

Respo nder No.	Responder	Commen t No.	Policy Theme(s)	Issu e No.	Issue Heading	Preferred Approach Supported	Or Alternative Approach	New (novel) approach	Comment	Officer Response	Officer Response and policy response 2016
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Agree with bringing forward exceptions for Natural Zone based on saved policy CC1.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
010	English Heritage	010/22	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	No		Yes	wider cross boundary impacts on heritage assetts and their setting might be referred to	Agreed	Incorporated into policy DMC2
010	English Heritage	010/23	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone				EH guidance for development management policies is not yet in place. EH is happy to work together on specific policy wording prior to next round of consultation.	Noted	No policy response required
010	English Heritage	010/24	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone				a wide range of other guidance can be downloaded from <www.HELM.org.uk>	Noted	No policy response required
014	Edale parish Council (Nick Faulks)	014/05	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone				Need to respect existing character of valley and landscape when considering potential sites.	Natural Zone policy is for development requiring planning consent.	Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
014	Edale parish Council (Nick Faulks)	014/06	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone				Development must be considered with due consideration with services and infrastructure.	Natural Zone policy is for development requiring planning consent.	Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
014	Edale parish Council (Nick Faulks)	014/07	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone				Risk of criteria being developed on a one size fits all basis, come flexibility.	Natural Zone policy is for development requiring planning consent.	Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is used in all areas. Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Agree with bringing forward exceptions for Natural Zone based on saved policy CC1.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
017	Winstar Parish Council (Rob Greateux)	005/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Agree with bringing forward exceptions for Natural Zone based on saved policy CC1.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/02	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes				Support noted	Incorporated into policy DMC2
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/07	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone				Agree with the Natural Zone concept but has to allow essntial land management work and therefore development to enable this to take place especially given the NPPF encouragement to business	Qualified support noted and points addressed by policy	Incorporated into policy DMC2
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/10	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/03	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Necessary to review Natural Zone boundaries.	Work completed.	new maps prepared on back of review of the section 3 areas and forms part of the development plan documents submitted for examination.

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Agree with bringing forward exceptions for Natural Zone based on saved policy CC1.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
037	Natural England	037/02	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Support existing criteria, also criteria of appropriate siting, landscaping, layout and design. Consideration given to the requirement for developers to offset any potential effects on biodiversity, for example by providing compensatory offsite measures.	Support and comment noted.	Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/08	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes				Support noted.	Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Preferred approach supported.	Support noted.	Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Agree with bringing forward exceptions for Natural Zone based on saved policy CC1.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC2
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/01	Landscape and Conservation	1	Exceptional circumstances for development in the Natural Zone	Yes			Under no circumstances should the protection of the Natural Zone be compromised for economic reasons.	Support noted.	Paragraphs 14 and 115 of the NPPF and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) anticipate that development will be restricted in order to conserve and enhance and that the highest status of protection is conferred on National Parks (NPVC) para 20. Criteria reflect that these are areas under section 3 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act particularly important to conserve.
003	NFU (Paul Tame)	003/01	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	-	-	Concern that landscape strategy approach will be used to prevent development rather than guide it.	Core Strategy policy L1 embeds landscape strategy as important material consideration when assessing development proposals - National Park is a landscape designation. Conservation and enhancement of natural beauty is reason for the existence of the National Park.	The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Consider landscape strategy should be part of Development Management policies.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
014	Edale parish Council (Nick Faulks)	014/08	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Consider landscape strategy should be part of Development Management policies.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Consider landscape strategy should be part of Development Management policies.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/03	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/08	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 3		Don't bring elements of the Landscape Strategy into the plan but strengthen the profile of the Landscape Strategy through consistent use and promotion	The Authority has chosen to bring limited parts of the Strategy forward but recognises that the profile of the Landscape Strategy is now raised through use and promotion	Incorporated into policy DMC1
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1

030	Oldham Council (Clare Moran)	030/01	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions				Important that OPD respects the sensitive and important landscapes of south Pennine moors.	The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/06	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Landscape Strategy not conceived as SPD. Landscape thinking already sufficiently embedded.	The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/11	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No			No explanatory comment made	Nothing to respond to	See policy DMC1
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/04	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Fundamental elements of Landscape Strategy should be brought into the formal development plan.	The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Consider landscape strategy should be part of Development Management policies.	The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
037	Natural England	037/03	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes			Welcome approach giving landscape strategy SPD status.	The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/09	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
049	Severn Trent Water	049/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No		Suggest preparing new landscape strategy SPD	Refers to para 153 of NPPF about use of SPDs.	SPD could be produced later if considered necessary following monitoring of approach through Development Management approach. The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
049	Severn Trent Water	049/03	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No		Suggest preparing new landscape strategy SPD	Would want to be involved in preparation of SPD.	SPD could be produced later if considered necessary following monitoring of approach through Development Management approach. The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan is further embedded into the Development Management policies document, showing Landscape character areas and types and explaining the 'landscape first' approach. In this way the primacy that natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage is given is brought through into the planning process.	Incorporated into policy DMC1

053	Peak Park Watch	053/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2			Limited parts of the Landscape Strategy brought into the plan	Incorporated into policy DMC1
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	No	Option 2		Consider landscape strategy should be part of Development Management policies.	Limited parts of the Landscape Strategy brought into the plan	Incorporated into policy DMC1
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/02	Landscape and Conservation	2	Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
003	NFU (Paul Tame)	003/02	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No			Concern that concept of cumulative impact will be used to prevent development.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Doubt that a single policy would cover the situation.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Easier to assess likely impact on different types of development.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
010	English Heritage	010/01	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes			Welcome recognition and preferred approach to cumulative impact.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Doubt that a single policy would cover the situation.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Easier to assess likely impact on different types of development.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Doubt that a single policy would cover the situation.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Easier to assess likely impact on different types of development.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes				Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/01	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes			Right that cumulative harm should be material consideration.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/09	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Responder doesn't consider individual development should be discriminated against on grounds of its contribution to a cumulative impact	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes	Option 1		Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/12	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No			No comment.		No policy response required
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/05	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes			Careful attention to wording needed, examples given.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Doubt that a single policy would cover the situation.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Easier to assess likely impact on different types of development.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
037	Natural England	037/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes			Focus should be on the range of valued characteristics rather than character and appearance of National Park.	Support and comment noted. Reference can be made to valued characteristics in the general policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/02	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration				Consideration of cumulative impacts could go much further to include carbon emissions, mineral resources, ecological resources and the future of the built environment. National Park is a living asset in its entirety, whose net value to society should grow and improve over time. So for examples, carbon savings and associated long term impacts on the sustainability of the National Park could be better weighed against localised impacts from renewable energy developments or from re-use of existing buildings.	Approach taken by the National Park Authority has to be consistent with primary legislation as set out in GSP1 and the Core Strategy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/10	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes			Might also be extended to cover cumulative applications for carbon emissions.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	Yes			Preferred approach supported.	Noted.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
053	Peak Park Watch	053/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Already enough cumulative harm clauses. For clarity could be added to relevant sections of document.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/03	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Doubt that a single policy would cover the situation.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/04	Landscape and Conservation	3	Considering cumulative harm as a material consideration	No	Option 1		Easier to assess likely impact on different types of development.	Cumulative impact of development is a material planning consideration that is usefully included in the general design policy rather than in an independent policy or across several policies. Overly complex to include it in each policy.	Incorporated into policy DMC1
003	National Farmers Union	003/03	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	No	No	No	This is yet another burden on farming and other business with the text allowing the Authority to demand removal of any building it does not like. NFU feels that this is beyond the Authority's powers and against the tenor of the NPPF.	The response is incorrect in as much as it says the policy approaches are beyond the powers of the NPA and the approach was embodied in the Structure and Local Plans. It does not express a preference between options, disliking both. It does not comment on the positive forward looking aspects of option 2. Since the Core Strategy already rolls forward the Structure Plan principle, weight cannot be given to this comment in relation to DMP policy. .	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/05	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	No	No	Yes	Options not understood fully because of possible drafting error. Structure Plan Policy C2 seemed about right and the resources and practicality of going further is questioned.	Drafting error is that "C6" in the options text should read "C2." To stick only with C2 would, however, result in a policy statement that limits action solely to cases where buildings or structures are subject to conditions re removal. There might be many other cases including those which involve the successful change of use attached to an older building to an employment use in a more modern / appropriate replacement building. It would be in principle contrary to purposes - which are "to „enhance" and would deny the existence of existing powers to remove 'eyesores.'	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
009	Kirklees Council	009/01	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased				Supportive of the preferred approaches and wish to be consulted on detailed wording.		This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1

010	English Heritage	010/02	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	Yes				Support noted.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/05	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	No	No	Yes	Options not understood fully because of possible drafting error. Structure Plan Policy C2 seemed about right and the resources and practicality of going further is questioned.	Drafting error is that "C6" in the options text should read "C2." To stick only with C2 would, however, result in a policy statement that limits action solely to cases where buildings or structures are subject to conditions re removal. There might be many other cases including those which involve the successful change of use attached to an older building to an employment use in a more modern / appropriate replacement building. It would be in principle contrary to purposes - which are "to ..enhance" and would deny the existence of existing powers to remove 'eyesores.'	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/05	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	No	No	Yes	Options not understood fully because of possible drafting error. Structure Plan Policy C2 seemed about right and the resources and practicality of going further is questioned.	Drafting error is that "C6" in the options text should read "C2." To stick only with C2 would, however, result in a policy statement that limits action solely to cases where buildings or structures are subject to conditions re removal. There might be many other cases including those which involve the successful change of use attached to an older building to an employment use in a more modern / appropriate replacement building. It would be in principle contrary to purposes - which are "to ..enhance" and would deny the existence of existing powers to remove 'eyesores.'	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/02	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased			Yes	The aim should be to allow buildings to remain where a productive alternative use is available.	The intent was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/03	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased			Yes	Modern agricultural buildings require considerable investment and should not be discarded. Only those structure that are genuinely redundant (not temporarily out of use) and incapable of suitable alternative use should be removed because they add unnecessary clutter to the landscape. Policy needs to distinguish between these and other cases.	The intent was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/10	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased			Yes	Once a building is constructed it forms part of the landscape and, if redundant, the first option should be to seek alternative use (as per para 2.32 of the consultation document and NPPF para 28).	The intent was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/07	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased			Yes	NPA and developers should seek re-use rather than removal on grounds of landscape alone. Removal of redundant buildings would be "ultra vires" and contrary to human rights law.	The intent was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/13	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased			Yes	Response implies that removal should only be where there is no alternative use that may benefit local people or businesses.	The intent was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/06	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased				Points out that the options presented in the consultation are not clear. If a more exacting approach is to be taken, DMP policy will need to be backed up with guidance about implementation - potentially to the extent of assessing individual buildings to identify those for removal in areas of greatest concern.	The intent was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment. The lack of clarity in options is understood and the need for improved description of intent etc. is accepted.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/05	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	No	No	Yes	Options not understood fully because of possible drafting error. Structure Plan Policy C2 seemed about right and the resources and practicality of going further is questioned.	Drafting error is that "C6" in the options text should read "C2." To stick only with C2 would, however, result in a policy statement that limits action solely to cases where buildings or structures are subject to conditions re removal. There might be many other cases including those which involve the successful change of use attached to an older building to an employment use in a more modern / appropriate replacement building. It would be in principle contrary to purposes - which are "to ..enhance" and would deny the existence of existing powers to remove 'eyesores.'	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
036	Youlgrave	036/04	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	No	No	Yes	Options not understood fully because of possible drafting error. Structure Plan Policy C2 seemed about right and the resources and practicality of going further is questioned.	Drafting error is that "C6" in the options text should read "C2." To stick only with C2 would, however, result in a policy statement that limits action solely to cases where buildings or structures are subject to conditions re removal. There might be many other cases including those which involve the successful change of use attached to an older building to an employment use in a more modern / appropriate replacement building. It would be in principle contrary to purposes - which are "to ..enhance" and would deny the existence of existing powers to remove 'eyesores.'	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
037	Natural England	037/05	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	Yes				Support noted.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/11	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD.	Noted	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/04	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	Yes			Increases scope to plan strategically for on going restructuring of the rural economy whilst enhancing landscape.		This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/03	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased	Yes			there are too many non-traditional buildings in the landscape. There is a tendency for large structures to remain after their useful life is finished. Removal should be encouraged.	Noted.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
053	Peak Park Watch	053/04	Landscape and Conservation	4	Removing modern, non-traditional structures from the countryside once their original use has ceased				Not necessary. Modern structure must have been approved by the National Park and therefore should have new uses found for them - more sustainable than demolishing.	The intent of policy was to avoid development of whatever types in locations where development of agricultural buildings would only be permitted in the first instance, because of the special circumstances that have long surrounded control over agricultural built-investment.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/06	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	No	Option 1	No	Favours fewer criteria, alongside neighbourhood plans because of fear that local options would be unnecessarily reduced by criteria additional to LC3 that are at present unspecified	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
010	English Heritage	010/03	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	Yes				Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/06	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	No	Option 1	No	Favours fewer criteria, alongside neighbourhood plans because of fear that local options would be unnecessarily reduced by criteria additional to LC3 that are at present unspecified	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text

017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/06	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	No	Option 1	No	Favours fewer criteria, alongside neighbourhood plans because of fear that local options would be unnecessarily reduced by criteria additional to LC3 that are at present unspecified	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/04	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits				In the National Park, the lack of prescriptive boundaries has not given rise to unwarranted peripheral expansion (perhaps because NPK status has enabled better protection anyway).	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/05	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	Yes				Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/11	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits		Option 1		Reasons not given	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/14	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits		Option 1		Settlement split by boundary. Response implies that option 1 will enable greater involvement of Parish Council alongside neighbourhood plan with less detailed constraint from policy itself.	Policy on settlement limits references neighbourhood plans because that can usefully inform whole settlement planning where two planning authorities cover the settlement. However the absence of a neighbourhood plan would not prevent whole settlement consideration of development options with constituent planning authorities for areas of a settlement outside the National Park and this has happened already for some edge of Park settlements (Meerbrook and Hayfield)	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/07	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	Yes			Inclusive approach to whole community involvement is a fundamental part of this.	Policy on settlement limits references neighbourhood plans because that can usefully inform whole settlement planning where two planning authorities cover the settlement. However the absence of a neighbourhood plan would not prevent whole settlement consideration of development options with constituent planning authorities for areas of a settlement outside the National Park and this has happened already for some edge of Park settlements (Meerbrook and Hayfield)	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/06	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	No	Option 1	No	Favours fewer criteria, alongside neighbourhood plans because of fear that local options would be unnecessarily reduced by criteria additional to LC3 that are at present unspecified	Preference noted, although comment may be based on a slight misunderstanding: since Option 1 does not necessarily imply criteria that are <u>additional</u> to those in LC3. The potential to discuss criteria at examination will provide all parties with an opportunity to ensure that provide a framework for rather than unnecessarily limit local options.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
036	Youlgrave	036/05	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	No	Option 1	No	Favours fewer criteria, alongside neighbourhood plans because of fear that local options would be unnecessarily reduced by criteria additional to LC3 that are at present unspecified	Preference noted, although comment may be based on a slight misunderstanding: since Option 1 does not necessarily imply criteria that are <u>additional</u> to those in LC3. The potential to discuss criteria at examination will provide all parties with an opportunity to ensure that provide a framework for rather than unnecessarily limit local options.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/12	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text

