as well as farm scale; need a more diverse waste stream to make it viable.

Listing of responses on Policy CC3: Waste Management – domestic, industrial and commercial waste

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
CC3	Environment Agency	44	90	Yes	Sound	No
CC3	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	153	Yes	Sound	Yes
CC3	Friends of the Peak District	20	162	Yes	Sound	Yes
CC3	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	324	Yes	Unsound	No
CC3	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	325	Yes	Unsound	No
CC3C	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	326	Yes	Unsound	No
CC3	National Trust	73	353	Yes	Sound	No

Policy CC4: Waste Management – on farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure and slurry

Summary of main issues raised:

- The main issues are the extent to which the policy will enable anaerobic digestion plants to be established at a community as well as farm scale; the extent to which it can receive a waste stream that makes it viable to operate; and the flexibility on types and source of waste permitted by the policy.

Listing of responses on *Policy CC4: Waste Management – on farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure and slurry*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
CC4	National Farmers Union	35	60	Yes	Unsound	No
CC4	Country Land & Business Association	54	137	Yes	Unsound	No
CC4	Sustainable Youlgrave	26	154	Yes	Unsound	Yes
CC4	Friends of the Peak District	20	161	Yes	Unsound	Yes
CC4	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	329	Yes	Unsound	No
CC4	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	327	Yes	Unsound	No
CC4	PDSEG / Rural Action Derbyshire	27	328	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy CC5: Flood risk and water conservation

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy could be locationally specific in order to not repeat National Planning Policy guidance.

Listing of responses on *Policy CC5: Flood risk and water conservation*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
--------------	--------------------	----------------	-------------------	--------	--------	------------------

CC5	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	104	Yes	Unsound	Yes
CC5	National Trust	73	354	Yes	Sound	No

## **Chapter 12: Homes, shops and community services**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Open market housing should be permitted as a means of financing social housing.
- The chapter as it relates to Bakewell is not justified by the evidence or by PPS4.
- Restricting retail use in Bakewell to anywhere but the town centre means that the strategy is opposed to the types of retail use which seem quite appropriate outside the town centre.
- The Core Strategy should allow appropriate flexibility to support development proposals within sustainable locations for moderate food store development, where they are compliant with the sequential approach and where there would be no significant adverse impact upon existing centres.
- Open market housing may be required for financial viability purposes to bring forward conservation and enhancement development on the site, or treatment of an underutilised or a despoiled site. This also applies to sites where high infrastructure costs require cross funding.

Listing of responses on *Chapter 12: Homes, shops and community facilities*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request</b>
Chapter 12	Derbyshire County Council	47	281	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 12	East Midlands Development Agency	49	301	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 12	Kirklees Council	50	313	Yes	Sound	No
12.13 -12.14	Indigo Planning Limited	65	232	Yes	Sound	No
12.18	Country Land & Business Association	54	138	Yes	Unsound	No
12.19	Litton Properties / Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners	28	36	Yes	Sound	Yes
12.44	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	268	Yes	Unsound	No

12.44	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	277	Yes	Sound	No
-------	-----------------------------------	----	-----	-----	-------	----

### Policy HC1: New housing

#### Summary of main issues raised:

- Derbyshire Dales already has more than its share of new housing and evidence is insufficient / not presented to justify the proposed levels of development.
- The policy is a workable and flexible approach which enables local conditions to be recognised, including the potential contribution of open market housing to achieving conservation and enhancement.
- The policy should not exclude those who live outside the 63 listed settlements or a neighbouring settlement, or discriminate against those wishing to build an affordable home on an already owned plot – whether inside or outside a settlement.
- The policy is unsound because there are a large number of very small parishes in the National Park, many of which are not adjacent to settlements within which affordable housing is most likely to be approved under this policy.
- There is internal inconsistency between the policies and those of neighbouring plans in situations where cross boundary issues are relevant.
- Clarity on conversion is needed together with a change to allow holiday homes to routinely be converted to affordable homes.
- A policy for the delivery of affordable housing that relies on social funding is insufficiently flexible.
- An outright ban on open market housing prevents subsidy of the affordable housing by the private sector and is contrary to national policy in PPS3.

