

PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

# **CORE STRATEGY PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

September 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: [aldern@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:aldern@peakdistrict.gov.uk)

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

**This and other Local Development Framework documents can be made available in large copy print, audio cassette, Braille or languages other than English. 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 [policy@peakdistrict.gov.uk](mailto:policy@peakdistrict.gov.uk).**

## Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Preliminary consultation on Issues, 2004	6
3	'Help Shape the Future' consultation, 2005	8
4	Issues and Options consultation, 2007	10
5	Further consultation on Issues and Options, 2008	12
6	Refined Options consultation, 2009	14
7	Preferred Approaches consultation, 2009	15
8	Consultation under Regulation 27	16

### Appendices:

1	Who we consulted on 'Help Shape the Future'	17
2	Key points arising from 'Help Shape the Future' consultation	22
3	Who we consulted on Issues and Options	25
4	Deposit locations and public libraries	29
5	Key points from Issues and Options consultation and how these were addressed in Refined Options	30
6	Who we consulted in later stages	33
7	Key issues from Refined Options consultation and how these were addressed in selecting Preferred Approaches	36
8	Key points from Preferred Approaches consultation and how these were addressed in the Submission Core Strategy	42
9	Policy development through Refined Options - Preferred Options - Submission version	48

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended in 2008 and 2009) require planning authorities to undertake consultation and public participation in the preparation of Development Plan Documents. This Statement has been prepared to meet the requirements of Regulation 30 in the 2009 amendments.

1.2 Regulation 25 as amended in 2008 states the following requirements for public participation in the preparation of a development plan document:

*(1) A local planning authority must -*

- a) notify each of the bodies specified in paragraph (2) of the subject of a DPD which they propose to prepare; and*
- b) invite each of these bodies to make representations to them about what a DPD with that subject ought to contain.*

*(2) The bodies referred to in paragraph (1) are –*

- a) Such of the specific consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider may have an interest in the subject of the proposed DPD; and –*
- b) Such of the general consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider appropriate.*

*(3) If a local planning authority proposes to prepare a DPD, they must also consider whether it is appropriate to invite representations from persons who are resident or carrying on business in their area.*

*(4) If a local planning authority decide that it is appropriate to invite representations under paragraph (3) they must make arrangements for the purposes of inviting representation from such persons of the descriptions in paragraph (3) as they think appropriate.*

*(5) In preparing the DPD, the local planning authority must take into account any representations made to them in response to invitations under paragraph (1) or (4).*

(Note that early stages of preparation were done under previous Regulations 2004)

1.3 The Peak District National Park Core Strategy DPD has been prepared in accordance with the **Local Development Scheme** (LDS), which describes the documents that will make up the new planning policy framework, and sets out the timetable for their preparation and review on a rolling programme. The LDS Second Revision (adopted 2010) can be viewed at on the National Park Authority's website at [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/plansandpolicies](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/plansandpolicies).

1.4 Although the early consultation stages pre-date the adoption in 2006 of the **Statement of Community Involvement** (SCI), the process followed similar requirements to those now set out in the adopted SCI. The SCI can also be viewed on the Authority's website.

1.5 Under the 2004 Act, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (incorporating the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment) must be undertaken to inform the production of the Core Strategy. The SA's role is to assess the extent to which emerging policies will help to achieve environmental, social and economic objectives, and to consider ways in which the plan can contribute to improvements in conditions.

1.6 SA was initially carried out internally within the National Park Authority. The SA consultation bodies (Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature and

Environment Agency) were consulted on an initial SA Scoping Report in 2005. This limited consultation was to obtain comments on the proposed methodology and scope of the SA, and inform the development of sustainability objectives and indicators. When stages of Local Development Framework (LDF) preparation were reprogrammed in the LDS, consultants were engaged to validate the initial report. They identified several gaps which needed to be addressed, and an updated scoping report was published for consultation in 2008.

- 1.7 Subsequently, consultants have provided SA at each stage in preparation. They have made comments on the style and clarity of options and emerging policies, aiming to remove uncertainties over the kind of impact that might result. As a result, policies in the Submission document should have few significant adverse effects, and those that remain are likely to be relatively small scale, localised, and the result of policies that deliver significant benefits to other SA objectives. The influence of the SA is described in the **Sustainability Appraisal Report** which accompanies the submitted Core Strategy. This can be viewed on the Authority's website at [www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/plansandpolicies](http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/plansandpolicies).

## **2. Preliminary consultation on Issues, 2004/5**

- 2.1 A key principle at the start of the Authority's work on the LDF was to align the work with the review of the National Park Management Plan (NPMP). It was considered that many of the themes would be consistent between both plans, with the LDF being the spatial expression of the NPMP strategy. Therefore a variety of joint engagement methods were used during 2004 and early 2005 to gather evidence and opinions from local communities, visitors, partner authorities and organisations, and everyone with an interest in the National Park. The aim was to understand the key issues and consider the direction for future National Park policy. The events focused on the most contentious areas as a means of sparking debate and raising levels of interest and involvement. The 6 issues discussed were:
- affordability of housing
  - farming and biodiversity
  - tourism and recreation
  - transport
  - quarrying
  - village life
- 2.2 6 village meetings were open to the public:
- |                |           |              |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| • Bakewell     | (14 June) | 30 attended  |
| • Kettlethulme | (21 June) | 25 attended  |
| • Castleton    | (30 June) | 50 attended  |
| • Warslow      | (7 July)  | 150 attended |
| • Dungworth    | (12 July) | 30 attended  |
| • Glossop      | (15 July) | 40 attended  |
- 2.3 A questionnaire survey was undertaken over the summer. 1750 surveys were distributed at local agricultural shows, in Tourist Information Centres and libraries. 344 responses were received, 63% from visitors and 34% from residents. Responses addressed a number of issues:
- Support for linking environment and economy so that farmers can make a living – some changes to the environment would be acceptable eg more livestock, more woodland;
  - Schools, shops, Post Offices and housing are important to community life. Lack of services and public transport, and traffic impact detract from village life. It is very important to conserve and enhance the traditional village scene and tranquillity;
  - Quarrying should be as now or less;
  - An entry fee for access to the National Park is not acceptable. Should reduce cross park traffic and use traffic calming;
  - New housing should be for local communities. Second homes should not reduce the number of permanent homes.
- 2.4 The annual Parish Councils' Conference was held at Hayfield on 9 October 2004, attended by more than 40 parish councillors from around the National Park. Discussion covered issues for the LDF which were raised in the questionnaire survey and public village meetings. The annual Constituent Councils' Forum on 14 January 2005 also focused on plans review.
- 2.5 Plans Review was the focus of a National Park Member event held on 7 January 2005, which looked at issues and options around National Park purposes and duty, and considered the first year's consultation work. A Member housing workshop was held on 4 February. A debate was also held for Authority staff.
- 2.6 The annual conference with constituent councils on 14 January 2005 was an opportunity to consider key issues emerging from the National Park Management Plan and LDF consultations and reviews.

- 2.7 A Derbyshire Dales and High Peak Local Strategic Partnership event on 26 January 2005 discussed regional and sub-regional strategies, community strategies, National Park Management Plan and local development frameworks.
- 2.8 The Policy Planning Manager met representatives of Age Concern on 27 January 2005 to discuss how policy and planning issues affected them.
- 2.9 Engagement took also place with partners through the Local Access Forum, Peak Park Transport Forum, and Peak District Housing Forum; establishment of the Peak Park Recreation Forum; Moors for the Future Partnership and Stanage Forum; Visit Peak District Partnership; and partner involvement in producing strategies for Cultural Heritage and Promoting Understanding.
- 2.10 Many more issues were raised and taken forward to the next stage of consultation.

### **3. 'Help Shape the Future' consultation, 2005/6**

3.1 'Help Shape the Future' was the focus of a more formal consultation process during 2005. It was a joint document for the LDF Core Strategy and the National Park Management Plan (NPMP), to help ensure consistency and compatibility between plans and to reduce the burden of consultation on stakeholders. The NPMP is the key means by which a spatial approach for the Peak District can be achieved, and is the main document where Community Strategy priorities across the 12 constituent authorities (together with other relevant strategy documents) can be reflected and linked to policies in the LDF.

3.2 'Help Shape the Future' was based on consultation to date, and also included quantitative evidence of the main trends and issues over the previous 5 to 10 years. Its purpose was to:

- present the broad issues affecting the National Park;
- offer options for its future management; and
- invite comment and gather support for future Park management.

The options were grouped under three headings based upon National Park purposes and duty.

3.3 A 6 week period of formal consultation was undertaken from 3 May to 14 June 2005. The document was available for public inspection at the National Park Office, Bakewell and at the offices of Derbyshire Dales District Council, Matlock; High Peak Borough Council, Glossop; Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Leek; Macclesfield Borough Council, Macclesfield; and Sheffield City Council, Sheffield. The document was published on our website, together with advice on where and when paper copies were available for inspection. Copies of the document were sent to the list of 574 consultees shown in Appendix 1 and comments were invited. This was a very comprehensive scoping consultation particularly including disability and ethnic minority groups.

3.4 A 'Help Shape the Future' launch event was held on 3 May 2005 at Losehill Hall, Castleton. 66 participants from the Authority and its partners looked at options for future National Park management, and considered the challenge of working together for truly sustainable development of the National Park.

3.5 A press release was issued on 3 May 2005. The Peak Advertiser, Derbyshire Times, Buxton Advertiser, Huddersfield Examiner, Sheffield Telegraph, Matlock Mercury, Peak Times and Stockport Express carried articles about plan preparation and encouraged people to participate in the consultation and help shape the future of the National Park. Interviews were conducted with High Peak Radio, BBC Radio Derby and BBC Radio Sheffield.

3.6 A newly-styled National Park newsletter containing information on the plans review was sent to all households in May 2005. Six new fact sheets were prepared to help inform debates, and web pages were created on the Authority's website.

3.7 A total of 64 representations was received to the formal consultation, raising more than 700 individual points. A summary of the issues raised which were relevant to the Local Development Framework is at Appendix 2. All of these issues were considered during preparation of subsequent documents. Some detail was more relevant to the Development Management Policies document to be prepared later.

3.8 Four 'Securing the Future of the Peak District National Park' topic meetings were held towards the end of 2005:

- Parwich (13 October) Housing 10 attended
- Bakewell (17 October) Farming & rural economy 25 attended
- Hope Valley (3 November) Young peoples' issues 14 attended

- Wincle (17 November) Sustainable communities 31 attended

Press releases and adverts for the events were placed in local newspapers. Flyers and posters were displayed around the immediate community. Radio interviews were conducted for the Hope Valley event. Articles were included in parish newsletters in the Wildboarclough, Wincle and Danebridge area. A number of partner organisations gave presentations, sat on panels, or were happy to take questions from the floor.
- 3.9 Peak 11 Youth Conferences were attended in 2005 and 2006. These involved the major secondary schools in and around the National Park, consulting with young people to hear their views on National Park Management Plan and LDF issues.
- 3.10 Four workshops were held for Authority Members to discuss issues and options, on 7 January, 4 February, and 7 October 2005, and 5 May 2006. A staff workshop was held on 25 August 2005.
- 3.11 Officers and Members were present at a number of Agricultural Shows in the summer of 2005, to explain the LDF process and gather the views of residents and visitors:
  - Bakewell Show (4 & 5 August)
  - Manifold Show (14 August)
  - Hope Show (30 August)
  - Penistone Show (11 September)
- 3.12 Hope Valley Forums focused discussion on particular issues:
  - Off-road vehicle use (22 June 2005) 200 attended
  - Access to services (21 September 2005) 40 attended
  - Affordable housing (23 March 2006) 38 attended
- 3.13 Alongside work on the NPMP (which was adopted in December 2006), officers compiled a set of LDF policies described as Preferred Options. These were put before Members at the Authority Meeting in May 2006, with the intention of moving forward with consultation. However, further GOEM advice prompted officers to consider experiences at Stafford and Lichfield, where Inspectors found the plans unsound because a Core Strategy must present a proper range of spatial options. Officers then sought to gain more insight into LDF experiences at other authorities, and decided to rework all the material gathered during 2006 into a new set of Issues and Options for the LDF Core Strategy.

#### **4. Consultation on Issues and Options, 2007**

- 4.1 Building on the debate started in 2005, and comments received during the preparation of the new National Park Management Plan, we undertook further consultation on Issues and Options for the LDF Core Strategy.
- 4.2 Following Government Office advice received on the 'Help Shape the Future' consultation, further work was needed to clarify those matters that represented spatial options as opposed to other actions and programmes more appropriate to the NPMP. It would also be important to clearly spell out reasonable alternatives in the context of National Park purposes and other evidence. By way of simplifying first thoughts on options, the Authority consulted on a set of topic-based Issues and Options papers for a 6-week period from 18 May to 29 June 2007. The topic papers summarised the issues, evidence and possible options for future policy. Copies were sent to all Parish Councils in and adjoining the National Park.
- 4.3 Letters were sent to more than 400 consultees listed in Appendix 3. This was a smaller list than for the previous consultation, because the low level of response prompted us to tailor the list to target those groups with spatial planning and National Park interests. Consultees were informed that the documents were available on the Authority's website or as paper copies on request (51 copies were sent out). Press releases on 22 March and 3 May encouraged people to get involved and have their say. Copies of the documents were placed on deposit at the Authority's office and at constituent council offices, and 41 libraries in and around the National Park held copies of the consultation documents (see Appendix 4).
- 4.4 As proposed in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which was adopted in December 2006, a number of additional methods were used to involve people in the consultation process.
- 4.5 6 public exhibitions/meetings were held, advertised in the local press and by posters placed in shops, libraries etc:
- Bamford (29 March) 20 attended
  - Chapel en le Frith (12 April) 5 attended
  - Bakewell (16 April) 20 attended
  - Dungworth (18 April) 5 attended
  - Parwich (24 April) 10 attended
  - Warslow (10 May) 30 attended
- People who were unable to attend the meetings were invited to comment on issues such as affordable housing, quarrying, transport and the economy, via the internet, by phone or in writing.
- 4.6 On 13 June a presentation was made to the Derbyshire Dales and High Peak Local Strategic Partnership Executive Board on LDF affordable housing policy, jointly with officers from the District Councils. A Local Strategic Partnerships Workshop on 27 July discussed Community Strategy priorities and enabled the Authority to map the spatial implications of community strategies and those priorities which had greatest significance for the National Park.
- 4.7 Groups of stakeholders met to discuss issues and options, including the Land Managers Forum on 7 March, the Peak Park Parishes Forum on 8 May, and the Minerals Forum on 22 August, which was attended by 22 industry representatives.
- 4.8 Hope Valley Forums discussed the following issues:
- Transport (6 July) 24 attended
  - Communities doing it for themselves (21 June) 56 attended

- A visitor's experience (21 November) 15 attended

4.9 A total of 44 representations to the formal consultation were received, raising more than 500 individual points. These were divided between topics as follows:

Vision and objectives	68 comments
Valued characteristics	12
Landscape policy	25
Natural resources and utilities	47
Minerals	66
Transport	79
Recreation and tourism	57
Housing	65
Settlements	17
Economy	41
Waste management	21
Planning gain	7

244 comments supported particular options.

- 4.10 Detail showing the key issues raised from consultation on the issues and options, and how these were addressed in refining Options is at Appendix 5.
- 4.11 From the concerns raised by GOEM and the action plan agreed following the PAS report, it was clear that further work was still required. Evidence gathering, particularly by collaborating in joint work with Derbyshire Dales District Council and High Peak Borough Council, continued through to the middle of 2009, but by mid 2008 the Authority was ready to share a new set of options with stakeholders.