045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/01	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits				Any policies should be a positive management tool rather than purely preventative or negative.	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/05	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	Yes			larger settlements might benefit from formal character study	Noted. The statement about larger settlements accords with the proposed use of capacity studies.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/04	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	Yes			settlement limits should be clearly delineated to maintain village character. Small changes need to be discussed thoroughly through medium of neighbourhood plans.	Additional criteria are provided on settlement limits and capacity work has taken place with local councils. Bakewell has a different policy approach.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/05	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits			Yes	Considers that settlement limits should be drawn to prevent arbitrary decisions (being decided by Town Council and residents)	Noted but not accepted as a principle to apply across all settlements. Where neighbourhood plans have requested a boundary, the NPA has agreed it provided it doesn't undermine the core strategy	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/14	Landscape and Conservation	5	Settlement limits	No	Option 1	No	Favours fewer criteria, alongside neighbourhood plans because of fear that local options would be unnecessarily reduced by criteria additional to LC3 that are at present unspecified	Preference noted, although comment may be based on a slight misunderstanding; since Option 1 does not necessarily imply criteria that are <u>additional</u> to those in LC3. The potential to discuss criteria at examination will provide all parties with an opportunity to ensure that provide a framework for rather than unnecessarily limit local options.	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
003	National Farmers Union	003/04	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	Yes	No	No	Supported provided that it does not lead to a sudden upsurge in numbers of designated important open spaces.	Support noted. Designation is an outcome of Conservation Area Appraisal as opposed to depiction on the DMP map and numbers /rates should not be changed by this choice of option.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/07	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	No	Option 2	No	Concerned to retain maximum flexibility for the neighbourhood planning process and character of individual places including wider landscape concerns and not just "historic" built environment.	Preference noted. In addition it might be argued that the process of identifying assets described in para 2.45 is not complete if limited to important open spaces in conservation areas. If used, option 1 would need to be carefully caveated to reflect these concerns.	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/08	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/09	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/10	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
010	English Heritage	010/04	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	Yes	Yes		Supports preferred approach but asks for additional recognition of as yet "undiscovered" open spaces - that may be identified in studies of as part of considering proposals	No objection in principle although this is arguably part of standard design / layout policy.	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/07	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	No	Option 2	No	Concerned to retain maximum flexibility for the neighbourhood planning process and character of individual places including wider landscape concerns and not just "historic" built environment.	Preference noted. In addition it might be argued that the process of identifying assets described in para 2.45 is not complete if limited to important open spaces in conservation areas. If used, option 1 would need to be carefully caveated to reflect these concerns.	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/08	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/09	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/10	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3

017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/07	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	No	Option 2	No	Concerned to retain maximum flexibility for the neighbourhood planning process and character of individual places including wider landscape concerns and not just "historic" built environment.	Preference noted. In addition it might be argued that the process of identifying assets described in para 2.45 is not complete if limited to important open spaces in conservation areas. If used, option 1 would need to be carefully caveated to reflect these concerns.	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/08	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/09	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/10	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/06	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	Yes				Noted	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/12	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements		Yes		This option is more in keeping with the NPPF .	This statement is not explained in detail.	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/15	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements				Comment about the need to emphasise local views of the Parish Council	This implies support for option 2 although this is not stated.	
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/08	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	Yes			if spaces are shown on plan comprehensively and the importance of Conservation Area Appraisal is retained for more detailed understanding	Noted	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy DMC3
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/07	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	No	Option 2	No	Concerned to retain maximum flexibility for the neighbourhood planning process and character of individual places including wider landscape concerns and not just "historic" built environment.	Preference noted. In addition it might be argued that the process of identifying assets described in para 2.45 is not complete if limited to important open spaces in conservation areas. If used, option 1 would need to be carefully caveated to reflect these concerns.	
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/08	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/09	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/10	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	
036	Youlgrave	036/06	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	No	Option 2	No	Concerned to retain maximum flexibility for the neighbourhood planning process and character of individual places including wider landscape concerns and not just "historic" built environment.	Preference noted. In addition it might be argued that the process of identifying assets described in para 2.45 is not complete if limited to important open spaces in conservation areas. If used, option 1 would need to be carefully caveated to reflect these concerns.	
036	Youlgrave	036/07	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy.
036	Youlgrave	036/08	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	
036	Youlgrave	036/09	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	
037	Natural England	037/06	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements				Supports inclusion. Offers no preference. Asks that greenspaces in towns and villages be protected. Recommends use of ANGst as a useful tool to ensure adequate provision so accessible natural greenspace.	Support noted. Use of ANGst to be considered in context of small national park communities.	

042	Friends of the Peak District	042/13	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted but not directly relevant to the issue	ANGst not considered necessary to reference in the context of small national park communities
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/06	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	Yes			with in principle support in policy to enable other sites identified in conservation area appraisals etc. to be included.	Noted.	
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/15	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements	No	Option 2	No	Concerned to retain maximum flexibility for the neighbourhood planning process and character of individual places including wider landscape concerns and not just "historic" built environment.	Preference noted. In addition it might be argued that the process of identifying assets described in para 2.45 is not complete if limited to important open spaces in conservation areas. If used, option 1 would need to be carefully caveated to reflect these concerns.	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/16	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/17	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/18	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements					Part of 005/7	
053	Peak Park Watch	053/06	Landscape and Conservation	6	Protecting important open spaces in settlements				Conservation area appraisals identify too many areas as being important and stifle local need housing. This should be left to Town Councils and residents.	Noted	Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/11	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes	No	Yes - introduce additional matters	introduce the following additional matters into the policy ---- "lighting schemes" should include the effect of lighting emitted through roof windows // - provision should be made for the unobtrusive placing of wheeled bins // - LC4 (b)(i) and (ii) still remain relevant, as they expand on GSP3 // - In a hilly area, applicants should be required to provide details of land levels in relation to adjoining development.	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text	
010	English Heritage	010/05	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/11	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes	No	Yes - introduce additional matters	introduce the following additional matters into the policy ---- "lighting schemes" should include the effect of lighting emitted through roof windows // - provision should be made for the unobtrusive placing of wheeled bins // - LC4 (b)(i) and (ii) still remain relevant, as they expand on GSP3 // - In a hilly area, applicants should be required to provide details of land levels in relation to adjoining development.	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/11	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes	No	Yes - introduce additional matters	introduce the following additional matters into the policy ---- "lighting schemes" should include the effect of lighting emitted through roof windows // - provision should be made for the unobtrusive placing of wheeled bins // - LC4 (b)(i) and (ii) still remain relevant, as they expand on GSP3 // - In a hilly area, applicants should be required to provide details of land levels in relation to adjoining development.	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/07	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text

025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/13	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
029	Bakewell Partnership	029/19	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development			Yes	Requests an SPD for this in relation to Bakewell's central shopping area - in keeping with an approach taken in other Derbyshire market towns. Cross relates to Issues 8: Conservation Areas / 14: Shop Fronts & 15: Outdoor Advertising.	Relatively new Conservation Area analysis allied to relatively new Shop Fronts SPD gives coverage for Bakewell Central Shopping Area and is backed up by the neighbourhood plan work on public realm	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/08	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/16	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/09	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/11	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes	No	Yes - introduce additional matters	introduce the following additional matters into the policy ---- "lighting schemes" should include the effect of lighting emitted through roof windows // - provision should be made for the unobtrusive placing of wheeled bins // - LC4 (b)(i) and (ii) still remain relevant, as they expand on GSP3 // - In a hilly area, applicants should be required to provide details of land levels in relation to adjoining development.	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text	See DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
036	Youlgrave	036/10	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes	No	Yes - introduce additional matters	introduce the following additional matters into the policy ---- "lighting schemes" should include the effect of lighting emitted through roof windows // - provision should be made for the unobtrusive placing of wheeled bins // - LC4 (b)(i) and (ii) still remain relevant, as they expand on GSP3 // - In a hilly area, applicants should be required to provide details of land levels in relation to adjoining development.	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
037	Natural England	037/07	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes			requests that criteria give particular attention to landscape character and biodiversity (e.g. as per NPPF para 118	Noted	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/14	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted but not directly relevant to the issue	In supporting text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/07	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes				Noted	No policy response required
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/19	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development	Yes	No	Yes - introduce additional matters	introduce the following additional matters into the policy ---- "lighting schemes" should include the effect of lighting emitted through roof windows // - provision should be made for the unobtrusive placing of wheeled bins // - LC4 (b)(i) and (ii) still remain relevant, as they expand on GSP3 // - In a hilly area, applicants should be required to provide details of land levels in relation to adjoining development.	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text	
053	Peak Park Watch	053/07	Landscape and Conservation	7	Design, layout and landscaping of development			Yes	Saved policy LC4 should be expanded to include references from GSP3 to sustainable building technologies and mitigating the impact of climate change.	Noted	See Policy DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and supporting text and Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/16	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B. Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	In so far as these matters can be controlled through planning, they are now addressed by DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping, and in supporting text
010	English Heritage	010/06	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas		Yes		Request additional detail in design guidance SPD in any case.	Does not impact on policy wording.	

010	English Heritage	010/07	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes				Noted	
010	English Heritage	010/08	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas				Policy wording should reflect the thrust and language of the NPPF as well as relevant legislation. The concept of "significance" should be reflected in the new policy	Accepted	
010	English Heritage	010/21	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas			Yes	suggests combination of issues and policies into a single "heritage assets" approach - suggests definition of non-designated assets in policy and inclusion of change of use considerations	No objection to this which would have been the preferred route in the Structure Plan if supported by statutory consultees at that time. However, definitions ought to be in text rather than policy and need to avoid being exclusive. Similarly ref to change of use ought to be in text that links 2 policy areas together. Change of use issues may be significant enough to warrant a separate policy - discuss	Incorporated in policy and supporting text.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/16	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	Incorporated in policy and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/16	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/08	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes				Noted	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/14	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes				Noted	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/17	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes				Noted	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/10	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Core Strategy commitment to policy must be honoured - and other cultural heritage assets encompassed	Noted	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/16	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	Policy DMC8 now references non designated heritage assets
036	Youlgrave	036/13	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
038	Pauline Beswick	038/01	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas			Yes	All wording needs to brought up to date with regard to Core Strategy and NPPF and concepts such as "heritage assets" "significance" and "setting" should be used.	Noted.	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
038	Pauline Beswick	038/02	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas			Yes	more mention is needed of the need to safeguard, record and enhance the historic environment with equal strength to that for the natural environment (issue 22 is quoted as example)	Noted.	Incorporated in policy and supporting text.
038	Pauline Beswick	038/03	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas			Yes	it is equally important to assess the importance of non-designated historic elements in line with approach to the natural environment (issues 23 and 24 are quoted as examples).	Noted.	Not given its own policy but the point is incorporated in policy DMC8
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/15	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted but not directly relevant to the issue	Policy applies to all buildings and structures so covers both designated and non-designated heritage assets. Supporting text and DMC10 also covers designated and non designated heritage assets
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/08	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes				Noted	No policy response required
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/22	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/06	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes				Noted	See policy DMC8 and supporting text

053	Peak Park Watch	053/08	Landscape and Conservation	8	Conservation Areas	Yes			saved policy is acceptable	Noted	See Policy DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and supporting text and Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/17	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B. Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
010	English Heritage	010/09	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Policy wording should reflect the thrust and language of the NPPF as well as relevant legislation. The concept of "significance" should be reflected in the new policy	Accepted	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/17	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B. Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	Incorporated in policy DMC7 and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/17	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B. Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/15	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings			Yes	Concerned that the proposal to enhance LC6 will lead to further restriction on listed buildings which need an economic use if they are to be maintained. Policy LC6 should have a focus that allows alternative uses, even if this means that an existing building is extended or rebuilt as appropriate - provided that its intrinsic value is maintained.	Not agreed. The policy emphasis remains the proper conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. Changes driven by other economic agendas should not serve to change this emphasis	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/09	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings			???	Preferred approach is too restrictive and in particular does not make allowance for energy conservation measures essential to sustaining the life of a listed building. Alternative approach fails here too. Offers discussion on more flexible wording.	Not agreed, and position supported by other control regimes. As an example, Building Regulations give exemptions for energy conservation measures for listed buildings is recognition that the fabric and significance can be harmed by modern additions or insulation techniques.	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/18	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes					See policy DMC7 and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/11	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Core Strategy commitment to policy must be honoured - and other cultural heritage assets encompassed	Noted	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/17	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
036	Youlgrave	036/14	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/16	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted but not directly relevant to the issue	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/09	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes				Noted	No policy response required
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/23	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/09	Landscape and Conservation	9	Listed Buildings	Yes			saved policy is acceptable	Noted	See Policy DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and supporting text and Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/18	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
010	English Heritage	010/10	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings				Paras 132 & 133 of NPPF set out the framework for harm to and loss of a range of designated assets (not only listed buildings) and give criteria re their assessment.	This issue is adequately covered by paragraphs 132 and 133 of the NPPF. Heritage assets are irreplaceable and substantial loss or harm should be exceptional.	