#### Listing of responses on *Policy HC1: New housing*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
HC1	Grindlow, Great Hucklow & Little Hucklow Parish Council	15	13	Yes	Unsound	Yes
HC1	Brenda Middleton	15	14	Yes	Unsound	No
HC1	Martin Beer	21	16	Yes	Unsound	No
HC1	Sheffield City Council	18	19	Yes	Sound	No
HC1	Litton Properties / Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners	28	37	Yes	Unsound	Yes

HC1	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	51	Yes	Unsound	No
HC1	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	52	Yes	Unsound	No
HC1	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	53	Yes	Sound	No
HC1	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	80	Yes	Unsound	Yes
HC1	The Tissington Estate / Thomas Redfern	41	85	Yes	Sound	No
HC1	United Utilities	56	111	Yes	Unsound	Yes
HC1	Country Land & Business Association	54	139	Yes	Unsound	No
HC1A	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	81	Yes	Unsound	Yes
HC1C	Taddington & Priestcliffe Parish Council	40	82	Yes	Unsound	Yes
HC1	National Trust	73	355	Yes	Sound	No

Policy HC2: Housing for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises

Summary of main issues raised:

- Housing for key workers must include the housing of family employees of the business so e.g. the families of Peak District farmers can live in re-used traditional buildings.

Listing of responses on *Policy HC2: Housing for key workers in agriculture, forestry or other rural enterprises*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
HC2	Sheffield City Council	18	20	Yes	Sound	No
HC2	National Farmers Union	35	62	Yes	Sound	No
HC2	National Trust	73	356	Yes	Sound	No

Policy HC3: Buying existing homes to add to the affordable housing stock

Summary of main issues raised:

- This is an important change of emphasis and would help reduce the number that either become holiday lets and seasonal (second?) homes, or drift up-market and further out of reach of local people.
- Buying existing homes to add them to the affordable housing stock is only a very short term solution. Any removal of smaller, less expensive market priced housing from the open market, arguably the type of housing in short supply, reduces people's opportunities to get onto the housing ladder.

Listing of responses on Policy HC3: Buying existing homes to add to the affordable housing stock

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
HC3	Sheffield City Council	18	21	Yes	Sound	No
HC3	Country Land & Business Association	54	140	Yes	Unsound	No
HC3	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	105	Yes	Unsound	Yes

Policy HC4: Sites for gypsies, travellers or travelling show people

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy is ambiguous, lacking clarity, and effectively prevents appropriate site provision.

Listing of responses on *Policy HC4: Sites for gypsies, travellers or travelling show people*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
HC4	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	6	12	Yes	Unsound	No
HC4	Sheffield City Council	18	22	Yes	Sound	No
HC4	Friends of the Peak District	20	174	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy HC5: Provision and retention of community services and facilities

Summary of issues raised:

- Ensuring retention and provision of community services and facilities is a key role of the core strategy having regard to the social and economic imperatives for the National Park

Listing of responses on *Policy HC5: Provision and retention of community services and facilities*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
HC5	National Trust	73	357	Yes	Sound	No

Policy HC6: Shops, professional services and related activities

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy is unsound because it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base or proper consideration of PPS4 regarding retail provision.
- The policy does not adequately address the status and role of Bakewell or allow for development that meets potential development justified by evidence.
- Parts A & B are not compliant with PPS4.

Listing of responses on *Policy HC6: Shops, professional services and related activities*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
HC6	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	48	96	No	Unsound	Yes
HC6	Indigo Planning Limited	65	231	Yes	Unsound	No
HC6	National Trust	73	358	Yes	Sound	No

### **Chapter 13: Supporting economic development**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The plan should acknowledge that if no additional jobs are available local people will continue to face long journeys to work, adding to commuting pressures and diminishing community life.

Listing of responses on chapter 13: *Supporting economic development*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
Chapter 13	Derbyshire County Council	47	282	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 13	East Midlands Development Agency	49	302	Yes	Unsound	No
13.6	East Midlands Development Agency	49	303	Yes	Unsound	No

### **Policy E1: Business development in towns and villages**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Home working (particularly if served by high quality ICT) may provide economic and sustainability benefits without negative impacts on the environment.

Listing of responses on *Policy E1: Business development in towns and villages*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
E1	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	48	97	No	Unsound	Yes
E1	Litton Properties / Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners	28	38	Yes	Sound	Yes
E1	The Tissington Estate / Thomas Redfern	41	86	Yes	Sound	No
E1	Staffordshire County Council	63	197	Yes	Sound	No
E1	East Midlands Development Agency	49	304	Yes	Sound	No
E1D	Rock Mill Business Park / Silson Planning Services	36	64	Yes	Unsound	No
E1	National Trust	73	359	Yes	Sound	No

Policy E2: Businesses in the countryside

Summary of main issues raised:

- Small businesses should be permitted to use field barns, providing their character is conserved and minimal services are required.
- Restrictions on business development in the countryside are unjustified, and scale, location and type of employment development should be the key policy criteria used to make recommendations and decisions.