## **5. Further consultation on Issues and Options, 2008**

- 5.1 Following discussion with GOEM, the Authority recognised that an additional round of informal consultation and discussion was needed to ensure the Core Strategy met the requirements for a spatial plan. A revised LDS was approved, including a new timetable for preparation. A more detailed engagement plan was agreed, to communicate to stakeholders and local residents the spatial focus of the LDF process and encourage them to become involved. Various events were organised, involving authorities, agencies and groups, including decision makers, policy makers, developers, land managers and policy influencers.
- 5.2 The major focus of consultation was based around the introduction of landscape character to the LDF. An LDF/Landscape Character Key Stakeholder Workshop focusing on spatial strategy was held at Losehill Hall on 5 September 2008, attended by stakeholder representatives from a range of authorities and agencies. Representatives of Countryside and Land Use Consultants explained how the landscape character issues were being incorporated into the LDF and the approach to sustainability appraisal for the Core Strategy.
- 5.3 A press release was issued on 15 September 2008, encouraging people to “Have your say on planning and management of the National Park”. Articles were printed in the Matlock Mercury, Peak Times, Derbyshire Times, Macclesfield Express and Buxton Advertiser, and an interview was broadcast on Radio High Peak.
- 5.3 7 area-based public workshops were held around the National Park, including joint consultation on LDF issues and Landscape Character work:
- Kettleshulme (6 October) 11 attended
  - Hathersage (8 October) 18 attended
  - Hayfield (14 October) 16 attended
  - Warslow (15 October) 16 attended
  - Bakewell (18 October) 12 attended
  - Bradfield (20 October) 12 attended
  - Holme (22 October) 32 attended
- 5.4 These locations were chosen to reflect the different character areas which make up the National Park, to discover residents’ different values and spatial priorities. Representatives from Parish Councils, community contacts and local people involved in the landscape work were invited. A press release encouraged other residents to attend. Some of the main issues discussed at the meetings were:
- Residents in all areas were keen on renewable and sustainable energy, but wind power was a contentious issue;
  - The future of farming and its contribution to the variety of landscapes;
  - Optimism about other aspects of the economy, but speed of broadband is a concern;
  - Calls for a more flexible approach by the National Park Authority.
- 5.5 A Climate Change workshop was held on 9 September which involved a range of community representatives and major organisations. It was centred on interim findings of the Peak Sub-region Climate Change Study.
- 5.6 An evening workshop on minerals planning was held on 19 June and was attended by more than 30 people. The aim was to increase stakeholders’ understanding of the policy options and give them the opportunity to tell us what they thought.
- 5.7 Presentations were given to Staffordshire Moorlands Rural Forum on 17 April 2008 and to Derbyshire Dales and High Peak LSP on 4 June 2008 by the Policy Planning Manager.

- 5.8 A National Park Authority Member Workshop held at Aldern House on 24 October 2008 gave Members a more focussed opportunity to consider and discuss the various policy options.
- 5.8 The outcome of all of this consultation was presented in the Refined Options document, which included additional Options raised by stakeholders and members of the public.

## **6. Refined Options consultation, 2009**

- 6.1 The Refined Options document was strongly influenced by all the previous consultation, and included a comprehensive consideration of the policy, evidence and sustainability issues that had an impact on the strength of the options. It allowed a fresh assessment to be presented of the broad direction for the Core Strategy.
- 6.2 The document presented key themes in a set of topic papers, which illustrated how options were developed from responses to the previous consultations, outlined the results of Sustainability Appraisal, and set out newly-emerging options. The document also included the results of new work on devising a spatial portrait, setting out the distinctive values and challenges across 3 broad spatial areas and using evidence from the Landscape Character Assessment and the joint LDF/LCA workshops.
- 6.3 The consultation was open from 16 January to 10 April 2009. This extended period of 12 weeks was chosen principally to give Parish Councils more opportunity to participate, since some had previously commented that they had difficulty responding within the standard 6-week consultation period.
- 6.4 Copies of the document were sent to Parish Councils, constituent authorities, and other 'specific consultation bodies'. To keep costs down, other consultees were sent letters or emails explaining where to find the consultation material on the website and offering paper copies on request. In total, nearly 300 people and organisations were consulted (see list of consultees in Appendix 6). Again, this was a more targeted list than for previous consultations. Website consultation was handled through a Limehouse software portal, and responses were also welcome by phone, email or in writing. Using Limehouse enabled us to create a clear, user friendly document, with a closely-related survey to record opinion. However, there was a relatively low on-line response rate, and users encountered problems when downloading information.
- 6.5 Copies were placed on deposit at the National Park Office and at the offices of Derbyshire Dales DC, High Peak BC, Staffordshire Moorlands DC, Macclesfield BC, Sheffield City Council, and Kirklees MBC. Copies were also available to read at libraries in and around the National Park (as listed in the SCI).
- 6.6 A press release was issued on 26 January 2009, encouraging people to give their views on future Peak District planning issues. Newspapers including the Yorkshire Post, Matlock Mercury, Buxton Advertiser, Sheffield Star and Tideswell Village Voice carried items about the consultation.
- 6.7 A summary document was produced to offer a simpler, concise version of policies. This was placed on the website and copies were available on request.
- 6.8 Other events included an Authority Members' workshop held on 15 Sept 2009, which made suggestions about the style and content of the Preferred Approaches consultation document; and a number of other meetings held with groups including the Minerals Forum (with industry and community representatives), the Land Managers Forum, and the Peak Park Parishes Forum.
- 6.9 Nearly 100 respondents made comments on the Refined Options document, and 2034 individual points were logged. A summary table showing key issues and how these were addressed in drafting the Preferred Approaches document is at Appendix 7. Every comment has been considered during drafting of the Preferred Approaches document, but may also inform the more detailed Development Management policies to be contained in a subsequent Development Plan Document.

## **7. Preferred Approaches consultation, 2009**

- 7.1 Advice from the Government Office led us to make presentational changes. Contextual information on spatial aspects was made clearer; the spatial portrait and area objectives were central to the document for the first time, so it became more overtly a spatial plan.
- 7.2 The Preferred Approaches document was offered for consultation for a period of 6 weeks from 26 October to 7 December 2009. The consultation documents comprised the Preferred Approaches for the Core Strategy, Sustainability Appraisal and appendices, and Appropriate Assessment. In order to make the material more accessible to the general public, a 4-page 'easy guide' to proposed policies, and a summary of Preferred Policy Approaches, were also available.
- 7.3 Nearly 300 people and organisations were directly invited by letter or email to respond (see consultation list at Appendix 6). For this consultation we used specific letters to different groups to ask slightly different things, such as the views of parish councils on settlement strategy, and of LSPs on having regard to community strategy priorities.
- 7.4 In the interests of economy, wherever possible letters or emails were sent to consultees with direct links to the Authority's website to view the documents, and paper copies could be requested if required. Because of technical difficulties experienced with Limehouse its use was discontinued. Website consultation was handled through Survey Monkey, which offered equivalent functionality at the consultation end without problems of downloading large amounts of information. Our aim was to make the documents more accessible whilst using a simple on-line survey. Responses were also welcome by phone, email or in writing.
- 7.5 Copies were placed on deposit at the National Park Office and at the offices of Derbyshire Dales DC, High Peak BC, Staffordshire Moorlands DC, Macclesfield BC, Sheffield City Council, and Kirklees MBC. Copies were also available to read at libraries in and around the National Park (see list in Appendix 4).
- 7.6 A press release was issued on 23 October 2009 entitled "Have your say on National Park planning issues". Coverage was printed in the Glossop Chronicle, Ashbourne News Telegraph, Leek Post and Times and Yorkshire Post. A radio interview was given for BBC Radio Derby.
- 7.7 On 8 January 2010 a supplementary letter was sent to all Parish Councils, offering a further 6 week period inviting more responses on the approach to settlement policy. We were concerned that the original level of parish response on this important issue affecting communities was poor, and decided to try to generate a larger number of responses in order to properly gauge opinions. A further 14 responses were received from parishes within this period.
- 7.8 A final total of 88 responses were received making 1024 individual points. A table showing the main issues raised and how these were addressed in drafting the Core Strategy Pre-Submission DPD is at Appendix 8.
- 7.9 Every response has been considered during drafting of the Pre-Submission document, but the more detailed comments will also inform the Development Management policies to be contained in a subsequent document. Appendix 9 illustrates policy development through all stages of preparation of the Core Strategy.
- 7.10 The abolition of the Regional Assembly and revocation of the Regional Plan in June/July 2010 necessitated a revision to the intended pre-Submission consultation dates. Emails or letters were sent to everybody on the full consultation list to explain the reasons for delay.

## **8. Consultations under Regulation 27 (Pre-Submission consultation)**

- 8.1 The requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations (as amended in 2009) are:

*Regulation 27: Publication of a development plan document*

*Before submitting a DPD to the Secretary of State under section 20, the local planning authority must –*

*(a) make a copy of each of the proposed submission documents and a statement of the representations procedure available for inspection during normal office hours –*

*(i) at their principal office, and*

*(ii) at such other places within their area as they consider appropriate;*

*(b) publish on their website –*

*(i) the proposed submission documents,*

*(ii) a statement of the representations procedure, and*

*(iii) a statement of the fact that the proposed submission documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected;*

*(c) send to each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make representations under regulation 25(1) for the purposes of the DPD –*

*(i) a copy of each of the proposed submission documents, and*

*(ii) a statement of the representations procedure;*

*(d) send to each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make representations under regulation 25(1) for the purposes of the DPD –*

*(i) a statement of the representations procedure, and*

*(ii) a statement of the fact that the proposed submission documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected; and*

*(e) give by local advertisement notice which sets out –*

*(i) a statement of the representations procedure, and*

*(ii) a statement of the fact that the proposed submission documents are available for inspection and of the places and times at which they can be inspected.*

- 8.2 Consultation on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy document will take place from 15 September to 26 October 2010 and will follow the requirements set out in the Regulations and SCI. The list of consultees in Appendix 6 indicates 'specific consultation bodies' who will receive full copies of all the documents. In addition, people who commented at the Preferred Approaches stage will be included in this consultation. A separate Statement of Representations will summarise the main issues raised in this final consultation before submission to the Secretary of State.

## **Appendix 1: Who we consulted on 'Help Shape the Future'**

Abney & Abney Grange, Highlow & Offerton Parish Meeting  
Action with Communities in Rural England  
ADS Noor Project  
Advantage West Midlands  
Aeromodellers  
African Diaspora Association  
Afro-Caribbean Project  
Afro-Caribbean Talking Books  
Age Concern  
Aggregate Industries UK  
Ahmadiyya Community Development Group  
Al-Hikma Centre  
Alstonefield Parish Council  
Amber Valley CVS  
Association of National Park Authorities  
Arab Training and Information Centre  
Arts & Media Organisation  
Arts in the Peak  
Ashford Parish Council  
Asian Community Gardens Association  
Asian News  
Asian Women's Reading Group  
Association of Cycle Traders  
Association of National Park Authorities  
Aston Parish Meeting  
ATE Wales (Ministry of Defence)  
Automobile Association  
Bakewell & Eyam Community Transport  
Bakewell Access Group  
Bakewell Agricultural & Horticultural Society  
Bakewell Bridge Filling Station  
Bakewell Civic Society  
Bakewell Historical Society  
Bakewell Town Council  
Ballidon and Bradbourne Parish Council  
Bamford Community Arts and Crafts  
Bamford with Thornhill Parish Council  
Barlow Parish Council  
Barnsley Black and Ethnic Minority Initiative  
Barnsley Chamber of Commerce  
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council  
Barnsley VA  
Barrs and Co. Chartered Surveyors  
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership  
Baslow and Bubnell Parish Council  
Beeley Parish Council  
Beth Johnson Housing Association  
Birchover Parish Council  
Bismillah Association (Savile Town)  
Black and Proud User Group  
Black Environment Network  
Black Palm  
Blackwell Parish Meeting  
Blockstone Limited  
Blore with Swinscoe Parish Meeting  
Blue Mountain Activities  
Bonsall Field Barn Project  
Bonsall Parish Council  
Bosley Parish Council  
Bradfield Parish Council  
Bradford CVS  
Bradwell Parish Council  
Brampton Parish Council  
Brassington Parish Council  
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority  
British Aggregates Association  
British Association for Shooting & Conservation  
British Canoe Union  
British Cement Association  
British Ceramic Confederation  
British Driving Society  
British Hang Gliding & Paragliding Association  
British Horse Society (Derbyshire)  
British Mountaineering Council  
British Orienteering Federation  
British Telecommunications plc  
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers  
British Waterways  
British Wind Energy Association  
Brough and Shatton Parish Meeting  
Business Link Derbyshire  
Business Link Staffordshire  
Butterfly Conservation Cheshire & Peak District  
Butterton Parish Council  
Buxton Lime Industries  
Calver Parish Council  
Calver Mill Weir Liaison Group  
Camping and Caravanning Club  
Caravan Club  
Carriacou & Petit Martinique Grenada Assocn  
Castleton Chamber of Trade Ltd  
Castleton Gift Shop  
Castleton Parish Council  
Castleton Primary School  
CEMVO  
Centrica plc  
Chapel-en-le-Frith Town Council  
Charlesworth Parish Council  
Chatsworth Parish Meeting  
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees  
Chelmorton Parish Council  
Cheshire Community Council  
Cheshire County Council  
Cheshire Wildlife Trust  
Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire LSP  
Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside Parish Council  
Chisworth Parish Council  
Church Commissioners  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Coke, Turner & Co  
Commission for Rural Communities

Community & Cohesion  
 Community Council of Staffordshire  
 Congleton District CVS and Volunteer Bureau  
 Connexions Derbyshire  
 Consortium of Bengali Associations  
 Consortium of Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual Voluntary & Community Organisations  
 Coppice Community Centre  
 Council for British Archaeology  
 Council for National Parks  
 Country Land and Business Association  
 Countryside Agency  
 Countryside Agency East Midlands  
 Countryside Agency West Midlands  
 Countryside Training Partnership  
 CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire  
 Creswell Heritage Trust  
 Crown Estates  
 Cyclists Touring Club  
 Curbar Parish Council  
 Derbyshire Association of Local Councils  
 Dartmoor National Park Authority  
 Deaflinks Staffordshire  
 Defra  
 Dept for Communities and Local Government  
 Dept for Culture, Media and Sport  
 Dept of Environment, Transport & the Regions  
 Derby and Derbyshire Economic Partnership  
 Derby CVS  
 Derbyshire & P Park Sport & Recreation Forum  
 Derbyshire Aggregates Ltd  
 Derbyshire and Lancashire Gliding Club  
 Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee  
 Derbyshire Archaeological Society  
 Derbyshire Association for the Blind  
 Derbyshire Assocn of Residential Education  
 Derbyshire Bat Conservation Group  
 Derbyshire Building Society  
 Derbyshire Carers Association  
 Derbyshire Caving Association  
 Derbyshire Chamber of Trade & Business Link  
 Derbyshire Churches  
 Derbyshire Coalition for Inclusive Living  
 Derbyshire Community Foundation  
 Derbyshire Constabulary  
 Derbyshire County Council  
 Derbyshire Dales and High Peak LSP  
 Derbyshire Dales And South Derbyshire PCT  
 Derbyshire Dales CVS  
 Derbyshire Dales District Council  
 Derbyshire Dales Ranger Service  
 Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service  
 Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
 Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust  
 Derbyshire Learning and Skills Council  
 Derbyshire Lifelong Learning & Economic Devt  
 Derbyshire Partnership Forum  
 Derbyshire Probation Service  
 Derbyshire Rural Community Council  
 Derbyshire Soaring Club  
 Derbyshire Sport and Recreation Forum  
 Derbyshire Wildlife Trust  
 Derwent and Hope Woodlands Parish Council  
 Derwent Valley Rural Transport Partnership  
 Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd  
 Development Plan UK  
 Development Trusts Association  
 DIALOldham  
 Disability Sport England  
 Doncaster CVS  
 DPDS Consulting Group  
 Duke Street Community Centre  
 Dunford Parish Council  
 East Midlands Ambulance Service  
 East Midlands Churches Forum  
 East Midlands Development Agency  
 East Midlands Museums Service  
 East Midlands Regional Assembly  
 East Staffordshire Borough Council  
 Eastern Moors Horse Riding Association  
 Eaton & Alsop, Newton Grange Parish Council  
 Edale Mountain Rescue Team  
 Edale Parish Council  
 Edale Playing Field Committee  
 Edale Mountain Rescue Team  
 Edale Parish Council  
 Edale Playing Field Committee  
 Edensor Parish Meeting  
 Elton Parish Council  
 Elton Village Action Group  
 EMRAF  
 Engage East Midlands  
 English Heritage  
 English Nature  
 English Partnerships  
 Enviroment Agency (North West)  
 Enviromental Service Association  
 Environment Agency  
 Environment Agency Midlands Region  
 Environmental Services Association  
 Erewash CVS  
 Exmoor National Park Authority  
 Eyam Parish Council  
 Fairfield Farm  
 Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group  
 Fatima Women's Association  
 Fawfieldhead Parish Council  
 Fenny Bentley Parish Council  
 Fieldfare Trust  
 Fisher German  
 Fitzwilliam and Wentworth Estate  
 Flagg Parish Council