016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/18	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/18	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/16	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes				Noted	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/19	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes				Noted	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/12	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Core Strategy commitment to policy must be honoured - and other cultural heritage assets encompassed	Noted	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/18	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
036	Youlgrave	036/15	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/17	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted but not directly relevant to the issue	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/10	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes				Noted	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/24	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			Agreed	Noted - (N.B.Typing error in response assumed since would otherwise contradict points 005/7 to 13).	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/10	Landscape and Conservation	10	Demolition of Listed Buildings	Yes			saved policy is acceptable	Noted	Whilst the sustainability of replacement dwellings is ensured by core strategy CC1 and encouraged by CC2, the design merits of buildings are largely dictated by a traditional approach to design as required by GSP2, GSP3 and design guides. Whilst NPPF enables the innovative design 'in principle', the practice of the NPA is more conservative, although some such as the permission for a largely subterranean house above Eyam do show an ability to think beyond traditional design. Policy DMH9 does not overtly encourage innovative design but neither does it discourage it, and the greater need to consider context (site, surrounding built environment and wider landscape) creates the backdrop for innovative design proposals.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/19	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Concerned that there is no advantage in paying too much attention (in policy?) to the difference between historic and vernacular and that this is taking too much attention - rather: if buildings are unused the presumption should be to favour being put them to good use.	This concern is understood but misses the point that re-use is welcomed and encouraged in all cases except those that would harm countryside outside of settlements. However, the new use need not always be for a new home. Other uses (employment etc.) are encouraged by having less rigorous 'tests' to pass. It is the relationship to housing policy that requires justification on the basis of "enhancement."	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/20	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No	Yes 2		Where a building is of historic or architectural interest it is right to consider to what extent its features should be preserved. Sometimes it will be better to remodel to suit the new use and energy considerations.	The comment favours the greater level of detail and differentiation suggested in option 2 because of the increased flexibility that this might offer.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations

005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/21	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Applying for a new use is not an abuse or attempt to circumvent that planning system (para 2.77). This point is not understood, may be better deleted.	The concern in the original para 2.77 is to enable the planning system to have sufficient control over multiple applications that are designed to change / intensify the use of a building over time and secure permission for housing where this would not have been permitted in a single step change from (say) an agricultural building.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
010	English Heritage	010/11	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes			with emphasis that concentration on architectural merit alone is insufficient and would not be compatible with the NPPF and PPS5's practice guide. The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest.	Accepted - for consideration in relation to coverage of both this and other policies in this section of the plan.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
010	English Heritage	010/12	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes				Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/19	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Concerned that there is no advantage in paying too much attention (in policy?) to the difference between historic and vernacular and that this is taking too much attention - rather: if buildings are unused the presumption should be to favour being put them to good use.	This concern is understood but misses the point that re-use is welcomed and encouraged in all cases except those that would harm countryside outside of settlements. However, the new use need not always be for a new home. Other uses (employment etc.) are encouraged by having less rigorous 'tests' to pass. It is the relationship to housing policy that requires justification on the basis of "enhancement."	
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/20	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No	Yes 2		Where a building is of historic or architectural interest it is right to consider to what extent its features should be preserved. Sometimes it will be better to remodel to suit the new use and energy considerations.	The comment favours the greater level of detail and differentiation suggested in option 2 because of the increased flexibility that this might offer.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/21	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Applying for a new use is not an abuse or attempt to circumvent that planning system (para2.77). This point is not understood, may be better deleted.	The concern in the original para 2.77 is to enable the planning system to have sufficient control over multiple applications that are designed to change / intensify the use of a building over time and secure permission for housing where this would not have been permitted in a single step change from (say) and agricultural building.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/19	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Concerned that there is no advantage in paying too much attention (in policy?) to the difference between historic and vernacular and that this is taking too much attention - rather: if buildings are unused the presumption should be to favour being put them to good use.	This concern is understood but perhaps misses the point that re-use is welcomed and encouraged in all cases except those that would harm countryside outside of settlements. However, the new use need not always be for a new home. Other uses (employment etc.) are encouraged by having less rigorous 'tests' to pass. It is the relationship to housing policy that requires justification on the basis of "enhancement."	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/20	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No	Yes 2		Where a building is of historic or architectural interest it is right to consider to what extent its features should be preserved. Sometimes it will be better to remodel to suit the new use and energy considerations.	The comment favours the greater level of detail and differentiation suggested in option 2 because of the increased flexibility that this might offer.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/21	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Applying for a new use is not an abuse or attempt to circumvent that planning system (para2.77). This point is not understood, may be better deleted.	The concern in the original para 2.77 is to enable the planning system to have sufficient control over multiple applications that are designed to change / intensify the use of a building over time and secure permission for housing where this would not have been permitted in a single step change from (say) an agricultural building.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/09	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes				Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/17	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes			Although this is still extremely restrictive and does not allow easy conversion to new uses.	Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/20	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes				Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations

034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/13	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit		Yes		Historic and architectural merit need to be considered on their own terms. The Trust wishes "valued vernacular" to cover both listed buildings and those on a local list: these would qualify as heritage assets. Buildings of historic or vernacular merit would not, but nonetheless add to the character etc. of a group of buildings or Conservation Area.	Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/19	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Concerned that there is no advantage in paying too much attention (in policy?) to the difference between historic and vernacular is taking too much attention - rather: if buildings are unused the presumption should be to favour being put them to good use.	This concern is understood but perhaps misses the point that re-use is welcomed and encouraged in all cases except those that would harm countryside outside of settlements. However, the new use need not always be for a new home. Other uses (employment etc.) are encouraged by having less rigorous 'tests' to pass. It is the relationship to housing policy that requires justification on the basis of "enhancement."	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/20	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No	Yes 2		Where a building is of historic or architectural interest it is right to consider to what extent its features should be preserved. Sometimes it will be better to remodel to suit the new use and energy considerations.	The comment favours the greater level of detail and differentiation suggested in option 2 because of the increased flexibility that this might offer.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/21	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Applying for a new use is not an abuse or attempt to circumvent that planning system (para2.77). This point is not understood, may be better deleted.	The concern in the original para 2.77 is to enable the planning system to have sufficient control over multiple applications that are designed to change / intensify the use of a building over time and secure permission for housing where this would not have been permitted in a single step change from (say) an agricultural building.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
036	Youlgrave	036/16	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Concerned that there is no advantage in paying too much attention (in policy?) to the difference between historic and vernacular and that this is taking too much attention - rather: if buildings are unused the presumption should be to favour being put them to good use.	This concern is understood but perhaps misses the point that re-use is welcomed and encouraged in all cases except those that would harm countryside outside of settlements. However, the new use need not always be for a new home. Other uses (employment etc.) are encouraged by having less rigorous 'tests' to pass. It is the relationship to housing policy that requires justification on the basis of "enhancement."	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
036	Youlgrave	036/17	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No	Yes 2		Where a building is of historic or architectural interest it is right to consider to what extent its features should be preserved. Sometimes it will be better to remodel to suit the new use and energy considerations.	The comment favours the greater level of detail and differentiation suggested in option 2 because of the increased flexibility that this might offer. It is necessary to decide whether this is best in policy or SPD.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
036	Youlgrave	036/18	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Applying for a new use is not an abuse or attempt to circumvent that planning system (para2.77). This point is not understood, may be better deleted.	The concern in the original para 2.77 is to enable the planning system to have sufficient control over multiple applications that are designed to change / intensify the use of a building over time and secure permission for housing where this would not have been permitted in a single step change from (say) an agricultural building.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/18	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD		Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/02	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				Objects to both options but would welcome definition of terms "valued vernacular" and "traditional buildings of historic and vernacular merit" and the distinction (if any) between them.	Heritage assets approach is in line with NPPF.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations

045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/03	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				Either option should retain reference to "vernacular" since it is enshrined in the Core Strategy.	Policy L3 is overarching Policy which refers to heritage assets. Development management policies clarify designated and non-designated.	Heritage assets approach in line with NPPF.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/04	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				Core Strategy and saved local plan policies refer to "vernacular" in various ways but nowhere do they refer to historic and/or architectural merit"	Policy L3 is overarching Policy which refers to heritage assets. Development management policies clarify designated and non-designated.	Policy L3 is overarching Policy which refers to heritage assets. Development management policies clarify designated and non-designated.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/05	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				historic and/or architectural merit " is no easier to define than "valued vernacular" or "historic and vernacular merit". For various reasons including compatibility with Core Strategy "architectural" cannot simply be substituted in place of "vernacular."	Heritage assets approach is in line with NPPF.	Policy L3 is overarching Policy which refers to heritage assets. Development management policies clarify designated and non-designated.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/06	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				The Core Strategy already address matters considered by saved Local Plan Policy LC8 and there is no need to replace it.	Noted but policy and text needs updating to take account of new language around heritage significance	
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/07	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				The definition of terms referred to could help prevent change of use of recently built traditional buildings serving purposes other than residential. Clarification should focus on the setting and its contribution to the locality, its historic merit and any particular features.	Noted	
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/11	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes				Noted	The Authority's policy DMC5 is clear on what buildings or architectural or historic merit are and how that should be assessed and text to the heritage assets policy DMC10 makes it clear that proposals for buildings that do not have such status will be assessed against GSP1, GSP2, and GSP3, and L1, L2 and L3 of the Core Strategy.
051	The Ramblers Association	051/03	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				There might also be attributes of a building with architectural merit that make it unsuitable for residential use	Current policy is able to resist such examples and new policy will also.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/05	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				The resulting building can be incommensurate with for example windows that are too small.	The examples submitted relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/06	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				traditional domestic window openings are not required to be copied.	The examples submitted relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/07	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				Inappropriate new window opening details result in alien features to which attention is drawn. This has also led to their use in other existing buildings.	The examples submitted relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/08	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				traditional chimneys are not required and alien "pipes" are introduced.	The examples submitted relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/09	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				This use of metal flue-pipes is in the end unsustainable and unlikely to be upheld in future decisions. Why, therefore, impose them now.	The examples submitted relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/10	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				This use of metal flue-pipes is in the end unsustainable and unlikely to be upheld in future decisions. Why, therefore, impose them now.	The examples submitted relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations

051	The Ramblers Association	051/11	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit				The response is a criticism of policy rather than individuals.	Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/25	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Concerned that there is no advantage in paying too much attention (in policy?) to the difference between historic and vernacular and that this is taking too much attention - rather: if buildings are unused the presumption should be to favour being put them to good use.	This concern is understood but misses the point that re-use is welcomed and encouraged in all cases except those that would harm countryside outside of settlements. However, the new use need not always be for a new home. Other uses (employment etc.) are encouraged by having less rigorous 'tests' to pass. It is the relationship to housing policy that requires justification on the basis of "enhancement."	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/26	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No	Yes 2		Where a building is of historic or architectural interest it is right to consider to what extent its features should be preserved. Sometimes it will be better to remodel to suit the new use and energy considerations.	The comment favours the greater level of detail and differentiation suggested in option 2 because of the increased flexibility that this might offer.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/27	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	No			Applying for a new use is not an abuse or attempt to circumvent that planning system (para2.77). This point is not understood, may be better deleted.	The concern in the original para 2.77 is to enable the planning system to have sufficient control over multiple applications that are designed to change / intensify the use of a building over time and secure permission for housing where this would not have been permitted in a single step change from (say) an agricultural building.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/07	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes				Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
053	Peak Park Watch	053/11	Landscape and Conservation	11	Conservation of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Yes			but should combine with option 2 (preferred approach) of issue 12	Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
003	National Farmers Union	003/05	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Page 33, option 2. We hope that traditional buildings which are part of farmsteads, one of the buildings in a recognised farmyard, will be considered to be buildings in countryside locations rather than remote buildings in the countryside, and that conversion to housing for the family of the farm will be allowed as an alternative to affordable housing and holiday accommodation	Farmsteads are not assessed as being remote field-barns and in general the hopes expressed here are met by policy - including farm family housing which is dealt with in Core Strategy Policy HC3 with specific reference to conversion. Use by wider family members in instances of farm succession is dealt with in Issue 38 (see para 2.206).	
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/22	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			But needs to be more flexibility between the second and third bullet points using the kind of thinking explained under option 1.	This appears to be requesting more opportunity for re-use of more remote buildings based on criteria about consideration of the degree of impact on character. This is a reasonable expectation on policy.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
010	English Heritage	010/13	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes					Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
010	English Heritage	010/14	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations			Yes	"At risk" buildings may require intervention on order to secure retention and protection	Noted	
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/22	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			But needs to be more flexibility between the second and third bullet points using the kind of thinking explained under option 1.	Agreed. This appears to be requesting more opportunity for re-use of more remote buildings based on criteria about consideration of the degree of impact on character. This is a reasonable expectation on policy.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/22	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			But needs to be more flexibility between the second and third bullet points using the kind of thinking explained under option 1.	Agreed. This appears to be requesting more opportunity for re-use of more remote buildings based on criteria about consideration of the degree of impact on character. This is a reasonable expectation on policy.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/10	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes				Noted	Landscape first approach to heritage assets will assist in conservation and enhancement. Separate policy not brought forward as a result.

025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/18	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations		Yes		Considers alternative 1 to be more in keeping with NPPF where it thinks the emphasis to be on allowing conversions. It considers that a spatial hierarchy will be more inhibiting to good projects than simply considering applications on their merits.	Not agreed. The NPPF allows for consideration of National Park Purposes and circumstances in tandem with its general statements for re-use of buildings. Arguably a spatial hierarchy will prevent applicant from wasting time on the development of projects that will not be given permission.	
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/10	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations		Yes		Preferred option is too restrictive.	Noted.	Landscape first approach to heritage assets will assist in conservation and enhancement. Separate policy not brought forward as a result.
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/21	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes				Noted	Landscape first approach to heritage assets will assist in conservation and enhancement. Separate policy not brought forward as a result.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/14	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Historic and architectural merit need to be considered on their own terms. The Trust wishes "valued vernacular" to cover both listed buildings and those on a local list: these would qualify as heritage assets. Buildings of historic or vernacular merit would not, but nonetheless add to the character etc. of a group of buildings or Conservation Area. Consideration might be given to a matrix approach that combines issues 11 and 12. A potential matrix is supplied in the detailed response.	Agreed in part. The suggested matrix approach for different category heritage assets is considered more suited to the level of detail in SPD rather than the plan, but preferred uses in particular locations, recognises the sensitivity of landscape as well as buildings to different uses. Barn Conversions SPD can elaborate if necessary.	
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/22	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			But needs to be more flexibility between the second and third bullet points using the kind of thinking explained under option 1.	Agreed. This appears to be requesting more opportunity for re-use of more remote buildings based on criteria about consideration of the degree of impact on character. This is a reasonable expectation on policy.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
036	Youlgrave	036/19	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			But needs to be more flexibility between the second and third bullet points using the kind of thinking explained under option 1.	Agreed. This appears to be requesting more opportunity for re-use of more remote buildings based on criteria about consideration of the degree of impact on character. This is a reasonable expectation on policy.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/19	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			Need to be aware of possible dangers inherent in prioritising vernacular in medium to long term: a) the future absence of any imprint of present day design and architecture appropriate to a rural setting, and b) insufficient emphasis to sustainable energy efficient designs including retrofitting - resulting in unfavourable costs and lack of maintenance of areas outside National Park. The policies need a strong enabling commitment towards acceptable means of avoiding these dangers. There should be a spatial approach to these issues varying by settlement and landscape, moving away from the overly restrictive approach to date, including the current SPD	Noted but not directly relevant to the issue	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/08	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Objects strongly to preferred option.	Noted	
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/09	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Repeats points on issue 11 about not introducing new term such as "traditional buildings of historic or architectural merit" because it would complicate and confuse.	Noted. Consider "complicate and confuse"	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/10	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Policies in Core Strategy already provide guidance and acceptable new uses - E1/E2/RT1/RT2	Noted. Affected by new PD rights discussion.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/11	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations			Yes	Policies on conversion of buildings already provide clear guidance on acceptable uses for traditional buildings depending on their location. There is no need for additional guidance.	Consider. Affected by new PD rights discussion.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/12	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Policy HC1 (dealing with conversion to residential) is the only policy that does not include a spatial variation. This is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF. There is a finite supply of suitable buildings and the policy would not lead to proliferation in the open countryside.	Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations

045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/13	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations		Yes		Notwithstanding preference for no additional policy guidance, if a policy is necessary, option 1 is preferred, focussing on impact to stress the importance of conserving character and landscape.	Noted.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/12	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes				Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/02	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Quotes example of situation where barn change of use to residential should not be permitted, highlighting peripheral domestic clutter.	Noted. Current policy is able to resist such examples.	
051	The Ramblers Association	051/04	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Permitting a change of use to residential in a farm complex or village is also misconceived because (see 051/5 to 051/10).	These examples relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
051	The Ramblers Association	051/12	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations				Current policy is detrimental to the valued characteristics of the National Park. The conversions look like neither barns nor houses and are alien and incongruous. The current policy should be reviewed.	The examples given about the effect of policy relate to the details of design at a level of the design guide rather than policy in the Development Management Plan. They will be passed to the Cultural Heritage team and planning management service for consideration in that context	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/28	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			But needs to be more flexibility between the second and third bullet points using the kind of thinking explained under option 1.	Agreed. This appears to be requesting more opportunity for re-use of more remote buildings based on criteria about consideration of the degree of impact on character. This is a reasonable expectation on policy.	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/23	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
010	English Heritage	010/15	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes		broaden scope of policy	Policy should include additional criteria to cover important non-designated parks and gardens and areas of traditional parkland	Such areas are protected as community facilities or important open spaces or, in the context of neighbourhood planning, local green space. They are also part of the landscape strategy if there is any value as Parkland in a landscape character sense	See DMC9 and text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/23	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	No new policy created
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/23	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/19	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/11	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens			???	Preferred approach take no account of costs of maintenance. There is a need to consider viability and visitor related criteria, providing greater flexibility in relation to these to help sustain assets. Offers discussion on more flexible wording.	The NPPF sets the context for conservation of heritage assets and the different weight placed on conservation generally in National Parks.	See DMC9 and text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/22	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/15	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes			Core Strategy commitment to policy must be honoured - and other cultural heritage assets encompassed	Noted	See DMC9 and text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/23	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
036	Youlgrave	036/20	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
037	Natural England	037/08	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens				Supports inclusion. Offers no preference.	Noted	See DMC9 and text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/20	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/13	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/23	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text

053	Peak Park Watch	053/13	Landscape and Conservation	13	Important Parks and Gardens	Yes				Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/24	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	See DMC9 and text
010	English Heritage	010/16	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
010	English Heritage	010/17	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts				emphasises importance of traditional and historic shopfronts to character of buildings, street scene and wider area	Noted	DMS4 and text
010	English Heritage	010/18	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts		Yes		requests consideration of additional design guidance for shop fronts	SPD has been provided	DMS4 and text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/24	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/24	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/25	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/23	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/16	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts				Ideal solution may be to add missing elements into design guide, but this may be a convoluted approach to a modest matter	SPD has been provided	DMS4 and text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/24	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
036	Youlgrave	036/21	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/21	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/14	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/24	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/14	Landscape and Conservation	14	Shop Fronts	Yes				Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/25	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS4 and text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/25	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/11	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/24	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/17	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes			but detailed wording warrants review in relation to advertising intended to further NPK purposes (e.g. would the boundary millstones comply with LC11?)	Noted but specific wording for boundary millstones not thought to be justified.	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/25	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
036	Youlgrave	036/22	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
037	Natural England	037/09	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes			requests inclusion of LC11 (vi) in particular. Also would welcome specific ref to avoid detracting from landscape character.	Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/22	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising (includes LC11 (vi))
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/15	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/25	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/05	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes			this is becoming more of an issue	Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/15	Landscape and Conservation	15	Outdoor advertising	Yes			use of A boards should be discouraged, perhaps by promoting hanging signs	Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text

003	National Farmers Union	003/06	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No	No	Yes	Page 39, paragraph 2.102. We oppose option 2. Has size and type been a problem for this type of property in the past? If not, why should there be such tight controls now? The size and type of housing should depend on who it is needed for, size of family, etc.	Whilst the needs of the farming occupiers are understood, the possibility of a legal agreement being challenged at any time in the future (not simply at the time of the move from agricultural to local need) remains. We know from past experience in the affordable housing sector that the maintenance of restrictions (intended to secure affordability in perpetuity) on a house that is significantly larger than the agreed range is not considered to be "reasonable." Occupancy may frequently vary more quickly than a homes size and type so tying this to a particular family income etc. may not be sustainable in the long term.	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/26	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 replacement needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/27	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/28	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point has been considered carefully in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/29	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral			Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	Correct	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/30	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	it is not obvious to officers where this might apply or why but the size restriction has been removed in any case so the fear raised would not materialise.	DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text; and supporting text nevertheless takes on board that simpler design standards for stabling can be helpful in enabling equestrian business to flourish and in doing so helps guard against over designed and specked stable blocks.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/21	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy. Ian - this is logical but under new pd rights and NPPF it is harder to argue against the existence of some businesses in the countryside.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/22	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/23	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point has been considered carefully in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/24	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral			Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	This is a correct presumption.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/25	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	it is not obvious to officers where this might apply or why but the size restriction has been removed in any case so the fear raised would not materialise.	See DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/20	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/21	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/22	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point needs to be considered carefully with legal services in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/23	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral			Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	This is a correct presumption.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/24	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	I cant think of a situation where this might apply	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
025	Country Land and Business Association	025/20	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Continued support for these dwelling is extremely important. The consultation mentions potential abuse but does not recognise the need to provide housing that meets the needs of the employee and his family	wants LC12 with wider definition of essential worker and wants scope for family houses. Both can be achieved in replacement LC12 because there are space standards for 3,4, and 5 bed houses in the housing SPG.It is wrong therefore to assume affordable = small one and two bed houses.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/13	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	Yes				supported	support noted	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/23	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	Yes				supported	support noted	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
003	National Farmers Union	003/6	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No	No	Yes		Page 39, paragraph 2.102. We oppose option 2. Has size and type been a problem for this type of property in the past? If not, why should there be such tight controls now? The size and type of housing should depend on who it is needed for, size of family, etc.	Ask question about whether size an type has been a problem in the past. Whilst the needs of the farming occupiers are understood, the possibility of a legal agreement being challenged at any time in the future (not simply at the time of the move from agricultural to local need) remains. We know from past experience in the affordable housing sector that the maintenance of restrictions (intended to secure affordability in perpetuity) on a house that is significantly larger than the agreed range is not considered to be "reasonable." Occupancy may frequently vary more quickly than a homes size and type so tying this to a particular family income etc. may not be sustainable in the long term.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
034	National Trust	034/18	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	Yes				But consideration in keeping with Core Strategy needs to be wider than "agricultural or forestry workers" of the local plan and encompass "other rural enterprises"	Trust does not want restricted size and type of dwelling, and asks for wider definition of essential worker. We can agree to the latter, but the former needs work. It would be that the mechanism to restrict size and type is to prevent abuse of the policy but does not result in an affordable home in a sustainable location. Is so, what does it achieve? and is that reasonable?	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/26	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/27	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMU1 - DMU5 and supporting text to each policy
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/28	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point needs to be considered carefully with legal services in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/29	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral				Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	This is a correct presumption.	See DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/30	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	I cant think of a situation where this might apply	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
033	Rainow Parish council	033/25	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Option 1 preferred	Noted	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/26	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/27	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/28	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No				Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point has been considered carefully in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/29	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral			Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	This is a correct presumption.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/30	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	I cant think of a situation where this might apply	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council	017/21	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council	017/22	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council	017/23	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point has been considered carefully in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMU2: New and upgraded facilities; and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council	017/24	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral			Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	This is a correct presumption.	See DMU3: Development close to utility installations; and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council	017/25	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	I cant think of a situation where this might apply	See DMU3: Development close to utility installations; and supporting text
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/23	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Happy with LC12 as it is	Noted. However, LC12 needs to accommodate the wider definitions of rural worker already accepted in the Core Policy.	See DMU3: Development close to utility installations; and supporting text
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/24	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether the option 1 statement about recently sold buildings will be practical.	There will be inevitable judgements and difficulties to be made in individual cases, but as a principle this simply brings forward something that was accepted in the Structure Plan.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance; and supporting text
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/25	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Questions whether it is right or legal in option 1 to require legal agreements relating to a future eventuality rather than the application itself.	This point has been considered carefully in the light of the policy intent to permit a building for a range of specified purposes and arrange for interchangeability between them in a manner that prevents abuse of the planning system over time.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance; and supporting text
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/26	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No but neutral			Presumes that a replacement dwelling would not be dealt with under these policy options	This is a correct presumption.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance; and supporting text
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/27	Landscape and Conservation	16	Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings	No			Emphasises that a dwelling in a more remote location might require elements that make it more unreasonable to apply affordable housing size standards.	cant think where this might apply	See DMU3: Development close to utility installations; and supporting text
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/21	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/26	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development				Preference should be given to help encourage a sustainable and viable farming industry	Noted and agreed. This is the purpose of policies that address farm diversification, balancing that aim against impact on National Park purposes.	DMH4: Essential Worker Dwellings and supporting text moves away from size restrictions on worker dwellings, relying more on the sustainable income of the business to support the worker dwelling rather than the workers themselves.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/19	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	DMH4: Essential Worker Dwellings: The policy can encompass other businesses that are operationally dependent on the land including recreational businesses. The size restricting criteria have been removed other than in the sense that second and subsequent worker dwellings are subservient in size to original house. This reflects the different justification for worker dwellings as opposed to affordable dwellings. The control is through requiring that construction costs reflect the established functional requirement and likely sustainable income of the business. The rest of the old policy LC12 remains
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/31	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	DMH4: Essential Worker Dwellings: The policy removes any notion of refusing worker accommodation where other builds have been recently disposed of but requires consideration of scope to convert other buildings on the farm or rent other property that enables the worker to be available at times an essential worker needs to be available

036	Youlgrave	036/28	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	DMH4: Essential Worker Dwellings: The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close of any possibility of other uses.
037	Natural England	037/10	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development			Yes	Supports inclusion and need to protect landscape. Suggests widening scope to protect biodiversity and soils.	Noted and responded to in other policies.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/24	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	DMH4: Essential Worker dwellings : the size constraint removed from policy but not for the reason given in the comment
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/17	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	DMH4: Essential Worker Dwellings: The policy can encompass other business businesses that are operationally dependent on the land including recreational businesses. The size restricting criteria have been removed other than in the sense that second and subsequent worker dwellings are subservient in size to original house. This reflects the different justification for worker dwellings as opposed to affordable dwellings. The control is through requiring that construction costs reflect the established functional requirement and likely sustainable income of the business. The rest of the old policy LC12 remains
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/31	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	The policy removes any notion of refusing worker accommodation where other builds have been recently disposed of but requires consideration of scope to convert other buildings on the farm or rent other property that enables the worker to be available at times an essential worker needs to be available
053	Peak Park Watch	053/17	Landscape and Conservation	17	Agricultural or forestry operational development	Yes				Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
003	National Farmers Union	003/07	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No	Yes 2	No	Page 42, paragraph 2.110. In the light of the increased push for economic development in the National Planning Policy Framework we would urge the Peak Park Authority to adopt option 2 which provides for a slight relaxation of protection rather than the additional protection against development implied by option 1.	The preference for a relaxation is noted, and new permitted development rights favour such an approach. The scope for change within business use classes is wide, but the Authority considers policy to secure control over impact on valued characteristics is not considered unreasonable.	The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close of any possibility of other uses.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/32	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No		Yes	Seeks a more proactive approach with a presumption in favour of farm diversification built into any use of saved LC14	As shown in para 2.107 and 2.108, policy already presumes in favour of farm diversification except where circumstances would be likely to harm National Park purposes. A "proactive approach" could be achieved to more or less degree within this policy depending on the amount of time and resource offered by the NPA - for example through its farm liaison and economy teams.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/32	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No		Yes	Seeks a more proactive approach with a presumption in favour of farm diversification built into any use of saved LC14	As shown in para 2.107 and 2.108, policy already presumes in favour of farm diversification except where circumstances would be likely to harm National Park purposes. A "proactive approach" could be achieved to more or less degree within this policy depending on the amount of time and resource offered by the NPA - for example through its farm liaison and economy teams.	DMH4: Essential Worker dwellings : the size constraint removed from policy but not for the reason given in the comment
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/32	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No		Yes	Seeks a more proactive approach with a presumption in favour of farm diversification built into any use of saved LC14	As shown in para 2.107 and 2.108, policy already presumes in favour of farm diversification except where circumstances would be likely to harm National Park purposes. A "proactive approach" could be achieved to more or less degree within this policy depending on the amount of time and resource offered by the NPA - for example through its farm liaison and economy teams.	The policy removes any notion of refusing worker accommodation where other builds have been recently disposed of but requires consideration of scope to convert other buildings on the farm or rent other property that enables the worker to be available at times an essential worker needs to be available
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/14	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	Yes				Noted.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text

025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/22	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification		Yes		The working economy should be at the heart of all National Park policies and will be at the key to sustaining environment and communities at a time of diminishing grant aid and assistance. Positive policies are needed to allow conversion of both traditional and modern buildings to alternative uses. Alternative 2 is more aligned with NPPF and recognises the need for business flexibility.	Affected by new PD rights discussion. Needs to be considered alongside issue 12 where reuse of existing buildings is concerned. The policy also applies to new buildings where there are not suitable existing buildings to use.	The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close off any possibility of other uses.
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/12	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification				Preferred approach is too restrictive. No information is offered as to why this is the case.	Noted. Affected by new PD rights discussion.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/27	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	Yes				Noted. Affected by new PD rights discussion.	DMH4: Essential Worker dwellings : the size constraint removed from policy but not for the reason given in the comment
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/20	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	Yes				Noted. Affected by new PD rights discussion.	Size constraint is removed and ancillary dwelling policy is constructed to enable farm succession planning where no worker need to justify a new house.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/32	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No		Yes	Seeks a more proactive approach with a presumption in favour of farm diversification built into any use of saved LC14	As shown in para 2.107 and 2.108, policy already presumes in favour of farm diversification except where circumstances would be likely to harm National Park purposes. A "proactive approach" could be achieved to more or less degree within this policy depending on the amount of time and resource offered by the NPA - for example through its farm liaison and economy teams. Change policy wording would not guarantee it.	The opposition to the preferred option has led to a policy that restricts construction costs and therefore size and type of building to that which reflect the functional requirement and the likely sustainable income of the business. The policy does not include criteria that prevents further worker dwellings where previous ones have been sold on. This reflects the fact that some earlier worker dwellings could not be sustained as worker dwellings, the Authority does not want to prevent successful business from operating (within limits outlined in Economy policies) and the Authority feels that the careful application of other criteria can prevent or permit further worker homes to replace lost ones subject to proper siting design and landscape impact criteria. This is forward looking rather than negatively framed to try and squeeze out all possibility of policy abuse
036	Youlgrave	036/01	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	Yes			Agree with option 2 that allows greater freedom for farm diversification.	Noted	The opposition to the preferred option has led to a policy that restricts construction costs and therefore size and type of building to that which reflect the functional requirement and the likely sustainable income of the business. The policy does not include criteria that prevents further worker dwellings where previous ones have been sold on. This reflects the fact that some earlier worker dwellings could not be sustained as worker dwellings, the Authority does not want to prevent successful business from operating (within limits outlined in Economy policies) and the Authority feels that the careful application of other criteria can prevent or permit further worker homes to replace lost ones subject to proper siting design and landscape impact criteria. This is forward looking rather than negatively framed to try and squeeze out all possibility of policy abuse
036	Youlgrave	036/01	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No	Yes 2		seeks greater freedom for farm diversification - especially where buildings are in or on the edge of a village and outbuildings lend themselves to re-use for offices and light industry - including modern farm buildings that could be recycled without need for rebuilding.	Core Strategy Development Strategy DS1 and Business policy E1 for towns and villages already enable the flexibility desired within villages with the exception of direct re-use of a modern agricultural building if that is not considered appropriate.	size restriction removed
036	Youlgrave	036/29	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No		Yes	Seeks a more proactive approach with a presumption in favour of farm diversification built into any use of saved LC14	As shown in para 2.107 and 2.108, policy already presumes in favour of farm diversification except where circumstances would be likely to harm National Park purposes. A "proactive approach" could be achieved to more or less degree within this policy depending on the amount of time and resource offered by the NPA - for example through its farm liaison and economy teams. Change policy wording would not guarantee it.	size restriction removed and wider definition of worker included in policy. No requirement to re-cycle as affordable home.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/25	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	Yes			Comment states support for use restriction by value to land management and enhancing the national park rather than by use class.	This is nearest to option 1 and has been logged as support for the preferred option since option 2 does not bring forward constraints on use and therefore does not "retain policy based on LC14" (the stated preference).	Natural Zone policy is for development requiring planning consent.