Listing of responses on *Policy E2: Businesses in the countryside*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
E2	Martin Beer	21	17	Yes	Unsound	Yes
E2	National Farmers Union	35	61	Yes	Unsound	No
E2	Country Land & Business Association	54	141	Yes	Unsound	No

E2	Staffordshire County Council	63	198	Yes	Sound	No
E2	Peak Park Parishes Forum	60	208	Yes	Unsound	No
E2	East Midlands Development Agency	49	305	Yes	Unsound	No
E2C	The Tissington Estate / Thomas Redfern	41	87	No	Unsound	No
E2C	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	278	Yes	Unsound	No
E2	National Trust	73	360	Yes	Sound	No

#### **Chapter 14: Minerals**

Summary of main issues raised:

- The principles behind the policy for aggregate working are not in line with Mineral Policy Statements (MPS).
- The commitment to land banking aggregates for a given period from the end of the plan period is not clear and appears to be out of line with MPS requirements.
- The intent to scale down cement manufacture is not justified by MPS.
- The Core Strategy is unjustifiably prejudicing the future of cement manufacture in the Hope Valley.
- The intended destination for building and roofing stone is not justified by evidence.

Listing of responses on *chapter 14: Minerals*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 14	Derbyshire County Council	47	284	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 14	East Midlands Development Agency	49	308	Yes	Sound	No
14.1	Lafarge Cement UK	52	236	No	Unsound	Yes
14.2 – 14.4	Lafarge Cement UK	52	237	No	Unsound	Yes

14.4	British Mountaineering Council	59	191	Yes	Sound	No
14.6	Campaign for National Parks	55	180	Yes	Sound	No
14.6	GMGU (Urban Vision Partnership Limited)	64	201	Yes	Sound	No
14.7	Lafarge Cement UK	52	238	No	Unsound	Yes
14.8	Mineral Products Association	53	109	Yes	Unsound	Yes
14.8	Lafarge Cement UK	52	239	No	Unsound	Yes
14.12	Marshalls Stone Products / Geoplan Limited	10	255	Yes	Unsound	Yes
14.16	GMGU Urban Vision Partnership Limited)	64	202	Yes	Sound	No
14.17	Marshalls Stone Products / Geoplan Limited	10	256	Yes	Unsound	Yes
14.26	Lafarge Cement UK	52	240	No	Unsound	Yes
14.27	Lafarge Cement UK	52	241	No	Unsound	No
14.28	Lafarge Cement UK	52	242	Yes	Unsound	Yes
14.29	Lafarge Cement UK	52	243	Yes	Unsound	Yes
14.32	Marshalls Stone Products / Geoplan Limited	10	257	Yes	Unsound	Yes
14.37	British Mountaineering Council	59	190	Yes	Sound	No

Policy MIN1: Minerals Development

Summary of main issues raised:

- Parts of the policy are not in accordance with MPS1.
- The policy fails to define the extent of the provision of aggregates the Park will make during the Plan period, and hasn't rolled forward the agreed sub regional apportionment to the end of the plan period.
- The policy is planning on the basis of an inadequate provision and the Authority's commitment to a particular figure falls short of the plan period.
- Scaling down extraction ignores the knock on environmental impact of transporting stone from one side of the National Park to the other.
- No consideration is given to the impact on employment within the National Park.

Listing of responses on *Policy MIN1: Minerals Development*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
MIN1	Mineral Products Association	53	108	Yes	Unsound	Yes
MIN1	The Coal Authority	37	66	Yes	Sound	No
MIN1	CEMEX UK Materials Ltd	45	91	Yes	Unsound	No
MIN1	Country Land & Business Association	54	142	Yes	Unsound	No
MIN1	Lafarge Cement UK	52	244	No	Unsound	Yes
MIN1	National Trust	73	361	Yes	Sound	No

Policy MIN2: Fluorspar proposals

Summary of main issues raised:

- The encouragement and support for continued extraction by underground mining rightly recognises its scarcity within the UK and the need to source mineral supplies indigenously and, in doing so, avoid exporting environmental damage.
- The policy is right but it is important to continue a dialogue with private sector interests to ensure that emerging policy is evidence-based and has regards to commercial considerations and the strategic importance of this resource.

Listing of responses on *Policy MIN2: Fluorspar proposals*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
MIN2	Northwest Regional Development Agency	58	120	Yes	Sound	No
MIN2	National Trust	73	362	Yes	Sound	No

Policy MIN3: Local small scale building and roofing stone

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy does not conform to national guidance on heritage protection.
- The policy could frustrate the successful repair of important historic buildings and structures outside the National Park boundary.
- The policy does not recognise that quarrying in the National Park for use outside the National Park could in some cases reduce cross park haulage.