Foolow Parish Meeting  
 Forest Enterprise  
 Forestry Commission  
 Freight Transport Association  
 Friends of the Earth  
 Friends of the Peak District  
 Friends Social & Cultural Organisation  
 Froggatt Parish Meeting  
 Future Energy Solutions  
 Glebe Mines Ltd  
 Government Office for the East Midlands  
 Government Office for the West Midlands  
 Government Office for the North West  
 Gratton Parish Meeting  
 Great Fairfield Parish Council  
 Great Longstone Parish Council  
 Greater Manchester CVO  
 Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
 Greater Manchester PTE  
 Green Lane Association / DORA  
 Green Party  
 Greenpeace  
 Grindleford Parish Council  
 Grindon Parish Council  
 Haddon Estate  
 Hallamshire Historic Buildings Society  
 Halldale Property  
 Harriet Tubman Development Agency  
 Harthill Parish Meeting  
 Hartington Middle Quarter Parish Council  
 Hartington Nether Quarter Parish Council  
 Hartington Town Quarter Parish Council  
 Hartington Upper Quarter Parish Council  
 Hassop Parish Meeting  
 Hathersage Parish Council  
 Hathersage Village Action Group  
 Hayfield Parish Council  
 Hazlebadge Parish Meeting  
 Health & Safety Executive  
 Heart of England Tourist Board  
 Heathylee Parish Council  
 Heaton Parish Council  
 High Peak Access Group  
 High Peak and Dales PCT  
 High Peak Borough Council  
 High Peak CVS  
 High Peak Livestock Society  
 Highfields Farm  
 Highways Agency  
 Highways Agency Network  
 Historic Building Conservation  
 Historic Buildings & Monuments Commission  
 Hollinsclough Parish Council  
 Holme Valley Civic Society  
 Holme Valley Parish Council  
 Holmesfield Parish Council  
 Hope, Edale & Castleton Interpretation Group  
 Hope Valley Access Group  
 Hope Valley College  
 Hope Valley Community Rail Project  
 Hope Valley Community Rail Project  
 Hope Valley Lions Club  
 Hope with Aston Parish Council  
 House Builders Federation  
 Housing Corporation  
 Hucklow Parish Council  
 Huddersfield African Caribbean Carnival Cttee  
 Huddersfield Arabian Association  
 Huddersfield Chinese Community Centre  
 Hunter Archaeological Society  
 Ian Baseley Associates  
 Ible Parish Meeting  
 Ilam Community Initiative  
 Ilam Parish Council  
 Indian Association  
 Indian Muslim Welfare Society  
 Ineos Fluor  
 Institute of Public Rights of Way Officers  
 International Mountain Bicycling Association  
 John German  
 Jones Day  
 Kennel Club  
 Kettlethulme Parish Council  
 Khidmat Magazine for Women  
 King Sterndale Parish Meeting  
 Kirklees Metropolitan Council  
 Kirklees Partnership  
 Kirklees Race Equality Network  
 Kirklees Racial Equality Council  
 Kirklees VA  
 Lafarge Cement UK  
 Lake District National Park Authority  
 Landscape Institute  
 Laneside Caravan Park  
 Langsett Parish Council  
 LARA  
 Leahall Parish Meeting  
 Learning Skills Council  
 Leek and Moorlands Model Gliding Association  
 Leekfrith Parish Council  
 Lewis Wadsworth Estate Agents  
 Lindley Training  
 Little Longstone Parish Meeting  
 Litton Parish Council  
 Litton Properties Limited  
 Ljiljan Bosnia and Herzegovina Association  
 London Blind Ramblers Association  
 Long Rake Spar Co. Ltd  
 Longnor Parish Council  
 Lowfield Farm  
 Lyme Handley Parish Meeting  
 Macclesfield Borough Council  
 Macclesfield District CVS  
 Macclesfield Forest Wildboarclough Parish Mtg  
 Mai Bhago Indian Women's Society  
 Manchester Metropolitan University  
 Manchester VA  
 Matlock Business Group  
 Meltham Town Council  
 Original Blue John Craft Shop

Mid-Derbyshire Badger Group  
 Middleton and Smerrill Parish Council  
 Milen Day Centre  
 Ministry of Defence Estate Organisation  
 Ministry of Defence  
 Mobile Operators Association  
 Mono Consultants  
 Monyash Parish Council  
 Moorland Association, Peak District Branch  
 Moorlands Together LSP  
 Moors for the Future Partnership  
 Npower  
 NACRO  
 National Caving Association  
 National Council for Voluntary Organisations  
 National Council for Voluntary Youth Service  
 National Farmers Union  
 National Stone Centre  
 National Federation of Anglers  
 National Grid Company plc  
 National Market Traders' Federation  
 National Playing Fields Association  
 National Stone Centre  
 National Trust  
 National Trust (North West)  
 National Trust (Yorkshire)  
 Natural England  
 Nether Haddon Parish Meeting  
 New Mills Town Council  
 Newcastle-under-Lyme CVS  
 Network Rail North West  
 North Cheshire Housing Association Ltd  
 N Derbys Chamber of Commerce & Industry  
 N Derbys Childcare Network  
 North East Derbyshire District Council  
 North Eastern Derbyshire PCT  
 N Staffs & W Derbys Rural Transport Ptnership  
 North Stars Steel Orchestra  
 North West Development Agency  
 Northumberland National Park Authority  
 Northwest Development Agency  
 Northern Counties Housing Association  
 Oak Project  
 OBYA  
 Oil and Pipelines Agency  
 Oldfield Design  
 Oldham LSP  
 Oldham African Community  
 Oldham BME network  
 Oldham Kashmiri Assn  
 Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Oldham Polish Centre  
 One Barnsley LSP  
 One Plus (One Parent Families)  
 Onecote Parish Council  
 Open Spaces Society  
 OREP  
 Oriental Arts (Bradford) Ltd  
 Outseats Parish Council  
 Over Haddon Parish Council  
 Padley Manor Farm  
 Pakistan & Kashmir Welfare Assoc Youth Gp  
 Pakistan Society  
 Pakistani Community Centre  
 Parwich Parish Council  
 Parwich Village Action Group  
 Paul and Company ( Chartered Surveyors)  
 Peacock and Smith  
 Peak and Dukeries Land Rover Club 1983 Ltd  
 Peak and Northern Footpaths Society  
 Peak Climbing Club, Stocksbridge Project  
 Peak District Local Access Forum  
 Peak District Marketing Initiative  
 Peak District Products  
 Peak District Rural Deprivation Forum  
 Peak District Rural Housing Association  
 Peak District Sustainable Tourism Forum  
 Peak Forest Parish Council  
 Peak Forest Village Action Group  
 Peak Park Parishes Forum  
 Peak Park Transport Forum  
 Peak Park Trust  
 Peak Park Wildlife Advisory Group  
 Peak Rail plc  
 Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority  
 Pentland Chartered Surveyors  
 People's Trust for Endangered Species  
 Pilsley Parish Meeting  
 Planning Cooperative  
 Positive Action Training  
 Pott Shrigley Parish Council  
 Powergen plc  
 Puhktoon Resource Centre  
 Quarnford Parish Council  
 Quarry Products Association  
 RAC Motoring Services  
 Rainow Parish Council  
 Ramblers Association, Derbyshire Dales Area  
 Ramblers Association, New Mills & District Group  
 Ramblers Association, Yorkshire & NE Derbys  
 Rural Action Zone  
 Regal Yachting Association  
 RIBA  
 RMC Aggregates (UK) Ltd  
 Rochdale CVS  
 Rowland Parish Meeting  
 Rowsley Parish Council  
 Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors  
 Royal Mail  
 Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts - SEED  
 Royal Town Planning Institute  
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds  
 Rural Building Preservation Trust  
 Rural Development Service  
 Rural Housing Trust  
 Sheffield African Caribbean Mental Health Assoc

SACMHA Carers Group  
 Saddleworth Parish Council  
 Safer Derbyshire  
 Salfia Association  
 Salford CVS  
 Save Longstone Edge Ltd  
 Savile Town Elders Gp, Age Concern Kirklees  
 Second Step Caribbean Womens Gp - Agewell  
 Sennilow Farm  
 Severn Trent Water Ltd  
 SHEBEEN  
 Sheen Parish Council  
 Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
 Sheffield City Council  
 Sheffield City Ecology Unit  
 Sheffield Environmental Training  
 Sheffield Futures and Connexions  
 Sheffield Hallam University  
 Sheffield Visually Impaired Walking Group  
 Sheldon Parish Meeting  
 Shelter UK  
 Shelter Derbyshire  
 Snowdonia National Park Authority  
 Social Enterprise Coalition  
 Soil Association  
 South Asian Healthy Living Partnerships  
 South Darley Parish Council  
 South Derbyshire CVS  
 South Peak Raptor Study Group  
 South Yorkshire Partnership  
 South Yorkshire PTE  
 Space4trees  
 Speedwell Cavern  
 Sport England  
 St Joseph's Service to Deaf People  
 St John's Resource Centre Huddersfield  
 Stafford District VS  
 Staffordshire County Council  
 Staffordshire Historic Building Trust  
 Staffordshire Learning and Skills Council  
 Staffs Moorlands Community & Vol Services  
 Staffordshire Moorlands District Council  
 Staffordshire Moorlands PCT  
 Staffordshire Parish Council Association  
 Staffs RDA Fieldworker, Village Action Group  
 Staffordshire Wildlife Trust  
 Stanton in Peak Parish Council  
 Step-Up Project, Fartown High School  
 Stockport CVS  
 Stocksbridge Town Council  
 Stoke-on-Trent VA  
 Stoneham Housing Association  
 Strategic Rail Authority  
 Sure Start East Midlands  
 Sure Start West Midlands  
 Sustainability North West  
 Sustrans  
 Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council  
 Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Tamworth Deaf Gathering  
 Tarmac Ltd  
 Tatlow Stancer Architects  
 Tenant Participation Advisory Service  
 Terence O'Rourke plc for ETSU  
 Thornwick Lodge  
 Thorpe Parish Council  
 Tideswell Parish Council  
 Tintwistle Parish Council  
 Tissington Estate  
 Tissington Parish Council  
 TMS Europe Ltd  
 Touchstone Housing Association  
 Town and Country Planning Association  
 Trail Riders Fellowship  
 Transco  
 Transport 2000  
 Transport 2000 (Derbyshire & Peak District)  
 Transport and General Workers' Union  
 Treak Cliff Cavern  
 Treffpunkt Social Care & Health Project  
 Trent Strategic Health Authority  
 United Utilities  
 United Utilities (North West)  
 University of Derby  
 University of Sheffield  
 Visit England's North West  
 Visit Peak District & Derbyshire  
 Vivat Trust  
 Voluntary Oldham Online  
 Wardlow Parish Meeting  
 Warslow and Elkstone Parish Council  
 Waste Recycling Environmental Ltd  
 Waterhouses Parish Council  
 West Midlands Labour European Office  
 W Yorkshire Black Governors Support Service  
 West Yorkshire PTE  
 Westwood & Coldhurst Women's Association  
 Wetton Parish Council  
 Whaley Bridge Town Council  
 Wheston Parish Meeting  
 Wildlife Trusts  
 Wincle Parish Meeting  
 Winster Parish Council  
 Woodland Trust  
 Wormhill Parish Council  
 Yorkshire & Humberside Tourist Board  
 Yorkshire Culture  
 Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority  
 Yorkshire Electricity Group Plc  
 Yorkshire Forward  
 Yorkshire Naturalists Union  
 Yorkshire Rural Community Council  
 Yorkshire Water  
 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust  
 Youlgrave Parish Council  
 Youth Hostel Association

## **Appendix 2: Key points arising from 'Help Shape the Future' consultation**

### **General Spatial Strategy**

- Support for promotion of green building techniques, although they are not always compatible with traditional design.
- Developers should be required to undertake a strategic assessment of alternatives to inform decision-making on development proposals.
- Need to address the causes and impacts of climate change as requested in PPS1.

### **Landscape Strategy**

- Strong support for Landscape Character Assessment (LCA).
- Use, or make better use of, powers to deal with derelict or run down land.
- Support for a sensitive approach to development outside towns and villages, taking account of Village Design Statements (VDS) and LCA; retain flexibility for some uses.

### **Spatial Settlement Strategy**

- Support review of the Designated Settlement list. Consider each settlement's ability to accommodate new development, trends affecting services and facilities, and the relationships between parishes.
- Encourage and promote sustainable communities, by closer working with service providers and partners. Use key market towns on the fringe to sustain Park communities with jobs and services.
- Seek to prevent loss of employment, retail and community services including pubs and village garages, by resisting conversion to residential use.
- Consider development site allocations for Bakewell, to recognise the greater development pressure here than elsewhere in the Park, and its role as a key service centre.
- Support for increased community involvement in land use planning exercises at village level, to increase their understanding of the Park's special qualities and the Authority's understanding of the community.

### **Strategy for conserving and enhancing the valued characteristics**

- Strong support for retention of the Natural Zone, and for Biodiversity Action Plan and Cultural Heritage Strategy at the centre of National Park work. Safeguard non-statutory wildlife and geological sites.
- Support for a new Building Design Guide. Use all statutory powers to conserve and enhance the built environment.
- Treat barns and other buildings of traditional design as important features in their own right, encouraging new uses to ensure their conservation. Should be a greater emphasis on their re-use for locally needed affordable housing.
- Recognise that the cultural heritage and historic environment of the National Park are integral to sustainability, tourism, regeneration, economic and social inclusion objectives.
- Seek to reduce the impact of air services on the tranquillity of the Park.
- Ensure that all lighting requirements reduce the impact on the night sky.

### **Housing Strategy**

- Strong support for adopting a more proactive approach to secure a greater number of affordable homes, retaining current policy approaches but also trying to provide more homes in settlements by conversion of existing buildings, working positively with housing enablers, public and private sector players.
- Support for allocating sites for affordable housing in designated settlements in line with VDS and LCA, when a proven need is demonstrated.
- Concern that the sequential approach in PPG may not deliver affordable homes in sufficient numbers, because conversions are often expensive. May be more appropriate to require developers to provide a proportion of any new housing development as affordable housing, or levy a commuted sum.

- Apply the same space standards to new farmhouses as to local needs affordable housing, to ensure their potential to serve local housing need. Continue to tie new farmhouses to the farm business, to prevent large free market houses becoming established separate from the primary business of the farm.
- The holiday accommodation market is saturated and local needs housing on farms would be as economically beneficial as holiday lets.
- Support for lobbying housing authorities to levy higher council tax on second homes and use the revenue raised to invest in new affordable housing development.
- Introduce 'key worker' eligibility for affordable housing, to include catering staff, farmers, minerals, forestry and environmental workers.
- Improve monitoring and enforcement through closer working with housing providers, to ensure retention of more affordable housing.
- Introduce a policy that all newly built 1 & 2 bed houses can accommodate the elderly or disabled, to increase the range of accessible dwellings.
- More land needs to be made available. Strong support for exploring the potential for the Authority to use Compulsory Purchase Powers to secure land and buildings for new local needs affordable housing.