046	Derbyshire County Council	046/18	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	Yes				Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/32	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification	No		Yes	Seeks a more proactive approach with a presumption in favour of farm diversification built into any use of saved LC14	As shown in para 2.107 and 2.108, policy already presumes in favour of farm diversification except where circumstances would be likely to harm National Park purposes. A "proactive approach" could be achieved to more or less degree within this policy depending on the amount of time and resource offered by the NPA - for example through its farm liaison and economy teams. Change policy wording would not guarantee it.	The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close of any possibility of other uses.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/18	Landscape and Conservation	18	Farm diversification				Policy should be expanded as in option 2 to enable more uses	The new policy plus changes to permitted development rights are considered to be sufficiently enabling of diversified business uses	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Support noted.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted	The policy removes any notion of refusing worker accommodation where other builds have been recently disposed of but requires consideration of scope to convert other buildings on the farm or rent other property that enables the worker to be available at times an essential worker needs to be available
010	English Heritage	010/19	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features				Further definition of heritage assets needed.	Noted.	DMH4: Essential Worker Dwellings incorporates elements of option 1 but stops short of refusing new worker accommodation simply because existing worker accommodation has recently been disposed of.
010	English Heritage	010/19	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features			Yes	requests further definition of "heritage assets" and incorporation of concept of significance (implies this is preferable to concentration on designated sites and features)	Read together with response 010/21 the logic of this is to move to a single heritage assets policy with the definition incorporated in the text rather than the policy.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Support noted.	The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close of any possibility of other uses.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Support noted.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted	
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/05	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Support noted.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered by both policy and publication.	Support noted.	The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close of any possibility of other uses.
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/28	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/21	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes			In principle but detailed policy will need more of a review. English Heritage advice and other documents in Core Strategy paragraph 9.46	Cultural heritage assets policies need to be updated.	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/21	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes			Needs more detailed review of LC15 with greater emphasis on characterisation and significance and settings as per recent advice from English Heritage. Attention is drawn to issue inter relationships.	Noted. The Authority considers that the setting of heritage assets and relationship to landscape is covered by supporting text and policy.	
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Support noted.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted	The legal agreement remains necessary but allows for variation or removal should circumstances justify a change. It is agreed that the legal agreement is only justified for the current use and not to automatically close of any possibility of other uses.
036	Youlgrave	036/30	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/26	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.	Noted	DMH9 Replacement Dwelling policy is for situations where it may be justified to replace a house wholesale

042	Friends of the Peak District	042/26	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features				Recommends integrated ecosystem approach to natural and cultural heritage assets. Recommends Euro resource entitled "How to Plan for Nature" as part of this. Individual site considerations should form part of wider network thinking and requirements which may require sub-standard habitats to be improved and could extend beyond the site.	Noted	DMH4: Essential worker dwellings: the size restraint is removed though not for the reasons requested.
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/19	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/19	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes			Saved policies LC15 and LC16 should be combined. Danger is that every site with evidence of past uses will be required to have archaeological investigation	Noted but point is more about application policy than policy itself.	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted.	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/33	Landscape and Conservation	19	Historic or cultural heritage sites and features	Yes				Noted.	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/34	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes				Noted	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
010	English Heritage	010/20	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes			Concept of significance should be incorporated and setting in respect of designated heritage assets as per paragraph 139 of NPPF.	Noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests; DMC12: Sites ,features or species of wildlife,geological or geomorphological importance; DMC13: Protecting trees, woodland or other landscape features put at risk by development; and DMC14: Pollution and Disturbance; plus supporting text for all. All of these serve to protect biodiversity and soils.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/34	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes				Noted	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/34	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes				Noted	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/06	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes				Noted	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/29	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes			No further comment.	Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/22	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features				Paragraphs 9.41 and 9.47 of Core Strategy give undertaking to bring forward policies - also need policy for other cultural heritage assets.	Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/34	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes				Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/27	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.	Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/20	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes			Saved policies LC15 and LC16 should be combined. Danger is that every site with evidence of past uses will be required to have archaeological investigation.	Combination of policies to rationalise Development Management Document to be considered.	
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/34	Landscape and Conservation	20	Archaeological sites and features	Yes				Noted	
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/35	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes				Noted	
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/35	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes				Noted	
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/35	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes				Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/07	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes				Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.

026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/01	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			Suggest reference is made to habitats of principal importance to biodiversity to reflect Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act S40 duties.	Noted and addressed	DME2: Farm Diversification does not promote greater flexibility for farms in or on the edge of villages because DS1 and E1 of the core strategy is considered to already offer sufficient flexibility where DME2 is considered too restricting in and around villages.
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/30	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			No further comment.	Noted	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/23	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			References to ecosystems services and climate change in paragraph 2.125 of consultation document are considered too vague and should be strengthened in text or by a new policy in order to uphold the core strategy commitment.	The Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD was adopted in 2013 and	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/35	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes				Support noted.	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
037	Natural England	037/11	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			Pleased that Authority embedding requirements of para 109 of NPPF in development management policies. Draw attention to 3rd bullet.	Support noted and comment addressed.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
037	Natural England	037/12	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			No reference is made to Green Infrastructure (para 114 of NPPF).	Support noted and comment addressed.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/28	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.		See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/21	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/35	Landscape and Conservation	21	Sites features and species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/36	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/36	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/36	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/08	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/02	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes			Suggested stronger requirement be included for long term management and inclusion of requirement to report to local records centre.	Check with Ecology.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/31	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text

034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/24	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes			Approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/36	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
037	Natural England	037/13	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes			References to para 118 of NPPF. Support criteria include firstly to avoid, then mitigate and as a last resort compensate.	Noted and addressed	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
038	Pauline Beswick	038/01	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable				There should be more expression of the need to safeguard, record and enhance the historic environment, in line with the approach adopted for the natural environment - see wording of issue 22 and the "must" used.	Noted and addressed	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/29	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.	request noted	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overtly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/22	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overtly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/36	Landscape and Conservation	22	Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests where development is acceptable	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/37	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/37	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/37	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/09	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/03	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites				Discussions with relevant wildlife trusts are relevant.	Noted and wildlife trusts consulted where necessary, however in house ecologists have inputted heavily to the policy development which is an opportunity not available to many LPAs and is perhaps why this point was made	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text

032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/13	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	No			Current wording of CC19 overly restrictive. Greater thought needed at pre-application stage. Distinction between designated and undesignated sites.	Statutory purpose of National Park is to conserve and enhance wildlife.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/32	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/25	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes			Preferred approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/37	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
037	Natural England	037/14	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes			Natural England welcomes inclusion and supports proposed approach.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
038	Pauline Beswick	038/02	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites				Important to assess importance of non-statutory designated buildings and historic elements.	Noted, and policy and text does this	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/30	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites				Should cover opportunities for creating resistant ecological networks which may require substandard habitats to be improved and could extend beyond the site aided by biodiversity opportunity mapping	Noted and the Authority has begun work to map such areas.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/23	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/37	Landscape and Conservation	23	Assessing the nature conservation importance of non-statutory designated sites	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/38	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
010	English Heritage	010/25	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Preferred approach welcomed.	Support noted.	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/38	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/38	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/10	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	Reference is made in supporting text to DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/04	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Policy should be extended to cover other habitats other than woodland.	Noted and addressed by policy not least in the title	
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/33	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	The Core Strategy policy is now supplemented by the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD which was adopted in 2013 (i.e. supersedes the 2012 consultation document). This issue is considered to be addressed without the need for further policy

034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/26	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Preferred approach supported but re-planting of trees not always appropriate.	Noted and can be addressed on a case by case basis in line with landscape strategy management principles for particular areas and other guidance from conservation area analyses.	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/38	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	Reference to 'no net loss in biodiversity or geodiversity' is built into policy and text'.
037	Natural England	037/15	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Natural England welcomes inclusion and supports proposed approach.	Support noted.	Management of networks of biodiversity in supporting text. Other aspects of green infrastructure such as important open spaces, woodlands etc. are covered by other policies in this and other chapters of the plan e.g. DMC13: Protecting trees, woodland or other landscape features put at risk by development.
038	Pauline Beswick	038/03	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overtly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/31	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.	request noted	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
047	Woodland Trust	047/01	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Extend policy to provide protection for ancient woodlands.	request noted and addressed by policy	See DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance; and supporting text.
047	Woodland Trust	047/02	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Ancient woods richest wildlife habitats - particularly valuable. Preserving archaeological features and evidence of past land use.	request noted and addressed by policy	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
047	Woodland Trust	047/03	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Protection for finite resource from effects of adjacent and nearby land use. Not possible to replace ancient woodland by planning.	request noted and addressed by policy	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
047	Woodland Trust	047/04	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Would like to see policy commitment for creation of new woodland.	Development decisions are informed by landscape character and landscape strategy and if new woodland is necessary to achieve the management objectives for a particular character area or location it could be incorporated into a development .	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/24	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/38	Landscape and Conservation	24	Protecting trees, woodlands and of the landscape features	Yes				Support noted.	Staffordshire Moorlands EIP to check
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/39	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Impact on local neighbours.	Covered in GSP3 and DMC14 Pollution and disturbance development management criteria.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/39	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Impact on local neighbours.	Covered in GSP3 and DMC14 Pollution and disturbance development management criteria.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/39	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Impact on local neighbours.	Covered in GSP3 and DMC14 Pollution and disturbance development management criteria.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/11	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/05	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance				Should include reference to wildlife impacts.	valued characteristics of an area include wildlife so is captured by criteria in DMC14: Pollution and disturbance	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text

033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/34	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overtly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/27	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Preferred approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/39	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Impact on local neighbours.	Covered in GSP3 and DMC14 Pollution and disturbance development management criteria.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
037	Natural England	037/16	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Support preferred approach to cover important topics such as noise, tranquillity and dark skies.	Noted and addressed in policy criteria	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/32	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance				Ecosystems.	Noted and is addressed by the policy and supporting text	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
049	Severn Trent Water	049/04	Pollution and Disturbance	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Would like to see cumulative impacts taken into consideration as per para 143 of the NPPF.	Cumulative impacts referenced in supporting text in relation to air quality and water quality in this policy and is covered for all types of cumulative impact by DMC1 Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/25	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/39	Landscape and Conservation	25	Pollution and disturbance	Yes			Impact on local neighbours.	Covered in GSP3 and DMC14 Pollution and disturbance development management criteria.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/12	Landscape and Conservation	26	Surface water run-off	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	26	Surface water run-off	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/35	Landscape and Conservation	26	Surface water run-off	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/28	Landscape and Conservation	26	Surface water run-off	Yes			Preferred approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/33	Landscape and Conservation	26	Surface water run-off				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.	request noted	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
049	Severn Trent Water	049/05	Surface water run off	26	Surface water run-off	?			Document identifies changes to sustainable drainage system.		See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
049	Severn Trent Water	049/06	Surface water run off	26	Surface water run-off	?			Approach to maintain existing policy LC22 appears to negate environmental criteria. Key issue for Seven Trent Water.	The combination of core strategy CC policies, SPD DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and general policies for siting design layout and landscaping alongside general policies for any development in relation to impact on landscape character and valued characteristics (e.g. DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes is considered to address this point adequately	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
049	Severn Trent Water	049/07	Surface water run off	26	Surface water run-off	?			Question whether the maintenance of existing policy context is sufficient.	The combination of core strategy CC policies, SPD DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and general policies for siting design layout and landscaping alongside general policies for any development in relation to impact on landscape character and valued characteristics (e.g. DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes is considered to address this point adequately	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/26	Landscape and Conservation	26	Surface water run-off	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
006	Environment Agency	006/01	Contaminated Land	27	Contaminated land				LC24 relates only to human health - risk to water environment also to be taken into account.	DMC14: Pollution and Disturbance is considered to pick up and address this concern	See DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/13	Landscape and Conservation	27	Contaminated land	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	27	Contaminated land	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development

033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/36	Landscape and Conservation	27	Contaminated land	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/29	Landscape and Conservation	27	Contaminated land	Yes			Preferred approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/34	Landscape and Conservation	27	Contaminated land				Recommend "ecosystems" approach to this suite of issues.	request noted	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
053	Peak Park Watch	053/27	Landscape and Conservation	27	Contaminated land	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/14	Landscape and Conservation	28	Unstable land	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	28	Unstable land	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/37	Landscape and Conservation	28	Unstable land	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/30	Landscape and Conservation	28	Unstable land	Yes			Preferred approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
053	Peak Park Watch	053/28	Landscape and Conservation	28	Unstable land	Yes			Saved policy acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/15	Landscape and Conservation	29	Site briefs	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
026	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation	29	Site briefs	Yes			Matters relating to landscape are comprehensively covered both policy and publication.	Support noted.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overtly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
033	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/38	Landscape and Conservation	29	Site briefs	Yes			No further comment.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/31	Landscape and Conservation	29	Site briefs	Yes			Preferred approach agreed.	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/35	Landscape and Conservation	29	Site briefs				No preferred option given. Favour making greater use of site briefs in conjunction with ecosystems approach. This would enable NPA to set out preferences for how sites are developed.	Comment noted and	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
053	Peak Park Watch	053/29	Landscape and Conservation	29	Site briefs	Yes			Selective use of site briefs acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/ 45	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder thinks some new housing is key to tackle ageing population and conserving and enhancing the Park	The Core Strategy evidence explained that an ageing population would not be avoidable under any of the different development scenarios presented . The Authority has therefore prioritised development of the scarce capacity it has for development towards the needs of those who cannot to form households and are considered to be in housing need. The needs of others can be addressed through re-development of previously developed land and by conversion or in some cases replacement so housing provision is across types and tenure.	See DMU3: Development close to utility installations; and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/46	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are beyond suggesting that villages are not thriving. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the correlation between housing provision and a community's health is not evidenced or exact and cannot therefore drive policy .	See DMU3: Development close to utility installations; and supporting text