Listing of responses on *Policy MIN3: Local small scale building and roofing stone*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
MIN3	Marshalls Stone Products / Geoplan Limited	10	11	Yes	Unsound	Yes
MIN3	English Heritage	38	70	Yes	Unsound	No
MIN3	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	106	Yes	Unsound	Yes
MIN3	Country Land & Business Association	54	143	Yes	Unsound	No
MIN3	Staffordshire County Council	63	199	Yes	Sound	No
MIN3	Marshalls Stone Products / Geoplan Limited	10	258	Yes	Unsound	Yes
MIN3	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	279	Yes	Unsound	No
MIN3	National Trust	73	363	Yes	Sound	No

#### Policy MIN4: Mineral safeguarding

Summary of main issues raised:

- National planning policy does not indicate that mineral safeguarding should be carried out differently in National Parks to elsewhere, and the argument to not safeguard on the grounds that conservation policies prevent the risk of sterilisation occurring is insufficient reason to not comply with national safeguarding policy.
- The logic of seeking to safeguard some minerals but not others is unsound.

Listing of responses on *Policy MIN4: Mineral safeguarding*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
MIN4	Mineral Products Association	53	110	Yes	Unsound	Yes
MIN4	The Coal Authority	37	65	Yes	Unsound	No
MIN4	CEMEX UK Materials Ltd	45	92	Yes	Unsound	No

#### **Chapter 15: Accessibility, travel and traffic**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Heavy goods and long-distance traffic should go round the National Park and not through it.
- Maintaining adequate public transport services is likely to be increasingly challenging as public spending reduces.
- The problem of dangerous roads with high accident rates should be recognised more strongly, with a commitment to seek to work with partners to reduce the dangers.
- The potential to use transport networks and hubs to inform and educate visitors and residents about the Park is missing from this chapter.
- The Sustainable Transport Action Plan was not yet available at the time the Core Strategy was consulted upon, so it isn't possible to judge whether the policies of the core strategy are complementary.
- It is questioned whether the Delivery Plan is adequate to monitor performance of policy in any meaningful way.
- Unless we can define a level of traffic that is necessary for local businesses, residents and visitors, it is impractical to have an aspiration that seeks to prevent traffic beyond that level.
- The position on parking is unclear and may in fact reduce overall sustainability of journeys into the Park.

Listing of responses on *chapter 15: Accessibility, travel and traffic*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Chapter 15	British Mountaineering Council	59	184	Yes	Sound	No
Chapter 15	Derbyshire County Council	47	285	Yes	Unsound	No
Chapter 15	Derbyshire County Council	47	286	Yes	Unsound	No
Chapter 15	Derbyshire County Council	47	287	Yes	Unsound	No
Chapter 15	East Midlands Development Agency	49	307	Yes	Sound	No
15.1	William Moss	8	7	Yes	Unsound	No
15.1	Peter Simon	22	29	No	Unsound	Yes
15.1	Peter Simon	22	47	No	Unsound	Yes
15.1	Friends of the Peak District	20	223	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.1 – 15.6	Friends of the Peak District	20	226	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.2	Derbyshire County Council	47	293	Yes	Unsound	No
15.3	Friends of the Peak District	20	225	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.4	Friends of the Peak District	20	165	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.8	Friends of the Peak District	20	224	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.8	Peter Simon	22	30	Yes	Sound	Yes
15.8	Peter Simon	22	40	Yes	Unsound	Yes

15.13	Friends of the Peak District	20	222	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.14	William Moss	8	9	Yes	Unsound	No
15.14	Peter Simon	22	31	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.14	Peter Simon	22	32	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.14	Friends of the Peak District	20	221	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.14	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	269	Yes	Unsound	No
15.16	Friends of the Peak District	20	220	Yes	Unsound	Yes
15.18	Ramblers' Association (Greater Manchester & High Peak)	39	72	Yes	Unsound	No
15.18	Friends of the Peak District	20	167	Yes	Unsound	No
15.19	Friends of the Peak District	20	166	Yes	Sound	No
15.39	William Moss	8	10	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport

Summary of main issues raised:

- It is laudable to stop unnecessary traffic but the policy is a bit toothless and impractical.

Listing of responses on *Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
T1	Peter Simon	22	33	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T1	Friends of the Peak District	20	173	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T1	National Trust	73	364	Yes	Sound	No

Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic

Summary of main issues raised:

- The argument that traffic developments that increase the amount of cross-Park traffic could bring a long term clear net environmental benefit within the National Park is inconceivable and not backed up by evidence.
- The requirement for travel plans should be stronger.
- The policy is unsound and cannot be delivered because the Delivery Plan identifies no definitive sources of funding.
- The abandonment of the line of a Bakewell relief road is unjustified.

