

Independent Examination of Peak District National Park Development Management Policies

Peak District National Park Authority Responses to Matters and Issues

NB, existing modifications are highlighted in red with suggested new changes shown with strikethrough and underline.

Matter 11 – Travel and Transport - Tim

Issue: Are the policies clear and effective?

1 Should the policy distinguish major road schemes from local road schemes serving new developments as provided for by Core Strategy policy T2?

Core Strategy policy T2 provides a strategic overview to the Authority's approach to reducing and directing traffic at both the cross-Park and local level including our overall approach to roadbuilding; (whether improvements to major routes or the provision of new roads to access developments).

Core Strategy policy T2A states that transport developments that increase the amount of cross-Park traffic will be opposed; however Core Strategy policy T2B states that in exceptional circumstances such developments may be acceptable. Whilst policy T2B refers to exceptional circumstances, it does not provide any clarity as to what these circumstances might be, or the benefits to the National Park that might be sought in recompense for offering support for such proposals. The assumption within the Policy is that these schemes would be of a scale, which would fall outside of the Authority's planning function.

Development Management policy DMT1 seeks to add clarity to Core Strategy policy T2 by defining the exceptional circumstances that would be required to be met in order for the Authority to offer its support for a proposal, along with benefits to the National Park that would be expected to be delivered as a result of the scheme. In providing this clarity to Core Strategy policy T2, it was decided that the same level of scrutiny was also required for cross-Park rail infrastructure.

It would be extremely difficult to apply the criteria within the Development Management policy DMT1 to local roads, as they would almost certainly

fail the first criterion as described in Development Management policy DMT1A, in that they are unlikely to address a compelling national need which cannot be met by any reasonable alternative means.

It is thought that Core Strategy policy T2C provides the strategic approach to local road schemes that fall within the Authority's planning powers. In such cases the details as to how access roads might be designed and delivered would be subject to consultation with the appropriate constituent highway authority. Recognition of the National Park setting could be achieved through the level of design detail provided within the Transport Infrastructure Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. This document was produced in response to the reference within the Core Strategy at paragraph 15.25. The SPD went through a formal consultation process between November 2017 and January 2018. It is intended to adopt this SPD later this year, following amendments arising from the consultation process.

Policy DMT3: Railway construction

2 Are the criteria under part E (particularly (ii) and (iii)) sufficiently clear? Would a new station as part of a visitor management project be tantamount to a tourist or heritage attraction? How would a new station be a temporary part of a phased construction programme?

Policy DMT3: railway construction builds on the strategic approach provided within Core Strategy policy T5 and makes the assumption that the criteria of Development Management policy DMT1 have been met. DMT3 provides the criteria against which any new railway station or terminus within the National Park might be accepted or permitted. The premise of our approach is to ensure that where new rail infrastructure is provided, it forms part of sustainable transport system rather than acting as a car-borne tourist destination in its own right.

The questions put forward by the Inspector relate to the provision of station facilities. As the only existing railway line operating within the Park is the Hope Valley line, the responses to the questions use this line as an example in reference to the provision of new station facilities. However, there have been repeated calls for the reopening of other former railways within the Park over recent years. The approaches provided would also be applicable for any future rail development that might be brought forward within the National Park.

DMT3E(ii) refers to the development of a station as a temporary part of a phased construction programme. There is a history of the creation of such facilities within the National Park. For example, the building of the reservoirs within the Upper Derwent Valley included the creation of a spur from the Hope Valley Line which transported goods and workers to the construction site. This included the provision of temporary station facilities. The construction of the Upper Derwent reservoirs predates the designation of the National Park. Given the protection afforded to National Parks, a scheme of this scale is unlikely to be brought forward within the Peak District in the future.

However, it is possible that development could take place within the Park, for example within the Hope Valley, which would necessitate the transportation of materials and workers by rail on a temporary basis to a location not directly served by one of the existing stations. The creation of a temporary station facility may be less damaging than the creation of an access road to the site. In such a case, the provision of temporary station facilities may be the preferred approach in keeping with National Park purposes.

DMT3E(iii) refers to the acceptability of a station that formed part of a traffic or visitor management project. The assumption within the policy is that such a station would form part of an existing line and act to provide an alternative means of access to this location. For example the existing Hope Valley Line, which crosses the Peak District National Park, provides access to a number of popular visitor destinations. However, there might be a case for the development of a station halt to provide visitor access to an area within the Valley, which has extremely limited parking, or where inappropriate or inconsiderate parking was proving problematic.

The provision of a station halt, but without the provision of additional parking, (or the provision of extremely restricted parking for local users of the station), would fulfil this criterion. There would be a requirement to ensure that the provision of a station facility was coupled with other traffic management measures.

The station, would offer non-car access, but would not act as a tourist facility in and of itself; rather, its function would be to act as part of a visitor or traffic management tool.

Policy DMT5: Business parking

3 Is the policy sufficiently detailed or specific? Should the policy state that it applies to operational and non-operational parking?

Core Strategy policy T7 sets the strategic approach to parking across the various categories including residential, operational and non-operational. However, in developing the Development Management Policies, it became clear that the use of the terms '*operational*' and '*non-operational*' proved confusing to those providing comment on the various iterations of our parking policies.

Therefore, it was decided that we might provide an easier to understand set of policies if we focussed on the uses of the parking provided, and coupled this with an up-to-date set of parking standards for the National Park (Appendix 10 of the Consultation Document). It is hoped that this approach will reflect the requirement to provide sufficient parking facilities for new developments, whilst having regard to the National Park's purposes and the limited availability of land overall for development. It is also hoped that this approach will offer simpler and easier to understand policies and standards for developers.