016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/47	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder claims shortcomings in the Authority's residents survey vis a vis quality of life	The survey is noted but is not part of the evidence base for this Part 2 Local Plan document.	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/48	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners	The Authority policy of not allocating housing sites, and considering sites as 'exception sites' for affordable housing only has suppressed land values to ensure development can be delivered at a cost that addresses community need for affordable housing. This has proved successful over this and previous plan periods.	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/49	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the Authority acknowledges that its policies may discourage investment. The responder states that we are preventing conservation and enhancement by discouraging private sector investment.	The Authority considered it an acceptable risk for the benefit of those in housing need. The responder directly relates private sector investment to community vibrancy when the main driver for private sector investment is conservation and enhancement rather than addressing the locally evidenced need for affordable housing. This is confusing individuals needs (aggregated up to parish need for housing purposes), with a perceived community need for vibrancy.	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/50	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The responder questions the definition of proven need used in LH1 on grounds that private sector investment for conservation or enhancement in villages on sites of higher than agricultural land values is considered justified for the conservation and enhancement it brings and not for other community benefits.	Core Strategy Policy HC1 deliberately requires a community return. If the Authority lowers the bar, it loses the opportunity to address local need for affordable housing through such schemes. This either pressures greenfield sites or hastens the end of building altogether whether for local need or not.	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/51	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests a wider definition of local need	The definition of need is not a local definition but based on criteria widely used by housing authorities to allocate properties. The definition of 'local' is logical for our plan purposes and has been proven to work provided that housing providers don't allow need to at the expense of local connection (both are required)	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/52	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requested intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction as well as affordable housing	This is not considered to be the best use of limited exception sites in terms of meeting the affordable housing needs of the Park as required by the English National Parks and the Broads National Park Vision and Circular. Where individuals justify an affordable house to meet their own need it becomes effectively an intermediate house on re-sale because it remains restricted to local persons irrespective of their housing need.	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/53	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing eligible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies add detail to core strategy policy rather than changing its intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that new housing at a higher level will protect against loss or closure of community facilities. There is no evidence to support this assertion and some evidence from recent cases that it wouldn't. (Hartington appeal decision)	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/54	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder asks us to consider reasonable need rather than proven need	The basis for assessing needed and therefore likely delivery against need is embedded in the core strategy. The responder doesn't state what reasonable need might mean in practice so it is hard to assess how a policy including such a term could be used with any consistency or monitored	there was support to retain LU4 but Core Strategy and DMP policies don't seem to have covered this in the way we suggested in 2012 e.g. windfarms not mentioned anywhere.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/55	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests consistency between HC1 and LH1 in terms of specifying what can and can't be built by private developers	LH1 is replaced by DMH1 and there is no policy presumption that affordable housing cannot be delivered by private developers	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text.

016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/56	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder does not like criteria 2 of LH1 on basis that if a house is already available it stops people with land from building and breaks community networks	The new build of property when a suitable one exists in the parish will not be used to prevent further affordable housing development provided that the additional property would have been justified by the scale of housing need being beyond what existing affordable housing could provide for	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/44	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder thinks some new housing is key to tackling ageing population and conserving and enhancing the Park	The Core Strategy evidence explained that an ageing population would not be avoidable under any of the different development scenarios presented . The Authority has therefore prioritised development of the scarce capacity it has for development towards the needs of those who cannot to form households and are considered to be in housing need. The needs of others can be addressed through re-development of previously developed land and by conversion or in some cases replacement so housing provision is across types and tenure.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure supporting text which references the code of practice as a source of guidance to be used
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/ 45	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are beyond suggesting that villages are not thriving. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the correlation between housing provision and a community's health is not evidenced or exact and cannot therefore drive policy .	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/46	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder claims shortcomings in the Authority's residents survey vis a vis quality of life	The survey is noted but is not part of the evidence base for this Part 2 Local Plan document.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/47	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners	The Authority policy of not allocating housing sites, and considering sites as 'exception sites' for affordable housing only has suppressed land values to ensure development can be delivered at a cost that addresses community need for affordable housing. This has proved successful over this and previous plan periods.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/48	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the Authority acknowledges that its policies may discourage investment. The responder states that we are preventing conservation and enhancement by discouraging private sector investment.	The Authority considered it an acceptable risk for the benefit of those in housing need. The responder directly relates private sector investment to community vibrancy when the main driver for private sector investment is conservation and enhancement rather than addressing the locally evidenced need for affordable housing. This is confusing individuals needs (aggregated up to parish need for housing purposes), with a perceived community need for vibrancy.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/49	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The responder questions the definition of proven need used in LH1 on grounds that it doesn't cover some situations such as conservation or enhancement in villages on sites of higher than agricultural land values.	Core Strategy Policy HC1 deliberately requires a community return. If the Authority lowers the bar, it loses the opportunity to address local need for affordable housing through such schemes. This either pressures greenfield sites or hastens the end of building altogether whether for local need or not.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text, which now avoids any reference to PPS8
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/50	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests a wider definition of local need	The definition of need is not a local definition but based on criteria widely used by housing authorities to allocate properties. The definition of 'local' is logical for our plan purposes and has been proven to work provided that housing providers don't allow need to at the expense of local connection (both are required)	See DMU5: restoration of utility and telecommunications infrastructure

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/51	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction asked for	Intermediate homes do get added to stock when local people justify their own housing need and a house is built to meet their needs. These houses are recycled to local people, irrespective of their housing need, and they provide a small but growing number of houses for local people. The houses are however always justified by a housing need and retain occupancy restrictions so that they cannot be sold off as second homes or holiday homes.	See DMU5: restoration of utility and telecommunications infrastructure
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/52	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing eligible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies add detail to core strategy policy rather than changing its intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that new housing at a higher level will protect against loss or closure of community facilities. There is no evidence to support this assertion and some evidence from recent cases that it wouldn't. (Hartington appeal decision)	See DMU5: restoration of utility and telecommunications infrastructure
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/53	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder asks us to consider reasonable need rather than proven need	the basis for assessing needed and therefore likely delivery against need is embedded in the core strategy. The time for redefining need is gone but could be reconsidered at core strategy review. The responder doesn't state what reasonable need might mean in practice so it is hard to assess how a policy including such a term could be used with any consistency and monitored	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/54	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				need consistency between HC1 and LH1 in terms of specifying what can and cant be built by private developers	LH1 is replaced by DMH1 and there is no policy presumption that affordable housing cannot be delivered by private developers	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/55	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				don't like criteria 2 of LH1 on basis that if a house is already available it stops people with land from building and breaks community networks	The existence of a suitable house in the parish will not be used to prevent further affordable housing development provided that the additional property would have been justified by the scale of housing need being beyond what existing affordable housing could provide for	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/14	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				update the SPG too,	This is a reasonable request	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/15	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				and SPG must be full review with consultation rather than update of old one	This is a reasonable request	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/16	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Review size standards for affordable homes because they are too restrictive	This is reasonable to review and this has happened	See DMM57: Restoration and Aftercare; and supporting text.
042	Friends of Peak District	042/36	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			The responder favours a spatial approach to these policies, enabling a variation in the emphasis of the policies, and of how tightly drawn the definitions and boundaries for local need might be, based on a classification or hierarchy of settlements. The Lake District Core Strategy (policy CS18) may offer a starting point for how some sites might be specifically prioritised for affordable housing: this could inform issues 35 (replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions), 40 (change of use from shop to any other use) and 43 (re-use of un-occupied business sites), and 51 (holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation) in which there could be a spatial and/or site-specific presumption in favour of affordable housing; and a corresponding presumption against open market housing or holiday accommodation.	This is considered over-elaborate and unnecessary. Such rigid demarcation of uses by location only serves to reduce development options not increase them. The Core Strategy DS1 settlement hierarchy has been judged sound. A detailed spatial approach is for core strategy review. The Authority understands the approach taken in the Lake District and why this is attractive to the responder but conditions here would need to be the same to merit a similar policy approach to the Lake District. This needs to be explored at core strategy review.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text. See DMM57: Restoration and Aftercare; and supporting text.

009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
003	National Farmers Union	003/8	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	No			Responder wants to see the potential for farmers families to be accommodated when vernacular buildings are converted	The Authority has created the policy framework within which farming families can stay together when vernacular building or other buildings on farmsteads are converted. The driver is conservation of the buildings, and in many cases the dwelling unit created would not be justified by the business need. However the scope to provide for generations of farming families is created. The policy requires however that the properties are linked together so that future generations of farming families can benefit from the same arrangement and so that open market housing with no link to land management or a settlement is avoided.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
034	National Trust	034/32	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW3: The Impact of Minerals and Waste Development on the Environment; and supporting text and DMC3 Siting, design, layout and landscaping; and supporting text paragraph 3.31.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/44	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			The responder highlights the Authority's vision for vibrant villages is in line with the NPVC 2010.	The Authority's vision is that communities are vibrant and that the Park is conserved and enhanced (core strategy page 42) but the indicators of a vibrant community are not stated.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/ 45	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder thinks some new housing is key to tackle ageing population and conserving and enhancing the Park	The Core Strategy evidence explained that an ageing population would not be avoidable under any of the different development scenarios presented . The Authority has therefore prioritised development of the scarce capacity it has for development towards the needs of those who cannot to form households and are considered to be in housing need. The needs of others can be addressed through re-development of previously developed land and by conversion or in some cases replacement so housing provision is across types and tenure.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/46	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are beyond suggesting that villages are not thriving. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the correlation between housing provision and a community's health is not evidenced or exact and cannot therefore drive policy .	
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/47	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder claims shortcomings in the Authority's residents survey vis a vis quality of life	The survey is noted but is not part of the evidence base for this Part 2 Local Plan document.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/48	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners	The Authority policy of not allocating housing sites, and considering sites as 'exception sites' for affordable housing only has suppressed land values to ensure development can be delivered at a cost that addresses community need for affordable housing. This has proved successful over this and previous plan periods.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text

005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/49	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the Authority acknowledges that its policies may discourage investment. The responder states that we are preventing conservation and enhancement by discouraging private sector investment.	The Authority considered it an acceptable risk for the benefit of those in housing need. The responder directly relates private sector investment to community vibrancy when the main driver for private sector investment is conservation and enhancement rather than addressing the locally evidenced need for affordable housing. This is confusing individuals needs (aggregated up to parish need for housing purposes), with a perceived community need for vibrancy.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/50	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The responder questions the definition of proven need used in LH1 on grounds that private sector investment for conservation or enhancement in villages on sites of higher than agricultural land values is considered justified for the conservation and enhancement it brings and not for other community benefits.	Core Strategy Policy HC1 deliberately requires a community return. If the Authority lowers the bar, it loses the opportunity to address local need for affordable housing through such schemes. This either pressures greenfield sites or hastens the end of building altogether whether for local need or not.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/51	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests a wider definition of local need	The definition of need is not a local definition but based on criteria widely used by housing authorities to allocate properties. The definition of 'local' is logical for our plan purposes and has been proven to work provided that housing providers don't allow need to at the expense of local connection (both are required)	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/52	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requested intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction as well as affordable housing	This is not considered to be the best use of limited exception sites in terms of meeting the affordable housing needs of the Park as required by the English National Parks and the Broads National Park Vision and Circular. Where individuals justify an affordable house to meet their own need it becomes effectively an intermediate house on re-sale because it remains restricted to local persons irrespective of their housing need.	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/53	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing eligible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies add detail to core strategy policy rather than changing its intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that new housing at a higher level will protect against loss or closure of community facilities. There is no evidence to support this assertion and some evidence from recent cases that it wouldn't. (Hartington appeal decision)	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/54	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder asks us to consider reasonable need rather than proven need	the basis for assessing need, and therefore likely delivery against need is embedded in the core strategy. The time for redefining need is gone but could be reconsidered at core strategy review. The responder doesn't state what reasonable need might mean in practice so it is hard to assess how a policy including such a term could be used and monitored with any consistency.	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/55	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				need consistency between HC1 and LH1 in terms of specifying what can and cannot be built by private developers	LH1 is replaced by DMH1 and there is no policy presumption that affordable housing cannot be delivered by private developers	See DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/56	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				don't like criteria 2 of LH1 on basis that if a house is already available it stops people with land from building and breaks community networks	The existence of a suitable house in the parish will not be used to prevent further affordable housing development provided that the additional property would have been justified by the scale of housing need being beyond what existing affordable housing could provide for	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.
053	Peak Watch	053/31	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				supported	support noted	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/1	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				supported	support noted	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.

023	Rowsley Parish Council	023/1	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The process for finding good sites and building homes is too protracted.	Policy does not require sites to be identified on plan but officers and communities have good understanding of scope for development and can steer developers to possible sites on the basis of SHLAA or capacity work or neighbourhood plan work	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text which encompasses calcite working without the need for a specific policy for calcite.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			responder thinks some new housing is key to tackling ageing population and conserving and enhancing the Park	The Core Strategy evidence explained that an ageing population would not be avoidable under any of the different development scenarios presented . The Authority has therefore prioritised development of the scarce capacity it has for development towards the needs of those who cannot to form households and are considered to be in housing need. The needs of others can be addressed through re-development of previously developed land and by conversion or in some cases replacement so housing provision is across types and tenure.	See DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities and supporting text offers sequential approach to locating such facilities, having regard to relevant municipal waste management strategies and providing criteria against which to judge proposals.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are beyond suggesting that villages are not thriving. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the correlation between housing provision and a community's health is not evidenced or exact and cannot therefore drive policy .	See DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities and supporting text offers sequential approach to locating such facilities, having regard to relevant municipal waste management strategies and providing criteria against which to judge proposals.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder claims shortcomings in the Authority's residents survey vis a vis quality of life	The survey is noted but is not part of the evidence base for this Part 2 Local Plan document.	See DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities and supporting text offers sequential approach to locating such facilities, having regard to relevant municipal waste management strategies and providing criteria against which to judge proposals.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Option 2			responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners .	The Authority policy of not allocating housing sites, and considering sites as 'exception sites' for affordable housing only has suppressed land values to ensure development can be delivered at a cost that addresses community need for affordable housing. This has proved successful over this and previous plan periods.	See DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities and supporting text offers sequential approach to locating such facilities, having regard to relevant municipal waste management strategies and providing criteria against which to judge proposals.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the Authority acknowledges that its policies may discourage investment. The responder states that we are preventing conservation and enhancement by discouraging private sector investment.	The Authority considered it an acceptable risk for the benefit of those in housing need. The responder directly relates private sector investment to community vibrancy when the main driver for private sector investment is conservation and enhancement rather than addressing the locally evidenced need for affordable housing. This is confusing individuals needs (aggregated up to parish need for housing purposes), with a perceived community need for vibrancy.	See DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities and supporting text offers sequential approach to locating such facilities, having regard to relevant municipal waste management strategies and providing criteria against which to judge proposals.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The responder questions the definition of proven need used in LH1 on grounds that private sector investment for conservation or enhancement in villages on sites of higher than agricultural land values is considered justified for the conservation and enhancement it brings and not for other community benefits.	Core Strategy Policy HC1 deliberately requires a community return. If the Authority lowers the bar, it loses the opportunity to address local need for affordable housing through such schemes. This either pressures greenfield sites or hastens the end of building altogether whether for local need or not.	See DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and Waste Development on Amenity; and supporting text. See DMMW3: The Impact of Minerals and Waste Development on the Environment; and supporting text and DMC3 Siting, design, layout and landscaping; and supporting text paragraph 3.31.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests a wider definition of local need	The definition of need is not a local definition but based on criteria widely used by housing authorities to allocate properties. The definition of 'local' is logical for our plan purposes and has been proven to work provided that housing providers don't allow need to at the expense of local connection (both are required)	no policy response needed