Listing of responses on Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
T2	Peter Simon	22	39	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T2	Friends of the Peak District	20	171	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T2	Derbyshire Dales District Council	51	107	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T2C	George Challenger	42	88	Yes	Sound	Yes
T2C	Derbyshire County Council	47	294	Yes	Unsound	No
T2F	Peter Simon	22	41	Yes	Unsound	Yes

T2	National Trust	73	365	Yes	Sound	No
----	----------------	----	-----	-----	-------	----

Policy T3: Design of Transport infrastructure

Summary of main issues raised:

- The assertions about public transport appear optimistic and are in part wrong.
- The policy should state that alternatives to signs, such as engineering, landscaping, planting schemes and road markings must be considered first.
- The policy should require an audit of road signs and furniture and their selective removal.
- The policy cannot be adequately monitored by the indicators suggested.

Listing of responses on *Policy T3: Design of Transport infrastructure*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
T3	Friends of the Peak District	20	170	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T3	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	54	Yes	Unsound	No
T3A	Derbyshire County Council	47	295	Yes	Unsound	No

Policy T4: Managing the demand for freight transport

Summary of main issues raised:

- There is support for use of weight restriction orders to restrict freight transport.

Listing of responses on *Policy T4: Managing the demand for freight transport*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
T4	Friends of the Peak District	20	169	Yes	Sound	No

Policy T5: Managing the demand for rail, and re-use of former railway routes

Summary of main issues raised:

- All proposals should be subject to the test for major development.

Listing of responses on *Policy T5: Managing the demand for rail, and re-use of former railway routes*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
T5	Sheffield City Council	18	24	Yes	Sound	No
T5	Friends of the Peak District	20	175	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T5	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	270	Yes	Unsound	No
T5	Bakewell & District Civic Society	43	280	Yes	Sound	No

Policy T6: Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, and waterways

Summary of main issues raised:

- The ability to manage the Rights of Way network is questioned on the grounds that the implied partnership agreement between the NPA and the various Highways Authorities doesn't work well.

Listing of responses on *Policy T6: Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, and waterways*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
T6	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	55	Yes	Unsound	No
T6	Natural England	57	114	Yes	Sound	No
T6	Kirklees Council	50	314	Yes	Sound	No
T6	National Trust	73	366	Yes	Sound	No

Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks

Summary of main issues raised:

- The major challenge ‘to encourage Highway Authorities to tackle road safety in ways that conserve the valued characteristics of the landscapes through which routes pass’ (Para 4.33) is not addressed in policy.
- The policy, through its requirement for the review of existing traffic management schemes, does not recognise the effect that traffic management measures, including the restriction of non-residential car-parking, can have on the ability of visitors to enjoy and understand the National Park and on the economy of the National Park and therefore the well-being of its residents.
- The policy ‘no new road schemes will be permitted unless there are exceptional circumstances’ effectively removes the possibility to undertake an effective traffic management scheme for Bakewell.
- ‘Environmental capacity’ should be clearly defined in the glossary, or a different expression used as it means different things to different people.

Listing of responses on *Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks*

Para/ policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Legal?	Sound?	Hearing request?
T7	Friends of the Peak District	20	168	Yes	Unsound	Yes
T7	Chatsworth House Trust / Drivers Jonas Deloitte	46	271	Yes	Unsound	No
T7C	Derbyshire County Council	47	296	Yes	Unsound	No

**Other**

Summary of main issues raised:

- Glossary should include definition of Greenway.
- Most performance indicators have no measurable targets and are therefore meaningless.
- Derbyshire County Council does not wish to be committed to the estimated delivery figure for average annual daily traffic flows (Delivery Plan Policies T1 & T2, pages 59-60).
- Suggested updating to Sustainability Appraisal para 6.18 and Appendix 2 re Heritage at Risk register, Government’s Statement on the Historic Environment for England 2010, and PPS5.

Listing of responses on *Other*

<b>Para/ policy</b>	<b>Respondent / agent</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representation ID</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Hearing request?</b>
Appendix 3	Derbyshire County Council	47	289	Yes	Unsound	No
Delivery Plan	Geoffrey Nancolas	33	56	Yes	Unsound	No
Delivery Plan	Derbyshire County Council	47	297	Yes	Unsound	No
Sustainability Appraisal	English Heritage	38	71	Yes	Sound	No