#### Utilities strategy

- Encourage small-scale renewable energy technology to provide for individual properties or communities, but retain tight control over large-scale infrastructure development. Integrate renewable energy thinking into all aspects of planning.
- Support for a roaming pilot scheme for telecommunications operators across the Snake Pass to reduce the need for the development of further masts.
- Revise policy to facilitate expansion in telecommunications infrastructure to meet increasing demand, having regard to the operational requirements of networks and the limitations of technology, whilst minimising environmental impacts.

#### Economic strategy

- Encourage farmers to explore environmentally sustainable but also economically viable forms of diversification, which increase enjoyment and understanding of the National Park's special qualities.
- Support for encouraging economic development in the countryside, linked to environmental management, and based at the farmstead or focussed upon identified key settlements.
- Caution expressed over proposals to lobby government to recognise and address the proven link between intensified land management and the demand for large modern agricultural buildings. Limiting buildings will limit the farm's potential.
- Provide small business units by conversion or refurbishment, live-work residential units, and by small-scale new development on the edge of urban centres. The focus should be for businesses that depend on the special character of the National Park.
- Support for safeguarding existing employment sites from residential development pressures, given the difficulty in finding such sites when demand does occur.
- Secure further high-tech business improvements to help minimise the disadvantages of rural location for industry and business.

#### Strategy for promoting understanding and enjoyment

- Encourage visitors to learn about the National Park and its special qualities by wider promotion, the development of better quality facilities and access to information.
- Include a more specific reference to sustainable tourism to guide development decisions for general tourist pressures.
- Support for limiting most new tourism development in the landscape to the conversion of traditional buildings, sites on farms and in settlements. Concern expressed about out-of-centre tourism proposals.
- Mixed response to the preference for caravan and camping development rather than static or chalet style accommodation: some consider that statics and chalets can be

acceptable with appropriate screening and design, others feel that their scale, style, and permanence is too harmful and is more appropriate outside the National Park. Need to consider the traffic impact of touring rather than static developments.

- Support for valuing beautiful landscapes as assets in themselves, and actively promoting appropriate activities for enjoyment, responsible recreation and understanding of the National Park, its wildlife and cultural heritage.
- Value the 'quiet enjoyment' of the Park, managing the location of environmentally damaging sports, and pursuing measures to resolve negative impacts caused by them.
- Support for increasing our understanding of the positive economic and negative environmental impacts of recreation and tourism activity on the local community. Enable communities to share the economic and employment benefits of tourism.
- Explore the visitor-tourism relationship between the National Park and fringe areas.

#### Transport strategy

- General support for an environmental levy, alongside other demand management tools. Concern about impact on commercial vehicles, local people, and people getting to and enjoying the National Park.
- Strong support for a general reduction in traffic speeds; consider also traffic volume and noise.
- Ensure the highest standards of environmental design for new transport infrastructure.
- Establish a car parking strategy for the needs of visitors and residents, agreed with district/borough councils. Focus on indiscriminate parking, not restrict legitimate demand.
- Disperse visitor pressure to outlying areas, providing alternative means of access and connecting attractions, to reduce the cost of creating and managing car parks at popular locations.
- Work with partners to demonstrate the value of green travel planning, to encourage a quieter/slower pace to enjoy the special character of the area.
- Cautious support for encouraging greater use of public transport, although funding is a key issue. Could fund from environmental levy.
- Formulate a clear, integrated accessibility strategy to include car parking, walking and cycling, and dedicated green routes for recreation purposes. Prioritise interventions that reduce the need to travel before improving transport access to other locations.
- Investigate ways to secure more sustainable travel, acknowledging the important role of the car in rural areas and the difficulty created by flexible working patterns.
- Ensure travel and traffic implications are taken into account when making decisions that affect local services.

#### Minerals strategy

- Support for a presumption against new minerals sites, and for national and regional lobbying for National Parks to provide ever smaller amounts of the regional supply of aggregates.
- Support for tight control over mineral working through permissions, conditions and monitoring. Continue enforcement action of unauthorised development. Seek to reduce the impact of quarrying by green travel plans.
- Promote small-scale extraction of building stone, roofing slate and walling stone, to secure supply for improvements to traditional buildings and minimise transport movements.

#### Waste strategy

- Support for tight control over waste management through permissions, conditions and monitoring.
- Support for small scale recycling sites, taking a strategic approach considering impact on the environment and communities. Include proper consideration of siting and design, and broaden to cover composting and local waste recovery facilities.

### **Appendix 3: Who we consulted on Issues and Options**

Abney & Abney Grange, Highlow and Offerton Parish Mtg  
Action with Communities in Rural England  
Advantage West Midlands  
Aeromodellers  
Age Concern  
Aggregate Industries UK  
Alstonefield Parish Council  
Alternative Technology Assoc Derbyshire  
Amber Valley CVS  
Arts in the Peak  
Ashford Parish Council  
Association of Cycle Traders  
Association of National Park Authorities  
Aston Parish Meeting  
ATE Wales (Ministry of Defence)  
Automobile Association  
Bakewell & Eyam Community Transport  
Bakewell Access Group  
Bakewell Agricultural & Horticultural Society Ltd  
Bakewell Civic Society  
Bakewell Historical Society  
Bakewell Town Council  
Ballidon and Bradbourne Parish Council  
Bamford with Thornhill Parish Council  
Barlow Parish Council  
Barnsley Chamber of Commerce  
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council  
Barrs and Co. Chartered Surveyors  
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership  
Baslow and Bubnell Parish Council  
Baslow Village Action Group  
Beeley Parish Council  
Beth Johnson Housing Association  
Birchover Parish Council  
Blackwell Parish Meeting  
Bleaklow Industries Ltd  
Blockstone Ltd  
Blore with Swinscoe Parish Meeting  
Blue Mountain Activities  
Bonsall Field Barn Project  
Bonsall Parish Council  
Bosley Parish Council  
Bradfield Parish Council  
Bradwell Parish Council  
Brampton Parish Council  
Brassington Parish Council  
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority  
British Aggregates Association  
British Association for Shooting and Conservation  
British Canoe Union  
British Cement Association  
British Ceramic Confederation  
British Driving Society  
British Hang Gliding & Paragliding  
British Horse Society (Derbyshire)  
British Mountaineering Council  
British Orienteering Federation  
British Telecommunications plc  
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers  
British Waterways  
British Wind Energy Association  
Brough and Shatton Parish meeting  
Business Link Derbyshire  
Business Link Staffordshire  
Butterfly Conservation  
Cheshire and Peak District Branch  
Butterton Parish Council  
Buxton Lime Industries  
Calver Parish Council  
Calver Weir Mill Liason Group  
Camping and Caravanning Club  
Caravan Club  
Castleton Chamber of Trade  
Castleton Gift Shop  
Castleton Parish Council  
Castleton Primary School  
Centrica plc  
Chapel-en-le-Frith Town Council  
Charlesworth Parish Council  
CHART LSP  
Chatsworth Parish Meeting  
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees  
Chelmorton Parish Council  
Cheshire Community Council  
Cheshire County Council  
Cheshire Wildlife Trust  
Chinley, Buxworth and Brownside Parish Council  
Chisworth Parish Council  
Church Commissioners  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Coke, Turner & Co (Chartered Mineral Surveyors)  
Community Council of Staffordshire  
Community Work Alliance  
Congleton District CVS and Volunteer Bureau  
Connexions Derbyshire  
Council for British Archaeology  
Council for National Parks  
Country Land and Business Association  
Countryside Training Partnership  
Creswell Heritage Trust  
Crown Estates  
CTC  
Curbar Parish Council  
Cyclists Touring Club Right to Ride rep  
Dartmoor National Park Authority  
Deaflinks Staffordshire  
Defra  
Department for Communities and Local Government  
Department for Transport Rail Group  
Department for Culture, Media and Sport  
Derby and Derbyshire Economic Partnership  
Derby CVS  
Derbys and Lancs Gliding Club  
Derbyshire Aggregates Ltd  
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee  
Derbyshire Archaeological Society  
Derbyshire Assoc for the Blind  
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils  
Derbyshire Association of Residential Education  
Derbyshire Bat Conservation Group  
Derbyshire Building Society  
Derbyshire Carers Association  
Derbyshire Caving Association  
Derbyshire Chamber of Trade and Business Link  
Derbyshire Churches  
Derbyshire Coalition for Inclusive Living

Derbyshire Community Foundation  
 Derbyshire Constabulary  
 Derbyshire County Council  
 Derbyshire Dales and South Derbyshire PCT  
 Derbyshire Dales CVS  
 Derbyshire Dales District Council  
 Derbyshire Dales Ranger Service  
 Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service  
 Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
 Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust  
 Derbyshire Learning and Skills Council  
 Derbyshire Network  
 Derbyshire Primary Care Trust  
 Derbyshire Probation Service  
 Derbyshire Rural Community Council  
 Derbyshire Shelter  
 Derbyshire Soaring Club  
 Derbyshire Sport  
 Derbyshire Sport and Recreation Forum  
 Derbyshire Wildlife Trust  
 Derwent and Hope Woodlands Parish Council  
 Derwent Valley RTP  
 Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd  
 Development Plan UK  
 Development Trusts Association  
 Disability Sport England  
 Doncaster CVS  
 DPDS Consulting Group  
 Dunford Parish Council  
 East Midlands Ambulance Service  
 East Midlands Churches Forum  
 East Midlands Development Agency  
 East Midlands Museums Service  
 East Midlands Regional Assembly  
 East Midlands Strategic Health Authority  
 East Staffordshire Borough Council  
 Eastern Moors Horse Riding Association  
 Eaton and Alsop and Newton Grange Parish Council  
 Edale Mountain Rescue Team  
 Edale Parish Council  
 Edale Playing Field Committee  
 Edensor Parish Meeting  
 Elkstonian Village Society  
 Elton Parish Council  
 Elton Village Action Group  
 Engage East Midlands  
 English Heritage  
 English Partnerships  
 ENPAA, c/o Natural England  
 Environment Agency (Midlands Region)  
 Environment Agency (North West Region)  
 Environmental Services Association  
 Exmoor National Park Authority  
 Eyam Parish Council  
 Farfield Farm  
 Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group  
 Fawfieldhead Parish Council  
 Fenny Bentley Parish Council  
 Fieldfare Trust  
 Fisher German  
 Fitzwilliam (Wentworth) Estates  
 Flagg Parish Council  
 Foolow Parish Meeting  
 Forest Enterprise  
 Freight Transport Association  
 Friends of the Earth  
 Friends of the Peak District  
 Froggatt Parish Meeting  
 Furness Bros  
 Future Energy Solutions  
 Galliford Try Communications  
 Glebe Mines Ltd  
 Glentoal Associates Ltd  
 Government Office for the East Midlands  
 Government Office for the North West  
 Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber  
 Great Longstone Parish Council  
 Greater Manchester CVS  
 Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
 Greater Manchester PTE  
 Green Fairfield Parish Council  
 Green Party  
 Greenpeace  
 Grindleford Parish Council  
 Grindon Parish Council  
 Haddon Estate  
 Hallamshire Historic Buildings Society  
 Halldale Property  
 Harthill Parish Meeting  
 Hartington Middle Quarter Parish Council  
 Hartington Nether Quarter Parish Council  
 Hartington Town Quarter Parish Council  
 Hartington Upper Quarter Parish Council  
 Hassop Parish Meeting  
 Hathersage Parish Council  
 Hathersage Village Action Group  
 Hayfield Parish Council  
 Hazlebadge Parish Meeting  
 Health & Safety Executive (Hazardous Installations Dir.)  
 Heart of England Tourist Board  
 Heathylee Parish Council  
 Heaton Parish Council  
 High Peak Access Group  
 High Peak and Dales PCT  
 High Peak Borough Council  
 High Peak CVS  
 High Peak Livestock Society  
 Highfields Farm  
 Highways Agency  
 Highways Agency Network  
 Historic Building Conservation  
 Hollinsclough Parish Council  
 Holme Valley Civic Society  
 Holme Valley Parish Council  
 Holmesfield Parish Council  
 Hope, Edale and Castleton Interpretation Group  
 Hope Valley Access  
 Hope Valley College  
 Hope Valley Community Rail Project  
 Hope Valley Lions Club  
 Hope with Aston Parish Council  
 House Builders Federation  
 Housing Corporation  
 Hucklow Parish Council  
 Hunter Archaeological Society  
 Hyder Consulting (UK) Limited  
 Ian Baseley Associates  
 Ible Parish Meeting  
 Ilam Housing Committee  
 Ilam Parish Council  
 Ineos Fluor  
 International Mountain Bicycling Association

John German  
 Jones Day  
 Kettlethulme Parish Council  
 King Sterndale Parish Meeting  
 Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council  
 Kirklees Partnership  
 Lafarge Cement UK  
 Lake District National Park Authority  
 Landscape Institute  
 Laneside Caravan Park  
 Langsett Parish Council  
 LARA  
 Lea Hall Parish Meeting  
 Learning Skills Council  
 Learning Skills Council - Yorkshire and Humberside  
 Leek & Moorlands Model Gliding Assoc  
 Leekfrith Parish Council  
 Lewis Wadsworth Estate Agents  
 Lindley Training  
 Litton Parish Council  
 Litton Properties Ltd  
 Longnor Parish Council  
 Lowfield Farm  
 Loxley Valley Protection Society  
 Macclesfield Borough Council  
 Macclesfield District CVS  
 Macclesfield Forest and Wildboardclough Parish Meeting  
 Macclesfield LSP  
 Manchester VA  
 Matlock Business Group  
 Matlock Carbon Neutral Forum  
 Meltham Town Council  
 Mid-Derbyshire Badger Group  
 Middleton and Smerrill Parish Council  
 Midlands Rural Housing  
 Ministry of Defence Estate Organisation  
 Ministry of Defence  
 Mobile Operators Association  
 Mono Consultants Ltd  
 Monyash Parish Council  
 Moorland Association (Peak District Branch)  
 Moorlands Together LSP  
 Moors for the Future Partnership  
 Npower  
 National Caving Association  
 National Farmers Union (East Midlands Region)  
 National Federation of Anglers  
 National Grid  
 National Market Traders' Federation  
 National Playing Fields Association  
 National Trust (East Midlands)  
 National Trust (North West)  
 National Trust (Yorkshire)  
 Natural England  
 Natural England (East Midlands Region)  
 Nether Haddon Parish Meeting  
 Nether Water Environmental Ltd  
 Network Rail North West  
 New Mills Town Council  
 NHS East Midlands  
 North Cheshire Housing Association Ltd  
 North Dales LLP  
 North Derbys Chamber of Commerce & Industry  
 North East Derbyshire District Council  
 North Staffs - West Derbyshire RTP  
 North West Regional Development Agency  
 Northern Counties Housing Association  
 Northumberland National Park Authority  
 Oil and Pipelines Agency  
 Oldfield Design  
 Oldham LSP  
 Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council  
 One Barnsley LSP  
 Onecote Parish Council  
 Open Spaces Society  
 Original Blue John Craft Shop  
 Outseats Parish Council  
 Over Haddon Parish Council  
 Padley Manor Farm  
 Parwich Parish Council  
 Parwich Village Action Group  
 Paul and Company (Chartered Surveyors)  
 Peacock & Smith  
 Peak & Northern Footpaths Society  
 Peak and Dukeries Land Rover Club 1983 Ltd  
 Peak Climbing Club  
 Peak District Holiday Parks Association  
 Peak District Local Access Forum  
 Peak District Products  
 Peak District Rural Housing Association  
 Peak Forest Parish Council  
 Peak Forest Village Action Group  
 Peak Park Trust  
 Peak Park Wildlife Advisory Group  
 Peak Rail plc  
 Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority  
 Pentland Ltd  
 Peter Wigglesworth Planning Ltd.  
 Pilsley Parish Meeting  
 Planning Cooperative  
 Pott Shrigley Parish Council  
 Powergen plc  
 Tissington Estate  
 Quarnford Parish Council  
 Quarry Products Association  
 RAC Motoring Services  
 Rainow Parish Council  
 Ramblers Association, Yorkshire & NE Derbyshire  
 Ramblers Association, Derbyshire Dales Area  
 Rural Action Zone  
 Regal Yachting Association  
 RIBA  
 RMC Aggregates (UK) Ltd  
 Rowland Parish Meeting  
 Rowsley Parish Council  
 Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors  
 Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts - SEED  
 Royal Town Planning Institute  
 RSPB Northern England Region  
 Rural Building Preservation Trust  
 Rural Housing Trust  
 Saddleworth Parish Council  
 Safer Derbyshire  
 Save Longstone Edge Ltd  
 Severn Trent Water Ltd  
 Sheen Parish Council  
 Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
 Sheffield City Council  
 Sheffield Environmental Training  
 Sheffield First  
 Sheldon Parish Meeting  
 Shelter UK