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requested intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction as well as affordable housing	This is not considered to be the best use of limited exception sites in terms of meeting the affordable housing needs of the Park as required by the English National Parks and the Broads National Park Vision and Circular. Where individuals justify an affordable house to meet their own need it becomes effectively an intermediate house on re-sale because it remains restricted to local persons irrespective of their housing need.	no policy response needed
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing eligible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies add detail to core strategy policy rather than changing its intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that new housing at a higher level will protect against loss or closure of community facilities. There is no evidence to support this assertion and some evidence from recent cases that it wouldn't. (Hartington appeal decision)	See DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities and supporting text offers sequential approach to locating such facilities, having regard to relevant municipal waste management strategies and providing criteria against which to judge proposals.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder asks us to consider reasonable need rather than proven need	the basis for assessing needed and therefore likely delivery against need is embedded in the core strategy. The time for redefining need is gone but could be reconsidered at core strategy review. The responder doesn't state what reasonable need might mean in practice so it is hard to assess how a policy including such a term could be used with any consistency and monitored	The preferred approach was for a more restrictive approach to the requirement for travel planning; ultimately, it was thought that Core Strategy Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic provided adequate weight for the requirement of Travel Plans. In reference to the signing of the Strategic Road Network, the preferred approach was for this to be dealt with under the Design Guide - this is currently under development as a Transport Design Guide SPD - expected to go to public consultation in the Spring of 2017.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				need consistency between HC1 and LH1 in terms of specifying what can and cant be built by private developers	LH1 is replaced by DMH1 and there is no policy presumption that affordable housing cannot be delivered by private developers	This overall approach has been carried over into the DMP, but the Core Strategy Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport and T2: Reducing and Directing Traffic provide the Strategic steer for this issue.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				don't like criteria 2 of LH1 on basis that if a house is already available it stops people with land from building and breaks community networks	The existence of a suitable house in the parish will not be used to prevent further affordable housing development provided that the additional property would have been justified by the scale of housing need being beyond what existing affordable housing could provide for	The preferred approach was for a more restrictive approach to the requirement for travel planning; ultimately, it was thought that Core Strategy Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic provided adequate weight for the requirement of Travel Plans. Our overall approach to encourage sustainable travel has been carried over into the DMP, but the Core Strategy Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport and T2: Reducing and Directing Traffic provide the Strategic steer for this issue.
024	Tissington Estate	024/15	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				supported	support noted	See response to 020/1
017	Winster Parish Council	005/45	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder thinks some new housing is key to tackle ageing population and conserving and enhancing the Park	The Core Strategy evidence explained that an ageing population would not be avoidable under any of the different development scenarios presented. The Authority has therefore prioritised development of the scarce capacity it has for development towards the needs of those who cannot to form households and are considered to be in housing need. The needs of others can be addressed through re-development of previously developed land and by conversion or in some cases replacement so housing provision is across types and tenure.	See response to 020/2

017	Winster Parish Council	005/46	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. This is a function of the type of people that live in the community. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the relationship of this housing provision to the state of the community must not be overstated.	The preferred approach was for a more restrictive approach to the requirement for travel planning; ultimately, it was thought that Core Strategy Policy T2: Reducing and directing traffic provided adequate weight for the requirement of Travel Plans.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/47	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing	Yes			Responder claims shortcomings in the Authority's residents survey vis a vis quality of life	The survey is noted but is not part of the evidence base for this Part 2 Local Plan document.	See response to 005/98
017	Winster Parish Council	005/48	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners	The Authority policy of not allocating housing sites, and considering sites as 'exception sites' for affordable housing only has suppressed land values to ensure development can be delivered at a cost that addresses community need for affordable housing. This has proved successful over this and previous plan periods.	See response to 034/58
017	Winster Parish Council	005/49	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the Authority acknowledges that its policies may discourage investment. The responder states that we are preventing conservation and enhancement by discouraging private sector investment.	The Authority considered it an acceptable risk for the benefit of those in housing need. The responder directly relates private sector investment to community vibrancy when the main driver for private sector investment is conservation and enhancement rather than addressing the locally evidenced need for affordable housing. This is confusing individuals needs (aggregated up to parish need for housing purposes), with a perceived community need for vibrancy.	See response to 005/98
017	Winster Parish Council	005/50	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The responder questions the definition of proven need used in LH1 on grounds that private sector investment for conservation or enhancement in villages on sites of higher than agricultural land values is considered justified for the conservation and enhancement it brings and not for other community benefits.	Core Strategy Policy HC1 deliberately requires a community return. If the Authority lowers the bar, it loses the opportunity to address local need for affordable housing through such schemes. This either pressures greenfield sites or hastens the end of building altogether whether for local need or not.	The preferred approach was to remove the issue from the DMP document, but to refer to it in the accompanying test. This was in light of the Authority's existing position and powers with regard Traffic Regulation Orders. The issue was removed from the DMP, however, there is a reference in DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way Part C, that restricts development that would increase vehicular traffic on footpaths bridleways or Byways Open to All Traffic, except in exceptional circumstances.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/51	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests a wider definition of local need	The definition of need is not a local definition but based on criteria widely used by housing authorities to allocate properties. The definition of 'local' is logical for our plan purposes and has been proven to work provided that housing providers don't allow need to at the expense of local connection (both are required)	See response to 034/59
017	Winster Parish Council	005/52	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requested intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction as well as affordable housing	This is not considered to be the best use of limited exception sites in terms of meeting the affordable housing needs of the Park as required by the English National Parks and the Broads National Park Vision and Circular. Where individuals justify an affordable house to meet their own need it becomes effectively an intermediate house on re-sale because it remains restricted to local persons irrespective of their housing need.	See response to 034/59

017	Winster Parish Council	005/53	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing legible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies should add detail to the policy as written and adopted not a policy of different intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that a few houses will make the difference between a school staying open or being closed or a shop staying open or being closed. There is no evidence that such an approach works and some evidence (Hartington assessment of community need) that suggests it wouldn't even if the need was properly assessed	See response to 034/59
017	Winster Parish Council	005/55	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				need consistency between HC1 and LH1 in terms of specifying what can and cant be built by private developers	LH1 is replaced by DMH1 and there is no policy presumption that affordable housing cannot be delivered by private developers	See response to 034/59
017	Winster Parish Council	005/56	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				don't like criteria 2 of LH1 on basis that if a house is already available it stops people with land from building and breaks community networks	The existence of a suitable house in the parish will not be used to prevent further affordable housing development provided that the additional property would have been justified by the scale of housing need being beyond what existing affordable housing could provide for	The preferred approach was for criteria against which proposals for major new roads would be considered, in effect a major development test. This approach has been taken forward as Policy DMT1: Cross-Park Infrastructure.
017	Winter Parish Council	005/54	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder asks us to consider reasonable need rather than proven need	the basis for assessing need, and therefore likely delivery against need, is embedded in the core strategy. The time for redefining need is gone but could be reconsidered at core strategy review. The responder doesn't state what reasonable need might mean in practice so it is hard to assess how a policy including such a term could be used with any consistency and monitored. If the Authority changes its definition of need (towards a definition that accepts a 5 year connection for example) the purpose, and likely outcome of that change needs to be agreed. The Authority would not agree that it would stimulate housing delivery, and would not agree that it will have any bearing on the vibrancy of a community. It will change the levels of need, but it will only increase the gap between need and delivery (for what purpose?)	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/44	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder thinks some new housing is key to tackling ageing population and conserving and enhancing the Park	The Core Strategy evidence explained that an ageing population would not be avoidable under any of the different development scenarios presented . The Authority has therefore prioritised development of the scarce capacity it has for development towards the needs of those who cannot to form households and are considered to be in housing need. The needs of others can be addressed through re-development of previously developed land and by conversion or in some cases replacement so housing provision is across types and tenure.	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/ 45	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. This is a function of the type of people that live in the community. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the relationship of this housing provision to the state of the community must not be overstated.	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/46	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder claims shortcomings in the Authority's residents survey vis a vis quality of life	The survey is noted but is not part of the evidence base for this Part 2 Local Plan document.	no policy response needed

036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/47	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners	The Authority policy of not allocating housing sites, and considering sites as 'exception sites' for affordable housing only has suppressed land values to ensure development can be delivered at a cost that addresses community need for affordable housing. This has proved successful over this and previous plan periods.	The preferred approach was for criteria against which proposals for major new roads would be considered, in effect a major development test. This approach has been taken forward as Policy DMT1: Cross-Park Infrastructure - Highways England are one of our Statutory Consultees.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/48	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder states that the Authority acknowledges that its policies may discourage investment. The responder states that we are preventing conservation and enhancement by discouraging private sector investment.	The Authority considered it an acceptable risk for the benefit of those in housing need. The responder directly relates private sector investment to community vibrancy when the main driver for private sector investment is conservation and enhancement rather than addressing the locally evidenced need for affordable housing. This is confusing individuals needs (aggregated up to parish need for housing purposes), with a perceived community need for vibrancy.	See response to 020/3
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/49	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				The responder questions the definition of proven need used in LH1 on grounds that private sector investment for conservation or enhancement in villages on sites of higher than agricultural land values is considered justified for the conservation and enhancement it brings and not for other community benefits.	Core Strategy Policy HC1 deliberately requires a community return. If the Authority lowers the bar, it loses the opportunity to address local need for affordable housing through such schemes. This either pressures greenfield sites or hastens the end of building altogether whether for local need or not.	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/50	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requests a wider definition of local need	The definition of need is not a local definition but based on criteria widely used by housing authorities to allocate properties. The definition of 'local' is logical for our plan purposes and has been proven to work provided that housing providers don't allow need to at the expense of local connection (both are required)	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/51	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				Responder requested intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction as well as affordable housing	This is not considered to be the best use of limited exception sites in terms of meeting the affordable housing needs of the Park as required by the English National Parks and the Broads National Park Vision and Circular. Where individuals justify an affordable house to meet their own need it becomes effectively an intermediate house on re-sale because it remains restricted to local persons irrespective of their housing need.	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/52	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing legible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies should add detail to the policy as written and adopted not a policy of different intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that a few houses will make the difference between a school staying open or being closed or a shop staying open or being closed. There is no evidence that such an approach works and some evidence (Hartington assessment of community need) that suggests it wouldn't even if the need was properly assessed	See response to 005/100
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/53	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder asks us to consider reasonable need rather than proven need	the basis for assessing needed and therefore likely delivery against need is embedded in the core strategy. The time for redefining need is gone but could be reconsidered at core strategy review. The responder doesn't state what reasonable need might mean in practice so it is hard to assess how a policy including such a term could be used with any consistency and monitored	The preferred approach was to retain the criteria for public transport route enhancement as per Local Plan Policy L5: Public transport route enhancement. However, it was decided to take the Option 2 approach, which was to rely on the strategic principles of Core Strategy Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport, rather than a detailed policy within the DMP.

036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/54	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				need consistency between HC1 and LH1 in terms of specifying what can and cant be built by private developers	LH1 is replaced by DMH1 and there is no policy presumption that affordable housing cannot be delivered by private developers	The preferred approach was to retain the criteria for public transport route enhancement as per Local Plan Policy L5: Public transport route enhancement. However, it was decided to take the Option 2 approach, which was to rely on the strategic principles of Core Strategy Policy T1: Reducing the general need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport, rather than a detailed policy within the DMP.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/55	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				don't like criteria 2 of LH1 on basis that if a house is already available it stops people with land from building and breaks community networks	The existence of a suitable house in the parish will not be used to prevent further affordable housing development provided that the additional property would have been justified by the scale of housing need being beyond what existing affordable housing could provide for	See response to 034/61
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/ 45	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder doesn't think policies will make a significant contribution to thriving villages	The responder states that the options don't address the issues facing communities without saying what the issues are beyond suggesting that villages are not thriving. In the general sense though, housing at the levels envisaged in the core strategy will not in itself affect the extent to which a settlement thrives or is vibrant. The provision of housing for local people in housing need plugs a gap in the housing stock which by common consent needs plugging but the correlation between housing provision and a community's health is not evidenced or exact and cannot therefore drive policy .	See response to 034/61
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/47	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				responder states that the problem of housing provision is the need to get the land off private land owners	This has always been the case but policy has suppressed land values to ensure development addresses community need as well as conservation and enhancement.	See response to 034/61
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/51	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				intermediate market housing with local occupancy restriction asked for	Intermediate homes do get added to stock when local people justify their own housing need and a house is built to meet their needs. These houses are recycled to local people, irrespective of their housing need, and they provide a small but growing number of houses for local people. The houses are however always justified by a housing need and retain occupancy restrictions so that they cannot be sold off as second homes or holiday homes.	The preferred response was to set out criteria related to the development of new railway termini or heritage / tourist railways. This approach is brought forward in DMP Policy DMT3: Railway Construction parts D and E.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/52	Housing	30	Addressing local needs for affordable housing				the responder asks us to consider a different definition of local need based on a community need rather than individuals aggregated need for affordable housing	HC1 is about addressing eligible local need for homes not about addressing wider community needs through housing provision. The development management policies add detail to core strategy policy rather than changing its intent. The assumption in suggesting housing delivery is aimed at addressing community needs rather than that of the individual is that new housing at a higher level will protect against loss or closure of community facilities. There is no evidence to support this assertion and some evidence from recent cases that it wouldn't. (Hartington appeal decision)	The preferred response was to set out criteria related to the development of new railway termini or heritage / tourist railways. This approach is brought forward in DMP Policy DMT3: Railway Construction parts D and E.
016	Bamford and Thorn hill PC	005/57	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				Responder requests criteria to determine mix of house types and level of contribution required.	The Authority commissions viability evidence where necessary to determine what is reasonable by way of numbers type and tenure mix. It also consults housing managers to establish a desirable mix and type of housing for particular location.	See response to 034/62
016	Bamford and Thorn hill PC	005/58	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				Responder asks how will we choose whether covenants are appropriate and how will we decide what the covenant requires?	In most cases the intention is to secure benefits on site whether that is through high standards of design and materials or through on site affordable housing or a combination of the two. The Authority has a mechanism under core strategy HC1 that requires commuted sums to be spent away from a site where there is no community need for affordable housing or it is an unsustainable location outside of a DS1 settlement	See response to 034/62