SLAG  
SLEDGE  
Slinter Mining Co Ltd  
Snowdonia National Park Authority  
Soil Association  
South Darley Parish Council  
South Downs Joint Committee  
South Peak Raptor Study Group  
South Yorkshire Partnership  
South Yorkshire PTE  
Space4trees  
Speedwell Cavern  
SPITS  
Sport England  
Staffordshire County Council  
Staffordshire Historic Building Trust  
Staffordshire Learning and Skills Council  
Staffordshire Moorlands Community and Voluntary Services  
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council  
Staffordshire Parish Council Association  
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust  
Stanton in Peak Parish Council  
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
Stocksbridge Town Council  
Stoke-on-Trent VA  
Sustainability North West  
Sustainable Youlgreave  
Sustrans  
Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council  
Tameside Metropolitan District Council  
Tarmac Ltd  
Tatlow Stancer Architects  
Terence O'Rourke plc for ETSU  
Thornwick Lodge  
Thorpe Parish Council  
Tideswell Cricket Club  
Tideswell Parish Council  
Tintwistle Parish Council  
Tissington Parish Council  
TMS Europe Ltd  
Touchstone Housing Association  
Town and Country Planning Association  
Trail Riders Fellowship  
Transco  
Transport 2000 (Derbyshire & Peak District)  
Treak Cliff Cavern  
Turley Associates  
United Utilities  
Visit Peak District & Derbyshire  
Vivat Trust  
Wardlow Parish Meeting  
Warslow and Elkstone Parish Council  
Waste Recycling Environmental Ltd  
Waterhouses Parish Council  
West Midlands Labour European Office  
West Midlands Regional Assembly  
West Midlands Strategic Health Authority  
West Yorkshire PTE  
Wetton Parish Council  
Whaley Bridge Town Council  
Wheston Parish Meeting  
Wildlife Trusts  
Wincle Parish Meeting  
Winster Parish Council  
Woodland Restoration Ltd

Wormhill Parish Council  
Yorkshire & Humber Assembly  
Yorkshire & Humberside Tourist Board  
Yorkshire Culture  
Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority  
Yorkshire Electricity Group Plc  
Yorkshire Forward  
Yorkshire Naturalists Union  
Yorkshire Rural Community Council  
Yorkshire Water  
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust  
Youlgrave Parish Council  
Youth Hostel Association

#### **Appendix 4: Deposit locations and public libraries**

Copies of documents and Notices are available to view, and response forms can be obtained, at the Authority's main office:

Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, Derbyshire DE45 1AE;  
tel 01629 816200

And at the following constituent authorities' offices ('deposit locations'):

**Derbyshire Dales District Council**, Town Hall, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3NN; tel 01629 761100

**High Peak Borough Council**, Municipal Buildings, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 8AF; tel 0845 129 7777

**Staffordshire Moorlands District Council**, Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek, Staffordshire Moorlands ST13 6HQ; tel 01538 483483

**Macclesfield Borough Council** (to April 2009) **Cheshire East Council** (from 1 April 2009), Town Hall, Macclesfield, Cheshire SK10 1DP; tel 0300 123 5500

**Sheffield City Council**, Town Hall, Sheffield, S1 2HH; tel 0114 272 6444

**Kirklees Metropolitan Council**, Civic Centre 3, Market Street, Huddersfield, HD1 1WG; tel 01484 221000

The following public libraries in and around the National Park also hold copies of documents, statutory Notices and response forms:

Ashbourne	Denton	Manchester	Stockport
Bakewell	Derby	Matlock	Stocksbridge
Barnsley	Disley	Meltham	Tameside
Biddulph	Dronfield	New Mills	Tideswell
Bollington	Glossop	Oldham	Uppermill
Buxton	Holmfirth	Penistone	Whaley Bridge
Chapel en le Frith	Honley	Poynton	Wirksworth
Chesterfield	Hyde	Prestbury	
Congleton	Leek	Sheffield	
Delph	Macclesfield	Stalybridge	

## **Appendix 5: Key points from Issues & Options consultation and how they were addressed in Refined Options**

Key points made in responses to Issues and Options consultation	How issue was addressed in drafting Refined Options
<b>Vision &amp; objectives</b>	
Need to align timescales of National Park Management Plan, Regional Spatial Strategy and Core Strategy.	Core Strategy policies will be flexible to take account of changing circumstances in other Plans, Strategies etc.
<b>Landscape</b>	
Concern about whether emerging landscape guidelines cover elements of SP policy on valued characteristics. Suggested new option – include separate core policies to conserve and enhance valued characteristics of the NP, such as wildlife and cultural heritage.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
<b>Settlements</b>	
Weight of opinion against simple lists or hierarchies. Limited capacity for new build across many settlements in the NP. 2 additional options suggested – allow criteria to determine the acceptability of development in any particular location rather than a list of settlements; and use a revised list of designated settlements, making development decisions based on available capacity rather than a hierarchy.	New options taken forward to Refined Options.
<b>Natural resources &amp; utilities</b>	
Calls for a more flexible policy towards renewable energy installations.	Too much flexibility may risk harming the landscape which would be contrary to National Park purposes. Retained as 2 options but consider combination to give an area of strict protection with LCA used to inform and guide proposals elsewhere.
Calls for clarity in telecoms policies.	Not separately addressed in Refined Options. Too detailed a policy area for Core Strategy, Local Plan policies already give adequate coverage for this issue, which can be reviewed in Development Management DPD.
New option suggested – seek green infrastructure or climate adaptation provision from all developments, either directly or as a contribution to a central fund.	As a result of greater understanding of issues surrounding climate change and the importance of action to address them, new Issues and Options are offered on the energy hierarchy, scale of energy installations, flood risk reduction/water conservation, impact of climate change on land management, biodiversity and air quality.
<b>Minerals</b>	
Should refer to the role of recycled materials in reducing aggregate demand. Concern about limestone extraction taking place on the pretext of fluorspar working.	Not specifically mentioned in Refined Options. Key decision taken at this stage not to take a mineral by mineral approach, aim to be more strategic. Refined Options document gives an overview of different minerals. Detailed debate took place on the best overall fit for minerals policy, to give a much more bespoke approach aiming to balance national and regional policy with local circumstances.

Many respondents wanted a debate on the long term future of cement production in Hope Valley.	Not mentioned in Refined Options. See comment above. (The Preferred Approaches and Pre-Submission version set out more detail on the long term choices for cement production on the Hope Valley).
<b>Transport</b>	
Suggested new option - reduce unnecessary signage, retain parking polices, and reduce parking in new development to within national guidelines or even further.	New options taken forward to Refined Options.
New option suggested to bring together all the actions around sustainable transport - improve public transport, ensure compatibility with objectives and policies of other agencies, safeguard linear routes, require developments above a certain size to produce enforceable Travel Plans, and ensure that all development complies with accessibility criteria and provides sustainable transport.	Options covering the availability of access to public transport, and increasing its attractiveness, are not included in Refined Options in light of a focus on core issues with spatial implications. Other elements are taken forward in separate Issues/Options, rather than as a single option.
<b>Recreation &amp; tourism</b>	
Additional option suggested - reject major new tourism or recreational facilities in view of the potential traffic impact and environmental decline.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
Suggested new option - resist new build serviced holiday accommodation unless replacing existing holiday accommodation, because of potential traffic impact and environmental decline.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
Suggested new option – allow larger caravan and camping sites where they can be provided without harm to the valued characteristics of the NP, but not permanent chalets, lodges or static caravans.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
New options suggested – encourage caravan and camping sites to improve quality, eg by landscaping or by colouring/replacing static caravans.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
<b>Housing</b>	
Concern that social housing should remain permanently so through the involvement of Housing Associations.	It is now a generally accepted principle that social housing must be secured in perpetuity. NPA can restrict occupancy of newly built houses to meet the needs of people in the locality. We will work closely with other social housing providers.
New option suggested - build open market housing to cross-subsidise affordable housing.	Affordable housing needs of local communities must be addressed in context of NP purposes. EIP into the EM RSS tested and upheld this. It discounted the option of building open market housing solely in order to generate funds for locally-needed affordable housing. Therefore not taken forward to Refined Options, other than through schemes justified by conservation and enhancement of the National Park.
Suggested additional option on how to define local eligibility for affordable housing - define a radius of 3 miles.	Detailed discussion about whether to change the definition of local eligibility for affordable housing is more suited to development control policies than policies in Core Strategy.

<b>Economy</b>	
Suggested new option combining elements of the options for employment sites - review existing sites, propose other uses if sites were not needed; and consider new sites in accessible locations with appropriate travel policies.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
Suggested new option - limit new employment sites to areas with access to sustainable forms of transport.	New option taken forward to Refined Options.
Comments stressed the importance of farming to maintaining landscape quality in the National Park, and that farmers need to be able to adapt to remain viable.	The NPA supports diversification of the farming economy, where it contributes positively to conservation and enhancement of the National Park landscape, and where it supplements farmers' incomes. However, people other than farmers can be responsible for maintaining the landscape. Refined Options also explored whether businesses should be established in the countryside without a direct link to agriculture or land management.
<b>Waste management</b>	
It should not be assumed that all waste facilities are adverse to National Park environment; we should encourage local management of locally generated waste.	3 options taken forward include a policy presumption against all waste management facilities, but acknowledge that since this would preclude small scale collection facilities for recycling it is inappropriate. Other options are to accept locally-generated waste from the NP, and a new option using the Waste Hierarchy as an overriding policy principle.
Accepting waste management sites may help combat unauthorised sorting/treatment operations.	Accepting sites would be contrary to municipal waste management plans and NP purposes. Unauthorised operations are an enforcement issue.
<b>Planning gain</b>	
Planning gain should only be applied to housing schemes and large developments, because it might stall development.	Not included in Refined Options. Considered at this stage to be more appropriate to Development Management Policies DPD. (However, change of emphasis in amended Regs to delivery focus, and introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy, increased the profile of planning gain issues, so this issue was brought back at Preferred Approach stage.)

## **Appendix 6: Who we consulted in later stages**

Abney & Abney Grange PC\*  
Adrian Russell Associates  
Advantage West Midlands\*  
Age Concern  
Aggregate Industries UK  
Aldwark PC\*  
Alstonefield PC\*  
Ashford PC\*  
Ashover PC\*  
Aston PC\*  
Bakewell Town Council\*  
Bakewell Access Group  
Bakewell and District Historical Society  
Bakewell & Eyam Community Transport  
Bakewell & District Civic Society  
Ballidon & Bradbourne PC\*  
Bamford with Thornhill PC\*  
Barlow PC\*  
Barnsley Metropolitan Council\*  
Baslow & Bubnell PC\*  
Beeley PC\*  
Beth Johnson Housing Association  
Birchover PC\*  
Blackwell in the Peak PC\*  
Bleaklow Industries Ltd  
Blore with Swinscoe PC\*  
Bollington Town Council\*  
Bonsall Energy Group  
Bonsall PC\*  
Bosley PC\*  
Bradfield PC\*  
Bradnop PC\*  
Bradwell PC\*  
Brampton PC\*  
Brassington PC\*  
British Aggregates Association  
British Cement Association  
British Gas\*  
British Mountaineering Council  
British Telecommunications plc\*  
British Waterways  
Brough & Shatton PC\*  
Brushfield PC\*  
Business Link East Midlands  
Business Link Staffordshire  
Butterton PC\*  
Buxton Town Council\*  
Calver PC\*  
Carsington & Hopton PC\*  
Castleton PC\*  
Cemex UK Materials Ltd  
Central & Eastern Cheshire Primary Care Trust\*  
Centrica plc  
Chapel en le Frith PC\*  
Charlesworth PC\*  
CHART LSP  
Chatsworth House Trust  
Chatsworth PC\*  
Chelmorton PC\*  
Cheshire Community Council  
Cheshire Constabulary\*  
Cheshire County Council\*  
Cheshire Wildlife Trust  
Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside PC\*  
Chisworth PC\*  
Coal Authority\*  
Council for British Archaeology  
Council for National Parks  
Country Land and Business Association  
Cromford PC\*  
Curbar PC\*  
Darley Dale PC\*  
Department for Transport Rail Group  
Derbyshire Aggregates Ltd  
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee  
Derbyshire Coalition for Inclusive Living  
Derbyshire Constabulary\*  
Derbyshire County Council\*  
Derbyshire County Primary Care Trust\*  
Derbyshire Dales & South Derbyshire PCT\*  
Derbyshire Dales CVS  
Derbyshire Dales District Council\*  
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust  
Derbyshire Mental Health Service  
Derbyshire Rural Community Council  
Derbyshire Sport  
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust  
Derwent & Hope Woodlands PC\*  
Disley PC\*  
Dunford PC\*  
East Staffordshire Borough Council\*  
East Midlands Ambulance Service  
East Midlands Reg Assembly/Leaders Board\*  
East Midlands Development Agency\*  
East Midlands Housing Association  
East Midlands Trains  
Eaton & Alsop PC\*  
Edale PC\*  
Edensor PC\*  
Elton PC\*  
Emery Planning Partnership  
English Heritage\*  
ENPAA  
Environment Agency\*  
e-on\*  
Equity Housing  
Eyam PC\*  
Fawfieldhead PC\*  
Fenny Bentley PC\*  
Flagg PC\*  
Foolow PC\*  
Forest Enterprise  
Freight Transport Association  
Friends of the Peak District  
Froggatt PC\*  
Geoplan Ltd

Glebe Mines Ltd  
 Glientoal Associates Ltd  
 Glossop TC\*  
 Government Office for the East Midlands\*  
 Gratton PC\*  
 Great Hucklow PC\*  
 Great Longstone PC\*  
 Green Fairfield PC\*  
 Grindelford PC\*  
 Grindon PC\*  
 Harthill PC\*  
 Hartington Middle Quarter PC\*  
 Hartington Nether Quarter PC\*  
 Hartington Town Quarter PC\*  
 Hartington Upper Quarter PC\*  
 Hassop PC  
 Hathersage PC\*  
 Hayfield PC\*  
 Hazlebadge PC\*  
 Heathylee PC\*  
 Heaton PC\*  
 High Peak and Dales PCT\*  
 High Peak Borough Council\*  
 High Peak CVS  
 Highways Agency/Sec of State for Transport\*  
 Highways Agency East Midlands  
 Highways Agency Network  
 Hollinsclough PC\*  
 Holme Valley PC\*  
 Holmesfield PC\*  
 Holymoorside & Walton PC\*  
 Homes and Communities Agency  
 Hope PC\*  
 Hope Valley Access Group  
 House Builders Federation  
 Ian Baseley Associates  
 Ible PC\*  
 Ilam PC\*  
 Ineos Fluor  
 Ivonbrook Grange PC\*  
 Kettlehulme PC\*  
 King Sterndale PC\*  
 Kirklees Metropolitan Council\*  
 Kirklees Partnership  
 Kniveton PC\*  
 Lafarge Cement  
 Langsett PC\*  
 Leekfrith PC\*  
 Little Longstone PC\*  
 Litton PC\*  
 Local Access Forum (Peak District)  
 Longnor PC\*  
 Loxley Valley Protection Society  
 Lyme Handley PC\*  
 Macclesfield Borough/East Cheshire Council\*  
 Macclesfield Forest & Wildboardclough PC\*  
 Mapleton PC\*  
 Matlock Bath PC\*  
 Matlock Town Council\*

Meltham PC\*  
 Middleton & Smerrill PC\*  
 Middleton by Wirksworth PC\*  
 Mineral Products Association  
 Ministry of Defence  
 Mobile Operators Association\*  
 Mono Consultants Ltd  
 Monyash PC\*  
 Moorland Association (Peak District Branch)  
 Moorlands Together LSP  
 Mossley PC\*  
 National Farmers Union East Midlands Region  
 National Grid\*  
 National Trust  
 Natural England\*  
 Nether Haddon PC\*  
 Network Rail NW  
 New Mills PC\*  
 North East Derbyshire District Council\*  
 Northern Counties Housing Association  
 Northern Rail  
 North Staffordshire Primary Care Trust\*  
 North West Regional Development Agency/4NW\*  
 Northwood & Tinkersley PC\*  
 Nottingham Community Housing Association  
 Npower\*  
 Offcote & Underwood PC\*  
 Oil and Pipelines Agency  
 Okeover PC\*  
 Oldham LSP  
 Oldham Metropolitan Council\*  
 Onecote PC\*  
 Other National Park Authorities  
 Outseats PC\*  
 Over Haddon PC\*  
 Parwich PC\*  
 Peacock & Smith  
 Peak District Rural Housing Association  
 Peak Forest PC\*  
 Peak Park Parishes Forum  
 Pilsley PC\*  
 Planning Inspectorate\*  
 Pott Shrigley PC\*  
 Powergen plc\*  
 Quarnford PC\*  
 Rainow PC\*  
 Ramblers Association Derbyshire Dales Area  
 Ramblers Association Gtr Man & High Peak  
 Ramblers Association New Mills & District Group  
 Ramblers Association Yorkshire & North East  
 Renewable UK  
 Reopen Woodhead Railway Line Group  
 Rowland PC\*  
 Rowsley PC\*  
 RSPB  
 Rural Building Preservation Trust  
 Rural Housing Trust  
 Saddleworth PC\*  
 Sanctuary Housing Group

Severn Trent Water plc\*  
Sheffield City Council\*  
Sheffield First  
Sheen PC\*  
Sheldon PC\*  
South Darley PC\*  
South Yorkshire Police\*  
Sport England  
Staffordshire County Council\*  
Staffordshire Historic Building Trust  
Staffordshire Moorlands Comm & Vol Services  
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council\*  
Staffordshire Moorlands PCT\*  
Staffordshire Police\*  
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust  
Stagecoach East Midlands  
Stanton in Peak PC\*  
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council\*  
Stocksbridge PC\*  
Stoney Middleton PC\*  
Sustainable Bakewell  
Sustainable Youlgreave  
SUSTRANS  
Sutton PC\*  
Taddington PC\*  
Tameside Metropolitan District Council\*  
Tarmac Ltd  
The Woodland Trust  
Thorpe PC\*  
Tideswell PC\*  
Tintwistle PC\*  
Tissington & Lea Hall PC\*  
Tissington Estate  
Tittesworth PC\*  
TM Travel Ltd  
Transco  
Trent Barton  
United Utilities\*  
United Utilities North West\*  
Wardlow PC\*  
Warslow & Elkstones PC\*  
Waterhouses PC\*  
West Midlands Regional Assembly/Leaders Board\*  
Wetton PC\*  
Whaley Bridge PC\*  
Wheston PC\*  
Wincle PC\*  
Winster PC\*  
Wormhill PC\*  
Yorkshire & Humber Regional Assembly/Leaders Board\*  
Yorkshire Electricity Group plc\*  
Yorkshire Forward\*  
Yorkshire Water\*  
Youlgreave PC\*

\* 'specific consultation bodies'

## **Appendix 7: Key issues from Refined Options consultation and how they were addressed in selecting Preferred Approaches**

Key issue from Refined Options consultation	How issue was addressed in selecting Preferred Approaches
<b>Landscape</b>	
<p>There was equally strong support for either retaining strict protection of the Natural Zone (with exceptions for some types of development which should be tightly defined), or for a more flexible approach allowing landscape to change and evolve. Some respondents were concerned that more flexibility could damage the environment, and there were too many uncertainties. There was little support for a greater level of control, which might restrict economic growth and increase commuting, and there was no confidence in the ability to provide effective enforcement. However, greater control to prevent scrap and dereliction in the countryside was supported.</p>	<p>This has been dealt with by elevating landscape strategy (including the LCA) to Preferred Approach L1 whilst retaining the Natural Zone to protect the most sensitive landscapes. This means that there is greater information on which to base decision making and that the Natural Zone is not the overriding factor in decision-making on impact of proposals in landscape. The need for greater control to prevent scrap and dereliction in the countryside should be dealt with by DPD policies and/or SPDs.</p>
<p>Concern about the absence of a separate section on recreation and quiet enjoyment.</p>	<p>Visiting and Enjoying issues (Preferred Approaches VE1A &amp; B) have been added as a separate chapter.</p>
<p>There was strong support for retaining recreation zones. They could be reviewed in the light of LCA, but zones must include biodiversity and accessibility criteria as well as landscape considerations. A number of responses wanted to simplify current zones to refer only to the most sensitive areas and those under heaviest recreation pressure. Some respondents wanted a more flexible approach which would assess each proposal on its merits, looking at amenity, transport, heritage and landscape, and enabling natural evolution of recreational activity.</p>	<p>The decision on the approach to the recreation zone issue is for either General Spatial Policy or recreation policy rather than landscape policy. Feedback from recreation officers was that recreation zoning was perhaps unnecessary in light of landscape character work. Preferred Approach L1 now gives prominence to this work for all development proposals.</p>
<b>Settlements</b>	
<p>Respondents preferred to achieve a network of sustainable communities through a criteria-based approach, rather than using a list of settlements to limit where development would be acceptable. Small communities have been neglected by the current policy. Respondents wanted flexibility, to accommodate the proven needs of communities for affordable housing and small businesses in sustainable locations where there is capacity, and to conserve and enhance the landscape. However, the chosen approach must provide clarity for developers and be robust enough to stand up on appeal. Settlement policy needs to consider the network of settlements and the role they play together rather than taking each settlement in isolation.</p>	<p>The criteria-based policy has been tested and on balance rejected because it is not in line with national or regional guidance and is not spatial. This decision is taken in the knowledge that some local communities don't like it. We do not accept that small communities have been neglected, and the latest response from parishes on balance supports this view. We have provided flexibility for sustainable development in what we consider to be the most sustainable locations (taking into account capacity for development as a key factor in NP context). We think it does provide clarity for developers and will stand up on appeal. Choice of settlements has considered inter-relationship of settlements rather than each in isolation.</p>
<b>Climate change and natural resources</b>	
<p>Policy should be underpinned by more detailed guidance eg review of energy SPG. There was criticism that the NPA is proposing an unachievable goal if</p>	<p>SPG will be updated to SPD covering climate change, sustainable building and renewable energy. Current SPG and practice shows that low carbon and</p>

it expects green energy generation to have no impact on the landscape.	renewable energy technologies can be accommodated in the landscape in a sensitive manner.
There was strong support for identifying areas with scope for encouraging micro-renewables, and areas where there should be strict protection from inappropriate development eg Natural Zone or SSSIs. Responses debated how LCA could be used to assess impact on the landscape, and how to balance landscape considerations with the need to promote sustainability. Considering all applications for renewables in the context of landscape and design policies might allow some more flexibility, but there was concern that the most precious areas of wilderness might not be adequately protected. Policy should determine what is 'small-scale', and how to accommodate technological advances that might happen over the plan period.	Sub-region Climate Change study was jointly commissioned by the National Park, Derbyshire Dales District Council and High Peak Borough Council to consider potential for renewables and low carbon technologies incorporating a landscape sensitivity analysis of the area. The Study (published in July 2009) provides evidence-based understanding of capacity of landscape to accommodate wind turbine development in terms of scale and location in accordance with the requirements of PPS22.
Responses faced up to the difficult challenge of balancing measures to combat climate change and ensuring conservation as a National Park priority. Promotion of a sequential approach to the energy hierarchy received the strongest support, but there were misgivings about what would be achieved in reality. Respondents supported setting requirements for on-site renewable energy generation for either major developments or all development, several suggesting that the policy should set a more aspirational target.	Preferred Approach CC2 strengthens the sequential approach to the energy hierarchy, giving priority to energy conservation before energy generation. It links carbon reductions to readily quantifiable mechanisms such as Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Emissions rate. 'Fabric first' approach is consistent with NPA's responsibilities for affordable housing, ensuring that the most cost-effective means of achieving affordable warmth are considered first.
The majority of respondents would accept waste management facilities inside the Park to deal with locally-generated waste, if need was demonstrated, the site was environmentally acceptable and the least-damaging site was chosen. Key issues include accessibility of sites from the strategic road network and small scale. The waste hierarchy should be promoted, particularly recycling facilities including farm waste.	Preferred Approach CC6b widens the scope from current policy to consider agricultural waste generated within the NP, with separate criteria for the management of domestic, industrial and commercial waste in CC6a.
There was strong support for identifying development sites where construction and demolition waste could be reused. Consideration needs to be given to potential environmental impacts, and appropriate controls to cover contamination and dust generation. The reuse of waste materials from demolition, excavation or construction within the same site (or as close as possible) was strongly supported.	Preferred Approach CC1 encourages the re-use of construction and demolition waste. Indicative Development Management Criteria are set out, which will be included in a separate Development Plan Document
<b>Housing</b>	
There was unanimous support to allow flexibility to cater for the needs of the population for different types and tenure of housing, but not to set targets responding to the housing needs of different groups. There should be no form of housing target – should respond to need. The long-term sustainability of a village and its ability to function and support services, infrastructure and cultural heritage must be included, including recognition that housing for other than affordable needs may be appropriate in some settlements. There is little point in providing social housing in settlements with no services; large	Figures included are estimates rather than targets and are neither minima nor maxima. Issues around sustainability of villages form part of the settlement strategy considerations (see above). There are some circumstances where open market housing may be appropriate eg in changes of use and as a proportion of larger enhancement projects (where they would not otherwise be viable). Other than this, however, meeting affordable need remains the emphasis for new-build on rural exception sites. In the absence of housing targets and given NP purposes, there is no other justification for (new) open

villages offer the most opportunities and are the most sustainable.	market housing in addition to the existing stock.
There was concern about the feasibility of buy-back, in particular whether the rate of turnover will be sufficient to allow identified needs to be met with the required types and tenures in the places that are in need. Enhancement and reuse could be combined with increasing the amount of buy-back over time. There was preference for 'buy-back' to prioritise settlements where need was identified by the housing authorities and social housing providers, and those where it was difficult to accommodate new buildings. Some respondents felt that the economics of buy-back is not a planning matter.	The choice to retain 'buy-back' does not place heavy or over-reliance on this action and sits alongside new-build for affordable housing. Recognise that implementation will require dedicated effort by partners to develop appropriate systems. Preference for the location of buy-back will be led by the housing providers given that it does not require planning permission, but the NPA will contribute to partnership discussion on this point.
There was support for allowing special circumstances to be taken into account in cases of care need, although allowing too much flexibility for occupancy of supported housing might place disproportionate demand on the National Park. The provision of 'lifetime homes' needs to be developed into specific planning policy.	Flexibility is retained in the appropriate policy but without breaking the intent to serve needs arising within the National Park. We do not consider that a separate policy is required in the core strategy in order to encompass lifetime homes. More reference may be appropriate in Development Management policy.
Using more enhancement sites and changing the use of existing buildings was strongly supported, particularly in preference for their use as holiday accommodation. Specific opportunities for new housing that could be justified by enhancement should be identified in a Site Allocations DPD. There should be a flexible approach to the proportion of affordable homes that can be achieved in an enhancement scheme, but it should be clearly set out that the Authority will require as many affordable as is viable and needed to meet demand (according to the housing authority). A financial contribution should be required if a proportion of affordable houses was not possible or viable, and could be combined with setting out clear principles in the plan and then establishing the most suitable proportion on a scheme by scheme basis.	This approach is carried forward to the Preferred Approaches.
Rural exceptions policy should run side by side with the identification of larger sites for affordable housing. If legal advice or judgments indicate there are serious risks, sites should not be allocated on the proposals map and a limited revision of policy should remove the commitment. Although difficult, affordable housing site identification would help provide the necessary certainty in the planning process.	The NPA disagrees with those that favour site allocation, and prefers to continue its current successful approach to housing provision which it considers will help to prevent land price inflation and involve less risk.
New build homes are probably the best way to address housing need due to their flexibility - good utilisation of space and economic to run. However, there is concern that new build could leave existing village centres with a rapidly deteriorating stock of older houses that an ageing population would not be able to maintain and upgrade to increasingly stringent environmental and energy efficiency standards.	New build forms part of the Preferred Approach. Buy-back offers some opportunity to accelerate the up-grade of existing stock. Upgrades to existing housing stock will be a matter led by housing authorities.
<b>Economy</b>	
The majority of responses wanted to allow more diversified uses in both modern and traditional farm buildings in the countryside. Some respondents	The Preferred Approach widens the scope from current policy, to allow small businesses to be established in the countryside. It is not as permissive as

wanted policy to be more flexible and not require a link to agriculture or land management, but others are concerned that this could lead to a decline in landscape character.	some respondents would like to see, since the main purpose is to support farmers and land managers and enable them to maintain their land sustainably and in line with NP purposes.
There was overwhelming preference for allowing employment development in any settlement, subject to scale in the village setting and appropriate transport arrangements. No one wanted to limit employment development to Bakewell or the larger settlements. A minority wanted to select locations with sustainable transport, to reduce the need to travel by private car.	The strength of response generally supports the preferred approach, which steers employment development to settlements named categories A and B in Preferred Approach GSP4b. These villages are selected according to location, size, function, access to services, and capacity for new development. Villages in category C are very small but the opportunity remains for businesses to be established as diversification to support farming and land management.
Should include policy encouraging homeworking and live-work units.	Homeworking is included within Preferred Approach E2. Live-work units are not included; they have experienced mixed success elsewhere, and can be too inflexible in small settlements. The ability to accommodate many employment uses close to existing homes and on new mixed-use developments allows sufficient flexibility.
Respondents supported a review of existing employment sites, allowing other uses on surplus sites, because this meets the sustainability agenda. Blanket safeguarding of existing sites would not ensure that the best sites are retained or promoted. No-one supported allocating more sites, because there was a risk of blight, but we must retain the opportunity for business development in new locations if a viable case could be made. There were calls for improved IT provision and to allow small scale warehousing facilities.	Responses support the Preferred Approach E3. IT improvements are included within infrastructure and other improvements on existing sites encouraged by E3. Preferred Approaches in E1, E2 and E3 do not specifically prevent small scale warehousing facilities.
Several respondents agreed that major new recreation and tourism facilities would be inappropriate and unnecessary, but others felt that this was too restrictive. There was a plea to allow for the constantly evolving nature of recreation. It is important to retain the freedom from man-made intrusion as the essence of the National Park.	Preferred Approach VE1b encourages recreation and tourism facilities based upon the NP's valued characteristics, provided that factors such as location, capacity, scale and intensity of use are appropriate. New forms of recreation may be acceptable if they meet these requirements. Protection of the Natural Zone by GSP4a will ensure that wilderness areas remain.
Any assessment of need for hotel accommodation should take into account the abundant supply of hotel bed spaces in neighbouring areas. The exploration of eco-tourism opportunities was well supported, because it could provide additional jobs with minimum impact, but it needs definition.	Despite the amount of holiday accommodation around the NP, some evidence suggests that there is a shortage of serviced accommodation within. There is limited indication of demand for new hotels, but it is considered appropriate to positively encourage a new hotel in Bakewell, which has the best chance of meeting developers' aspirations. Eco-tourism is not specifically referred to because there is no widely accepted definition, but acceptable proposals could be permitted under E4 and VE1b.
Proposals for change of use should consider affordable housing in preference to holiday accommodation, if housing need was indicated.	It is not reasonable to require that priority is given to affordable housing over holiday accommodation. Holiday accommodation can provide extra income for farmers, help conserve traditional buildings and increase opportunities to enjoy the NP.
There was strong support for permitting only small scale caravan and camping sites, which would be the most compatible with National Park	The selection of Preferred Approach E5 is reinforced by the strong support for small caravan and camping sites and the concerns about static caravans

<p>purposes, but the term 'small scale' needs to be defined. Acknowledging that there is demand for more sites, some responses were in favour of allowing larger sites where intrusion and access are adequately addressed. Several responses were concerned that larger sites and statics/chalets would harm the National Park, increase traffic and raise sustainability issues, although two respondents felt that the NPA should be more positive and flexible.</p>	<p>and lodges. "Small scale" will be defined in subsequent Development Management Policy.</p>
<p><b>Minerals</b></p>	
<p>Not surprisingly, views are polarised between the industry wanting to continue mineral extraction and others wishing to limit minerals activity. Balancing protection for the National Park against economic pressures is crucial. There are some cases when environmental impact could be as great outside the Park boundary; it might sometimes be less damaging to source building stone for local use from small sites within the National Park. Policy needs to allow for the provision of building and roofing stone for conservation use, in line with Annex 3 of MPS1. The allocation of sites for fluorspar extraction was less popular; more evidence is needed of the national need and the quantity and quality of reserves.</p>	<p>The selection of Preferred Approaches MIN1/MIN2/MIN3/MIN4 seeks to balance economic and supply considerations for the various minerals against environmental considerations and the statutory duty to protect the NP. This issue will always be polarised between the industry and environmental lobby. The Preferred Approach is based on RSS policy requirement to work towards a gradual reduction in mineral extraction in the NP. Parts of the industry have fundamental concerns about RSS policy, but the LDF must conform to the RSS. A broadly new Preferred Approach for fluorspar has evolved from the Refined Options, developed as a hybrid based upon discussion with the industry, the issues of the national and international markets and how best to protect the landscape of the NP whilst allowing some form of extraction. The Preferred Approach for building stone has also been sub-divided, with large scale proposals being moved to the overall minerals policies, and a positive approach being taken towards small scale building and roofing stone proposals with safeguards to restrict their use to within the NP.</p>
<p>The option of not safeguarding any minerals received the most support, because there is no need to safeguard reserves given the low level of development in the National Park. However there was some support for safeguarding the most valuable resources such as fluorspar (if the government decide which reserves are to be safeguarded), and building stone (because of its continuing contribution to local character).</p>	<p>The option not to safeguard any minerals is contrary to national planning Policy in MPS1 and cannot be followed. Where MPAs have not included such safeguarding policies, they have been advised by the Planning Inspectorate not to proceed to Examination as they would almost certainly be found unsound. The Preferred Approach MIN7 seeks to identify key mineral resources for safeguarding, which is an extension of option M2.3. This will include some fluorspar vein structures, limestone of 98% calcium carbonate, and some sites for local building and roofing stone once these can be identified.</p>
<p>Establishing a preference for particular after-uses was generally supported, particularly the creation of links and buffers to mitigate historic habitat losses. However, there were calls for sufficient flexibility to make decisions on a site-by-site basis within a framework of guidance. The wishes of land owners should be taken into account. Reinstatement must be integral with the extraction planning - otherwise it will continue to be piecemeal and not meet the objective of enhancing the overall National Park environment.</p>	<p>Refined Options proposed two approaches towards restoration, the first to look on a site-by-site basis, and the second focussing on meeting biodiversity and landscape outcomes. The Preferred Approach takes forward a hybrid of these two, with site-by-site solutions being required but which contribute to the overall objectives of the NP.</p>

<b>Transport</b>	
There was strong support for ensuring that design of transport infrastructure conserves and enhances valued characteristics, supporting means to mitigate wildlife severance, and taking a more proactive role to influence review of speed limits and consistency across NP. Few liked leaving these things to the Highway Authorities, and many wanted a sympathetic approach to reflect NP characteristics and views of local communities.	Preferred Approach T2 is a combination of Refined Options T1.2 and T1.3. This aims to ensure that all transport infrastructure is carefully designed to take account of the NP's valued characteristics, and also provides mitigation measures for wildlife severance. The Preferred Approach retains an aspiration to take a proactive role in influencing speed limits.
There was strong support for resisting all new road schemes, including those currently safeguarded or given 'in principle support'. New roads would destroy landscape, wildlife and peace of the National Park. Only with stringent restrictions can the Park hope to survive - sandwiched as it is between 2 major urban areas. However some said that removing support for the Tintwistle bypass is very restricting in the longer term, and is unlikely to be sustainable; committing the Authority to opposing such a scheme until 2025 does not provide the flexibility needed. The Core Strategy should identify a clear role for the NPA in promoting and developing sustainable transport measures for the Longdendale Valley	Preferred Approach T3 combines Refined Options T2.3 and T2.4. This approach removes all 'in principle support' for new roads and resists new road schemes unless they provide access or in exceptional circumstances. Since this Preferred Approach allows for road schemes to be permitted in exceptional circumstances, it has an appropriate level of flexibility for the duration of the Plan. The Core Strategy will provide a clear policy basis for the NPA, as a planning authority, to form a view on any measures that are developed and promoted by highway and public transport authorities for the Longdendale Valley.
Many respondents favoured continuing to safeguard former rail routes (Matlock-Buxton and Woodhead) for their possible reinstatement, although there was concern about impact on landscape and wildlife and the possibility of providing replacement trails. Enhancements to local services on the Hope Valley line were also supported.	Preferred Approach T5 is a combination of Refined Options T6.2 and T6.4. This approach safeguards former rail routes for possible reinstatement, and safeguards land for enhancements to the Hope Valley Line. It should be noted that the preferred approach allows for any reinstatement of rail to be assessed on its merits – this would include impacts on landscape, wildlife and possible alternative routes for trails.
Respondents supported the current approach to car parking provision and enhancing coach parking facilities, with the ability to apply more restrictive measures on a case-by-case basis. There was concern that increased charges could lead to more inappropriate roadside parking. Opportunities should be sought to provide off-street parking in conservation areas and in some popular tourist areas where restrictions have harmed local businesses.	Preferred Approach T9 is a combination of Refined Options T5.2, T5.3, T5.4 and T5.5, and builds on the current policy for car and coach parking. It is for individual car park operators to determine car parking charges, so the Core Strategy makes no reference to this. The preferred approach allows for the provision of off-street parking where appropriate and accompanied by an equivalent reduction in on-street parking – this would therefore apply to conservation areas and popular visitor areas.
Transport policies should meet sustainability objectives but in the context of National Park purposes. Need to balance protecting the Park with promoting access to services by means other than the private car, particularly if combined with better public transport and park and ride if this is practicable. At the same time ensure that any new development is located in settlements with good provision for public transport, walking and cycling to reach essential services. The provision of highway management measures to encourage sustainable travel such as bus priority, cycle lanes, quiet lanes or additional footpaths, must not increase street clutter.	Preferred Approach GSP3 recognises the diverse needs and reduces social exclusion whilst conserving and enhancing the valued characteristics of the NP. This approach fosters access to services and facilities by the location of development. Preferred Approach T2 encompasses the design of infrastructure for sustainable travel.

## **Appendix 8: Key issues from Preferred Approaches consultation 2009 and how they were addressed in Submission Core Strategy**

Key issue from Preferred Approaches consultation	How issue was addressed in drafting Submission Core Strategy
<b>General spatial policies</b>	
Overall support for securing National Park purposes through spatial policy.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy GSP1.
Support for position on major development, but need to better reflect the tests in national policy.	Preferred Approach carried forward into policy GSP1 and paras 8.9 and 8.10.
Strong support for embedding landscape strategy into the CS.	Preferred Approach carried forward in Landscape policy L1.
Support for embedding principles on sustainable development, but needs more thought on how to address climate change at strategic level.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy GSP1. Policy CC1 addresses climate change mitigation and adaptation.
Mixed views on the settlement strategy. Preference expressed by Peak Park Parishes Forum and some parishes for a criteria-only approach with no list; category A and B approach should be deleted to remove confusion about the role of settlements and offer more flexibility. Several requests by parishes to alter the assumption about growth, with more flexibility in some cases and more constraint in others, with a plea from some to restrict new build development in that parish. Concern expressed that all other small settlements are not explicitly mentioned.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy DS1. Categories A and B removed, flexibility retained, but a process for dealing with limited development capacity put in place. The request from parishes for a greater or lesser development expectation has been met in some but not all cases. The policy does not explicitly mention all settlements because it is felt that this is unnecessary and does not make the policy clearer. However, map introduced to highlight overall distribution of named and unnamed settlements.
Cautious support for the approach to planning benefits – welcoming the reflection of local priorities, but concern that the approach is not sufficiently well defined.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy GSP4.
<b>Landscapes and Conservation</b>	
Overall support for the principles on natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. Concern about the level of detail, suggest that much of it should be in Development Management policy rather than CS.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy L1, which encompasses principle of natural beauty via landscape character and valued characteristics; L2, which encompasses wildlife via biodiversity and geodiversity; and L3, which encompasses cultural heritage via cultural heritage assets. Detail deferred to Development Management policy.
<b>Visiting and enjoying the National Park</b>	
General satisfaction with the preferred approach. Suggest that some of the policy content in VE1(a) could be in the supporting text rather than in policy.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy RT1. Words on role and general intent have been removed from policy, now in text paras 10.13-18.
Comments from 3 landowning interests seek greater flexibility for recreation and tourism developments in countryside locations, such as facilities outside settlements close to appropriate existing recreation facilities, or low-key interpretation in sensitive locations. On the other hand, 2 responses call for the NP itself to be the main attraction. Concern about requiring removal of a building/facility when no longer required.	Preferred Approach generally carried forward in policy RT1. Policy does give opportunity for low-key developments in countryside if they can justify location. Text at para 10.13 records the importance of retaining some areas valued for wilderness and solitude. Detail suggesting requirement for removal of a building or facility not retained in Core Strategy.

<b>Climate change and sustainable building</b>	
Overall support for embedding the energy hierarchy and higher sustainable construction standards into all new development. Sustainable development must be balanced with the historic built environment and landscape. More guidance sought in a future SPD on sustainable design and construction techniques. Exemplar schemes in sustainable design appropriate to the National Park could point the way for the future.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy CC1. More guidance to be given in future SPD on sustainable design and construction techniques, including exemplar schemes.
Overall support for the approach to renewable energy developments, with requests for more positive wording and definition of terms such as 'small scale' and 'appropriate scale'. Guidance on location and acceptable types of technologies is requested.	Preferred Approach simplified and generally carried forward in policy CC2. Policy sets out broad guidance on scale for wind turbines. Further guidance on technologies will be given in SPD.
Strong support for the approach to flood risk management. Detailed suggestions made regarding design detail.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy CC5. More detail will be given in SPD.
Comments seek better linkage between policy managing the impact of climate change on land use and biodiversity, and landscape policies.	Preferred Approach carried forward in landscape policies under policy L2 to create better linkage.
General support for policy approach on agricultural and domestic waste. Concerns expressed about the number of HGV trips because of the limited number of sites, and the definition of 'community' scale. Policy should support community-level Anaerobic Digestion.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy CC3. Proposals for anaerobic digestion plants dealing with a mixed waste stream are addressed in this policy. Separate policy CC4 is to assist farmers in waste management in Nitrate Vulnerable Zones through on-farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure, slurry and crops grown for the purpose. Policy CC4 reflects the fact that Environment Agency regulatory controls for anaerobic digestion of this type of waste stream are less onerous than for a mixed waste stream.
Overall support for the preferred approach for dealing with construction and demolition waste.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy CC3.
<b>Homes and communities</b>	
The National Park's role in providing affordable housing is supported. Strong overall support for the methods of delivering affordable housing, but some uncertainty about the role of buy-back. Support for greater provision of affordable housing through brownfield sites and enhancement schemes, but there is concern whether this is viable. Strong support for the scale of housing delivery to be within the capacity of the National Park, and respecting its character. 2 District Councils state that new homes can make a positive contribution as long as they are of an appropriate scale, well designed, and sensitively located.	Support noted and welcomed. "Buy-back" retained since not the only policy approach, and the need to bring forward further work on this is included in the delivery plan. Small enhancement projects involving single new dwellings removed from the viability requirement, enabling them to be open-market if applicant prefers. Positive contribution by appropriate new housing is inherent to the proposed policy.
Mixed views on the scope for open market housing, which could address general local need (not just affordable housing). Some view it as necessary to achieve appropriate enhancement and to deliver affordable homes through cross-subsidy. Others are fundamentally against market housing in favour of locally-needed homes.	Small enhancement projects involving single new dwellings removed from the viability requirement, enabling them to be open-market if applicant prefers. Larger schemes to retain viability tests before allowed to be open-market. Overall retention of focus on locally needed affordable homes.

Overall support for policies addressing the needs of different groups and types of tenure, but one objection to the limited provision for travellers. Question the Authority's role in prioritising needs in institutional accommodation. Care home needs warrant a flexible approach and separate policy.	No substantive change to Preferred Approach re gypsy and traveller sites, carried forward in policy HC4. Care homes are included in policy HC1, not separated from others (if it were to be then that would be more appropriate to development management policy document than Core Strategy).
Strong support for enabling housing provision for key workers employed in agriculture, forestry and other rural enterprises. Some concern about the viability of reusing existing traditional buildings.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy HC2. Concern re viability of reusing existing buildings is best dealt with in Development Management Policy document or in site by site considerations. It is not an inflexible requirement.
Overall support for identifying housing sites on a case-by-case basis rather than by allocation. An action plan of priorities or preferred sites should be considered linked to public funding and delivery.	Support noted and welcomed. Preferred Approach to not make allocations carried forward in policy HC1. The issue of preferences is dealt with in delivery plan.
Concern about the scope for community facilities in smaller (unlisted) villages, where provision could help sustainability by reducing the need to travel. Some calls for stronger policy to resist the loss of community facilities.	Policy HC5 focuses provision on larger villages for sustainability reasons, and these locations are likely to be the most viable. Para 5.24 (in Spatial and Development Strategy chapter) explains how smaller villages might improve provision through parish plans. It is not reasonable to have a blanket rejection of proposals which would lead to loss of community facilities, but policy HC5 requires clear evidence of non-viability and marketing for other community use.
Mixed response to the approach to retail provision, with some seeking greater opportunity for small scale developments in countryside locations, such as linked to recreation facilities. Concern that farm shops would not be acceptable under the preferred approach because they will generate more income than the farm.	Policy HC6 gives reasonable opportunity for small scale retail developments in the countryside. Farm shops are now specifically covered in policy and text para 12.46, differentiated from retail ancillary to other rural businesses.
<b>Economy</b>	
General support for the approach to business development in the countryside; some respondents are pleased by the more flexible approach and others want policy to go even further. The approach to business development in villages is also supported, although some feel that the approach is too restrictive.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policies E1 and E2. More clarity on the types of business that could be established and the need for a link to primary business where located on a farmstead or group of estate buildings. Clarified that towns and villages policy covers 'named' settlements and countryside policy includes small settlements.
Strong support for safeguarding existing employment land. Town and village employment space should be protected from other uses to give people access to central facilities.	Preferred Approach to safeguarding carried forward in policy E1.
General support for the approach to holiday accommodation. Some concern that these uses should not restrict other important objectives such as affordable housing.	Preferred Approach carried forward in policy RT2 within new Recreation and Tourism chapter. The Core Strategy does not give priority to affordable housing, which may not be appropriate in some locations. Owners of traditional buildings can legitimately consider conversions to housing, business, community or holiday use (see policy DS1). Conversion to holiday accommodation is consistent with NP purposes.

<p>Mixed response to the approach for caravans and camping. Some want only small sites and affordable camping, but others want opportunities for larger sites (including chalet and lodge parks) which they feel will be acceptable in some locations.</p>	<p>Policy RT3 generally follows Preferred Approach. Preference is retained for small sites (not defined but text suggests up to 30 pitches more likely to be acceptable). Sentence added in text para 10.26 that may allow “small simple timber structures” in some locations to replace static caravans where this would result in enhancement.</p>
<p><b>Minerals</b></p>	
<p>Some respondents want the objective of reducing mineral activity in the National Park to be explicitly stated. However, others say that mineral activity is an integral local economic activity, and relying on activity elsewhere to meet National Park demand will increase cross-park HGV traffic. A socio-economic impact report should be produced, underlining the impact of possible mineral plant closures.</p>	<p>Policy MIN1 is in general conformity with approach in MPS1 with regard to NPs, and EM Regional Plan policy 37 which specifically requires a reduction in amount and proportion of aggregates and other minerals from the Peak District. National and regional policy has full regard to economic, social and environmental implications which have been balanced within Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. SA on our policy approach has concluded that it is acceptable. Many people cite the potential for increasing cross-park traffic but there is no clear evidence for such claims. Since most of the designated growth areas and growth points lie to the S, SE and E of the NP, alternative extraction sites eg in Derbyshire would be better related to the likely future markets in terms of infrastructure.</p>
<p>Policy should be more flexible, to better reflect MSP1 which allows for mineral extraction in National Parks in ‘exceptional circumstances’. A case by case assessment of mineral applications would be more appropriate than an outright ban. The policy has no room for adaption to future contingency, such as current sites failing to meet demand due to depletion or permission expiry.</p>	<p>It is considered that policy MIN1 is in general conformity with the approach in MPS1 and Regional Plan policy 37. However, the additional wording proposed regarding the “exceptional circumstances” which will be a material planning consideration in any mineral related planning application has been added in response to comments to allow sufficient flexibility in the policy.</p>
<p>The Hope Valley Cement Works should be regarded in a more positive light as a central contributor to the local economy and a responsible working partner. More emphasis should be placed on making the works environmentally sustainable and limiting operation to undergrounding.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy does not set out any definitive stance on the long-term future of Hope Cement Works. It identifies this as an issue to be addressed in a subsequent review of the Core Strategy, when the plan period moves towards the end of the current life expectancy and permission. No changes have therefore been made in response to these comments.</p>
<p>Some responses welcome the shift to underground working of fluorspar, but others say that it cannot be done exclusively, and is not the most efficient method of extraction. Flexibility is needed in case underground reserves are depleted or become inefficient to work, and this may mean allowing opencast. Policy does not recognise that opencast sites can be returned to the landscape.</p>	<p>NPA continues to take a positive approach towards fluorspar in policy MIN2, based on the particular circumstances arising from its scarcity. Transition from opencast to underground working is generally accepted by all parties as a sound overall objective. Text para 14.39 amended to recognise that opencast extraction of fluorspar may be permitted where the exceptional circumstances set out in MPS1 can be demonstrated, recognising the industry’s need for flexibility. Issue of flexibility has been further highlighted by recent sale of Ineos Fluor to Mexichem, which may affect UK demand for the mineral over the plan period.</p>
<p>Making a distinction between building/roofing stone and larger aggregate activities is welcomed. Local building/roofing works eg Stanton Moor should be viewed as an economic and strategic asset with a strong national reputation. Conservation polices will not be sustainable if local</p>	<p>Preferred Approach carried forward in policy MIN3. MPS1 Annex 3 requires MPAs to have regard to local, regional and national need for certain building and roofing stone, but must balance this against protection of NP landscape. Other NPs’ adopted Core Strategies also have a local restriction (Lake</p>

<p>building/roofing quarries are not supported. The preferred approach is too restrictive, threatening local buildings and buildings of regional/national importance.</p>	<p>District, Northumberland and North York Moors). MPS1 does not identify conservation need as an exceptional circumstance to grant major development in NPs. Overriding policy approach of MPS1 and Regional Plan policy 37 is the fundamental consideration. MPS1 Annex 3 draws the historic environment rationale for building stone quite tightly, so would not be in line to supply a wide market. Must balance need for building stone for conservation purposes against NP purposes. Policy MIN3 is flexible enough to meet needs for management and maintenance of historic buildings within the NP. Repair needs of historic buildings outside the NP are important, but it is not considered appropriate to promote mineral extraction in the NP purely to meet their needs. Relaxing this stance could promote substantial demands for conservation building stone given the extent of urban areas around the fringe of the NP. English Heritage have not submitted any evidence to underpin their view that there is a shortage of conservation building stone to meet needs outside the NP from sources within. Substantial reserves of building stone within the NP have extant permissions, so there is no threat to the general supply of building stone from the NP.</p>
<p>Safeguarding needs a broader remit with greater emphasis on future contingencies, eg coal as a potential future energy source or stone needed to conserve buildings within and outside the National Park. Clear criteria explaining how sites are chosen for safeguarding should be given.</p>	<p>The points made are correct in relation to interpretation of national minerals planning policy. However, NPA is seeking only to justify safeguarding for the very high value mineral resources at this time. Accept that other mineral resources may meet MPS1 tests of being economically viable and proven; however these differ in that there is no exceptional justification relating to relative scarcity or extremely high value. MPS1 requirement to safeguard minerals 'as far as possible' does not necessarily mean all minerals in all circumstances. NPA takes lead from English NPs with adopted Core Strategies, which in general terms only safeguard local building and roofing stone and not other minerals. This precedent being set by Inspectors is considered to be the 'sound' interpretation of MPS1 for NPs to follow. These two defined resources and the areas identified meet the tests in MPS1 and practice guide. The two fluorspar permissions are not currently worked and also lapse during the plan period, so it is considered vital to safeguard them from sterilisation. The issue of safeguarding areas or sites of local building stone for heritage/conservation purposes is established in principle in policy MIN4; but evidence base is not yet completed so definition of these area/sites is left to subsequent Development Management Policies DPD.</p>
<p>Policy on restoration is strongly supported, with the suggestion that it should go further in making restoration of sites an essential planning application pre-requisite.</p>	<p>To strengthen the commitment to restoration, this issue has been moved from being a separate policy topic of its own and has now been incorporated into the overall policy framework of keynote policy MIN1.</p>

<b>Traffic, travel and accessibility</b>	
Concern over scope of policy - whether the LDF should go beyond land use policy for the delivery of spatial aims, and the legality of opposing transport developments outside the National Park.	Core Strategy has been revised to focus on land use policy. This has led to a reduction in the number of policies, so some of the Preferred Approaches will be addressed through either SPDs or within the Sustainable Transport Action Plan. Environment Act (1995) s.62 places a duty on bodies affecting land within a NP to have regard to NP purposes. This legalises the NPA's right to oppose transport developments outside the NP that may have negative impacts within it.
There is a wide range of views on reducing the need to travel and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport, from prohibiting all forms of cross-park travel to support for A628 improvement. Travel Plans should only be required for major transport proposals, because they are an unnecessary expense that may deter developers.	Policy T1 focuses on reducing the need to travel and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport, and is supported by all other transport policies. Policy T2 supports schemes to reduce cross-Park traffic, and opposes new road schemes or significant improvements to existing roads unless they provide necessary access to new development, or in exceptional circumstances in the national interest, in line with the NPs Circular 2010. Policy T2 requires Travel Plans in line with Government guidance, but uses the words "appropriate new developments" to allow flexibility in terms of size, impact and location of development.
There is support for some new road development – roads are needed for future economic growth. The lack of support for Bakewell relief road is damaging to the town, and an opportunity to reduce the number of cars has been ignored. Limiting car use may have a detrimental impact on businesses and restrict accessibility of the National Park for visitors. More attention should be paid to reducing harm by limiting the size and number of road signs, and to retaining the 'rural' character of smaller roads. Need to balance visual intrusion with safety.	Preferred Approach for new road development carried forward in policy T2 which accords with Government guidance. The phrase "exceptional circumstances" provides some flexibility to allow for individual circumstances. Preferred Approach for design of transport infrastructure carried forward in policy T3. This includes ensuring that the minimum amount of infrastructure is used.
The settlement strategy allows opportunity for growth but must be more closely related to transport service provision as stated in T4. Should refer to commuters going out of the National Park as well as those coming in. Policies T1a, T1b, T4 and T6 should be combined into a 'sustainable travel' policy.	Accessibility of settlements is now considered in Spatial and Development Strategy (see para 5.19 et seq). Policy T1 acts as an overarching policy covering the desire to reduce the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport for those journeys that are necessary. The other Preferred Approaches referred to are now covered by policies T2, T6 and T7.
The re-opening of the Woodhead railway would reduce the net levels of car use in the PDNP. Rail development proposals should not be restricted. All rail development proposals, including those safeguarded, should be subject to major development tests.	Policy T5 aims to manage the demand for rail and reuse of former railway routes. This policy safeguards the former Woodhead railway for any potential future rail use, but does not imply any in principle acceptance of such a scheme.
Rights of Way protection is too weak. Should explicitly mention 4x4 vehicles and protect against the damage they cause.	Policy RT1 covers elements of this. Recreation Strategy and NPMP consider management issues of trail bikes and 4x4 driving.
The approach for utilities infrastructure is too negative, and may restrict utility provision. Mast sharing and roaming should be encouraged, but broadband access is vital for business growth, so more masts may have to be erected at the cost of some visual amenity.	Policy DS1 refers to in-principle acceptability of utilities infrastructure development in settlements and in countryside outside Natural Zone. Detailed policies will be in subsequent Development Management Policies document.

**Appendix 9: Policy development through Refined Options - Preferred Approaches - Submission version**

Issues explored in Refined Options	Preferred Approaches	Submission Version
<b>Settlements</b> S1: Establishing the best pattern of development for the National Park and its communities	<b>General Spatial Policies</b> GSP4b: The settlement strategy	<b>Spatial and Development Strategy</b> DS1: Development strategy
	<b>General Spatial Policies</b> GSP1: Securing National Park purposes GSP2: Dealing with major development GSP3: Sustainable development principles GSP4a: Conserving and enhancing National Park landscapes  GSP5: Securing planning benefits	<b>General Spatial Policies</b> GSP1: Securing National Park purposes  GSP2: Achieving enhancement of the National Park GSP3: Development management principles GSP4: Securing planning benefit
<b>Landscape</b> L1: Principles for the management of development across all National Park landscapes	<b>Landscape and conservation</b> L1a: Conserving and enhancing natural beauty  L1b: Trees, woodlands, hedgerows, stone walls, field barns and other landscape features L1c: Landscape enhancement and improvement L2: Biodiversity and geodiversity L3a: Cultural heritage assets L3b: Evaluating assets of archaeological, artistic or historic significance L3c: Listed buildings and other buildings of historic or vernacular merit L3d: Assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance L3e: Significant parks and gardens	<b>Landscape and conservation</b> L1: Landscape character and valued characteristics L2: Sites of biodiversity or geodiversity importance  L3: Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance

<p><b>Landscape</b> L2: Provision of a positive framework for the public to access, enjoy and understand the landscapes and settlements of the National Park</p> <p><b>Economy</b> E4: Provision of new tourist facilities and attractions, and facilities to promote understanding of the National Park E5: Serviced and self-catering holiday accommodation E6: Caravans and camping</p>	<p><b>Visiting and enjoying the National Park</b> VE1a: Visiting and enjoying the National Park VE1b: Recreation, environmental education and interpretation development</p> <p><b>Economy</b> E4: Hotels, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation E5: Caravans and camping</p>	<p><b>Recreation and tourism</b> RT1: Recreation, environmental education and interpretation</p> <p>RT2: Hotel, bed and breakfast and self-catering accommodation RT3: Caravans and camping</p>
<p><b>Climate change and natural resources</b> CC1: The scale of energy installations CC5: Impact of climate change on land management, biodiversity and air quality CC2: Spatial distribution of renewable energies CC3: Incorporating on-site renewables and energy efficiency CC6: The need for waste management facilities CC7: Environmentally acceptable sites for waste management facilities where need has been demonstrated and no alternatives less damaging to the National Park exist CC8: Waste arising from all development in the National Park CC4: Waste management – on-farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure and slurry</p>	<p><b>Climate change and sustainable building</b> CC1: Sustainable design and construction CC5: Impact of climate change on land management, biodiversity and air quality CC3: Renewable energy developments CC2: Securing low carbon development</p> <p>CC6a: Management of domestic, industrial and commercial waste</p> <p>CC7: Dealing with construction and demolition waste CC6b: Agricultural waste generated within the National Park CC4: Flood risk management</p>	<p><b>Climate change and sustainable building</b> CC1: Climate change mitigation and adaptation</p> <p>CC2: Low carbon and renewable energy development CC3: Waste management – domestic, industrial and commercial waste</p> <p>CC4: Waste management – on-farm anaerobic digestion of agricultural manure and slurry CC5: Flood risk and water conservation</p>



<p><b>Minerals</b></p> <p>M1: Achieving a gradual reduction in the impact of minerals activity  M4: Restoration and after-use  M3: Review of old mineral permissions, Environmental Impact Assessments and consolidation of permissions  M2: Safeguarding</p>	<p><b>Minerals</b></p> <p>MIN1: Minerals  MIN2: Aggregates  MIN3: Cement-making materials  MIN4: Industrial limestone  MIN8: Restoration  MIN5: Fluorspar  MIN6: Building and roofing stone  MIN7: Safeguarding</p>	<p><b>Minerals</b></p> <p>MIN1: Minerals development    MIN2: Fluorspar proposals  MIN3: Local small-scale building and roofing stone  MIN4: Mineral safeguarding</p>
<p><b>Transport</b></p> <p>T2: The demand for new road schemes to accommodate current and future levels of traffic growth  T7: Accessibility    T1: The need to ensure that design criteria for roads and transport infrastructure conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the NP    T6: The demand for new rail schemes, including light rail, to provide alternative means of transport  T8: The availability of safe walking, cycling and equestrian routes  T3: The adverse impact of traffic  T4: The adverse impact of motor vehicles on environmentally sensitive areas of the NP  T5: Balancing the need for car and coach parking facilities against their impact</p>	<p><b>Traffic, travel and accessibility</b></p> <p>T1: Reducing the need to travel and encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport  T3: Managing the demand for new roads  T4: Providing sustainable access to essential services, and park and ride to visitor areas  T7: Directing traffic onto the most appropriate routes  T2: Design of transport infrastructure    T10: Managing the demand for freight transport and the provision of lorry parking  T5: Managing the demand for rail, and using former railway routes for non-motorised users  T6: Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, and waterways  T8: Ensuring that the adverse impact of motor vehicles is minimised  T9: Managing the demand for car and coach parks    T11: Managing the demand for air travel against its impact on the valued characteristics of the NP  T12: Utilities infrastructure</p>	<p><b>Accessibility, travel and traffic</b></p> <p>T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport    T2: Reducing and directing traffic    T3: Design of transport infrastructure    T4: Managing the demand for freight transport    T5: Managing the demand for rail, and reuse of former railway routes  T6: Routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, and waterways  T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks</p>