016	Bamford and Thorn hill PC	005/59	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes				Responder cannot see how independent advice on a case by case basis can work without applying certain criteria as to types of housing and as to the formula for financial contributions. In our view both of these should be dealt with in the Development Management Policies so that they can be subject to examination in public.	The process of commissioning independent viability evidence has resulted in successful resolution of two major enhancement opportunities since the Core Strategy was adopted. It remains appropriate to base the assessment on financial viability but also on what is appropriate for the environment in and around a site	It was thought that this issue was adequately covered at a strategic level within the Core Strategy. Therefore the preferred approach was not to bring the issue forward into the DMP.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/56	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings					but call for criteria to determine mix of house types and level of contribution required.	The criteria were implied by paragraph 2.162, and the approach now outlined in the Conservation and Housing Chapters makes clear that conservation outcomes are the driver for decisions rather than wider housing needs of the area.	It was thought that this issue was adequately covered at a strategic level within the Core Strategy. Therefore the preferred approach was not to bring the issue forward into the DMP.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/57	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings					Responder asks how will we choose whether covenants are appropriate and how will we decide what the covenant requires?	In most cases the intention is to secure benefits on site whether that is through high standards of design and materials or through on site affordable housing or a combination of the two. The Authority has a mechanism under core strategy HC1 that requires commuted sums to be spent away from a site where there is no community need for affordable housing or it is an unsustainable location outside of a DS1 settlement	See response to 034/63
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/58	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes				Responder cannot see how independent advice on a case by case basis can work without applying certain criteria as to types of housing and as to the formula for financial contributions. In our view both of these should be dealt with in the Development Management Policies so that they can be subject to examination in public.	The process of commissioning independent viability evidence has resulted in successful resolution of two major enhancement opportunities since the Core Strategy was adopted. It remains appropriate to base the assessment on financial viability but also on what is appropriate for the environment in and around a site	See response to 034/63
025	CLA	025/23	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes				CLA agrees with the preferred option for independent assessment of viability on enhancement sites but in pushing for cross subsidy they don't want the mixed housing development to stop at enhancement sites	The cross subsidy approach to housing delivery on exception sites has been explored, debated and rejected at Core Strategy examination. The Part 2 Local Plan is not re-opening the debate	It was thought that this issue was covered by existing approaches and facilities and that therefore there was no need to bring this issue within the scope of the DMP - this was the preferred approach.
025	CLA	025/24	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes				CLA consider that the unrestricted open market housing is a price worth paying to buy a few affordable houses on those sites that are thought to be good enough for new housing	The view is understood but was unsuccessfully argued for at core strategy stage	It was thought that this issue was covered by existing approaches and facilities and that therefore there was no need to bring this issue within the scope of the DMP - this was the preferred approach. The PDNPA were involved with discussions that led to the re-routing and rebranding of the 218 bus service via Chatsworth as the Peak Line Bus.
025	CLA	025/25	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes				CLA believes the SHMA would show a need for open market housing	Core Strategy has worked through the need for house types and the reason for trying to increase proportion of homes that are affordable. The population argument (accepted at core strategy stage) also changes the usual picture of housing provision.	It was thought that this issue was covered by existing approaches and facilities and that therefore there was no need to bring this issue within the scope of the DMP - this was the preferred approach.
025	CLA	025/26	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes				supported	support noted	See response to 034/64
025	CLA	025/31	Economy	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings					The responder wants a much greater emphasis on economic growth and cites NPPF paragraph 18 -22 and 28 as justification for that.	the CLA do not take into account NPPF paragraph 14 or 115 or the associated Vision and Circular with respect to how the government sees the development of economies in these areas. Paragraphs such as 29 and 66 make it clear that NPAs are considered to be doing well by their resident and business communities so there seems no justification to give business greater flexibility than it already enjoys through permitted development rights.	See response to 034/64

045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/17	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	No				The responder thinks issues 31 and 32 should be considered together	The two issues are inter related and in determining the policy response the issues are considered together. Where it is greenfield land, subdivision simply creates smaller exception sites, but would not reduce overall the scope for affordable housing. Where it is brownfield land there might be advantages or disadvantages to subdivision, and in most cases this would not avoid contributions towards affordable housing development. However, as brownfield land re-development is not driven by housing targets, it does not undermine other plan objectives to any significant extent, although the Authority discourages subdivision of land for the planning reason that this might unnecessarily stifle the scale of development that might otherwise be achievable.	Core Strategy Policy T4: Managing the demand for freight transport deals with freight at the strategic level, but the preferred option was for some of the detailed criteria from the Structure Plan (1994) Policy T7: Freight transport, haulage depots and lorry parks. This is brought forward within the Farming and Economy Chapter of the DMP under Policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/18	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	No				EPP say we are making misleading statements about NPPF paragraph 54.	The Authority defends its interpretation of NPPF and has had that interpretation regularly sustained at appeals since the core strategy was adopted. The cross subsidy approach to housing has been tested at examination and considered to be inappropriate, whilst the 100% affordable housing on exception site approach has been re-affirmed by government as justifiable for not just National Parks but any area that uses exception sites approach.	Core Strategy Policy T4: Managing the demand for freight transport deals with freight at the strategic level, but the preferred option was for some of the detailed criteria from the Structure Plan (1994) Policy T7: Freight transport, haulage depots and lorry parks. This is brought forward within the Farming and Economy Chapter of the DMP under Policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/19	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	No				Responder raises a strong objection to site by site viability assessment. Preference instead for certainty on thresholds park wide for benefit of agents and landowners	The Authority understands the request but, given the lack of known capacity for housing and the wider national park designation and development expectation, it considers it unjustified to forsake land to open market housing on a randomly agreed threshold.	See response to 034/65
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/20	Housing (31)	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	No				The responder objects to site by site assessments and prefers clear criteria including thresholds of affordables to open market housing	The Authority would agree that thresholds are useful if they are meaningful and aimed at achieving plan objectives. However, there is such a range of site types and likely costs of developing sites that arbitrary thresholds are not useful. A minimum would see agents only offering that: a middle ground would be pushed ever lower by agents and developers; a high level would be challenged constantly until it became untenable. A request to consider addressing local need up the point that schemes become unviable is needed with a commitment that the Authority will seek independent advice to assess this where it is necessary to reach a sound recommendation on a scheme. This would make it clear that we expected to see some effort to evidence and then address local housing need. Depending on the state of the economy; ability to borrow, interest rates, profit margins on open market homes etc., the viability will produce different figures. This is better than setting a low bar now which cant be raised or setting an over high bar that results in no development	See response to 034/65
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/21	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	No				EPP wants thresholds, but also wants flexibility to go beyond or below threshold depending on site	This request hints that thresholds are not always useful, which the Authority agrees with and which follows through into policy and text.	See response to 034/65

042	Friends of Peak District	042/37	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	No			The responder favours a spatial approach to these policies, enabling a variation in the emphasis of the policies, and of how tightly drawn the definitions and boundaries for local need might be, based on a classification or hierarchy of settlements. The Lake District Core Strategy (policy CS18) may offer a starting point for how some sites might be specifically prioritised for affordable housing: this could inform issues 35 (replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions), 40 (change of use from shop to any other use) and 43 (re-use of un-occupied business sites), and 51 (holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation) in which there could be a spatial and/or site-specific presumption in favour of affordable housing; and a corresponding presumption against open market housing or holiday accommodation.	This is considered over-elaborate and unnecessary. Such rigid demarcation of uses by location only serves to reduce development options not increase them. The Core Strategy DS1 settlement hierarchy has been judged sound. A detailed spatial approach is for core strategy review. The Authority understands the approach taken in the Lake District and why this is attractive to the responder but conditions here would need to be the same to merit a similar policy approach to the Lake District. This needs to be explored at core strategy review.	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document.
058	Guinness Northern Counties Housing Association	058/1	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			no comment	support noted	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document.
034	National Trust		Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			The approach proposed is one that is becoming increasingly tried and tested and National Trust has no objection to this approach	support noted	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. In addition it should be noted that the adopted standards allow sufficient flexibility to provide reasonable parking facilities to be incorporated into new developments.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/57	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				but call for criteria to determine mix of house types and level of contribution required.	The criteria are implied by paragraph 2.162 but perhaps need spelling out more clearly as the basic context for independent site by site analysis.	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. In addition it should be noted that the adopted standards allow sufficient flexibility to provide reasonable parking facilities to be incorporated into new developments.

005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/58	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				how will we choose whether covenants are appropriate and how will we decide what the covenant requires?	covenants are intended to secure community benefits. They should not be considered onerous and should be set at a level that enables both the developer and community to benefit, but the balance must not squeeze out community benefit for individual gain.	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. In addition it should be noted that the adopted standards allow sufficient flexibility to provide reasonable parking facilities to be incorporated into new developments.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/59	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			Responder cannot see how independent advice on a case by case basis can work without applying certain criteria as to types of housing and as to the formula for financial contributions. In our view both of these should be dealt with in the Development Management Policies so that they can be subject to examination in public.	The process of commissioning independent viability evidence has resulted in successful resolution of two major enhancement opportunities since the Core Strategy was adopted. It remains appropriate to base the assessment on financial viability but also on what is appropriate for the environment in and around a site	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. Policy DMT6: Visitor Parking provides additional clarification with regard to parking for visitors.
053	Peak Watch	053/32	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			supported	support noted	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. Policy DMT6: Visitor Parking provides additional clarification with regard to parking for visitors.
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/2	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			supported	support noted	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. With regard to Park and Ride, Core Strategy T7 provides the strategic steer, with DMP Policy DMT6 providing the link to Visitor Parking
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 005/101

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				but call for criteria to determine mix of house types and level of contribution required.	The criteria were implied by paragraph 2.162, and the approach now outlined in the Conservation and Housing Chapters makes clear that conservation outcomes are the driver for decisions rather than wider housing needs of the area.	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. DMP Policy DMT6 provides clarity on the provision of visitor parking
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				Responder asks how will we choose whether covenants are appropriate and how will we decide what the covenant requires?	In most cases the intention is to secure benefits on site whether that is through high standards of design and materials or through on site affordable housing or a combination of the two. The Authority has a mechanism under core strategy HC1 that requires commuted sums to be spent away from a site where there is no community need for affordable housing or it is an unsustainable location outside of a DS1 settlement	See response to 005/101
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			Responder cannot see how independent advice on a case by case basis can work without applying certain criteria as to types of housing and as to the formula for financial contributions. In our view both of these should be dealt with in the Development Management Policies so that they can be subject to examination in public.	The process of commissioning independent viability evidence has resulted in successful resolution of two major enhancement opportunities since the Core Strategy was adopted. It remains appropriate to base the assessment on financial viability but also on what is appropriate for the environment in and around a site	See response to 005/101
024	Tissington Estate	024/16	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 036/01
017	Winster Parish Council	005/57	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				but call for criteria to determine mix of house types and level of contribution required.	The criteria were implied by paragraph 2.162, and the approach now outlined in the Conservation and Housing Chapters makes clear that conservation outcomes are the driver for decisions rather than wider housing needs of the area.	See response to 036/01
017	Winster Parish Council	005/59	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			Responder cannot see how independent advice on a case by case basis can work without applying certain criteria as to types of housing and as to the formula for financial contributions. In our view both of these should be dealt with in the Development Management Policies so that they can be subject to examination in public.	The process of commissioning independent viability evidence has resulted in successful resolution of two major enhancement opportunities since the Core Strategy was adopted. It remains appropriate to base the assessment on financial viability but also on what is appropriate for the environment in and around a site	The preferred approach was to bring forward a range of parking policies, with scope to deviate from the Derbyshire Parking Standards according to the size of development. In practice, the complicated nature of the existing parking policies led to a rethink as to how they were presented resulting in the following DMP policies; DMT5: Business parking; DMT6: Visitor parking and DMT7: Residential off-street parking. In addition Derbyshire County Council no longer use their own parking standards, and use the 6Cs instead. Therefore it was decided to produce our own set of parking standards for the National Park - these form Appendix 10 of the document. DMP Policy DMT7: Residential off street parking provides the details on residential provision in conjunction with Appendix 10: Parking Standards.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/58	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				Responder asks how will we choose whether covenants are appropriate and how will we decide what the covenant requires?	In most cases the intention is to secure benefits on site whether that is through high standards of design and materials or through on site affordable housing or a combination of the two. The Authority has a mechanism under core strategy HC1 that requires commuted sums to be spent away from a site where there is no community need for affordable housing or it is an unsustainable location outside of a DS1 settlement	The preferred approach was to bring forward coach parking policies within a wider parking policy. However, it was decided that the cover offered by Core Strategy Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks was sufficient.

036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/56	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				but call for criteria to determine mix of house types and level of contribution required.	The criteria were implied by paragraph 2.162, and the approach now outlined in the Conservation and Housing Chapters makes clear that conservation outcomes are the driver for decisions rather than wider housing needs of the area.	The preferred approach was to bring forward coach parking policies within a wider parking policy. However, it was decided that the cover offered by Core Strategy Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks was sufficient.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/57	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings				Responder asks how will we choose whether covenants are appropriate and how will we decide what the covenant requires?	In most cases the intention is to secure benefits on site whether that is through high standards of design and materials or through on site affordable housing or a combination of the two. The Authority has a mechanism under core strategy HC1 that requires commuted sums to be spent away from a site where there is no community need for affordable housing or it is an unsustainable location outside of a DS1 settlement	The preferred approach was to bring forward coach parking policies within a wider parking policy. However, it was decided that the cover offered by Core Strategy Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks was sufficient.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/58	Housing	31	Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings	Yes			Responder cannot see how independent advice on a case by case basis can work without applying certain criteria as to types of housing and as to the formula for financial contributions. In our view both of these should be dealt with in the Development Management Policies so that they can be subject to examination in public.	The process of commissioning independent viability evidence has resulted in successful resolution of two major enhancement opportunities since the Core Strategy was adopted. It remains appropriate to base the assessment on financial viability but also on what is appropriate for the environment in and around a site	The preferred approach was to bring forward coach parking policies within a wider parking policy. However, it was decided that the cover offered by Core Strategy Policy T7: Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks was sufficient.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/60	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				The responder contends that the incremental development of sites with open market housing but no contribution is contrary to the intent of HC1 but would mean someone wanting to develop a house on a large plot of land or curtilage would be disadvantaged by either a refusal or the requirement to sign up to whole site development.	The justification for market housing is clearly described under HC1. The danger of incremental re-development of sites to avoid affordable housing contributions is recognised.	The preferred approach was to rely on the strategic principles of the Core Strategy to deliver traffic restraint rather than to bring forward detailed DMP Policy. This is the approach that was undertaken.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/61	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				The responder thinks it is unworkable because land could simply be divided into plots and developed piecemeal over time	The subdivision of land does not remove the requirement to comply with policy but might enable holders of large plots of land to realise some monetary value on land they no longer need. The value is however suppressed by the restrictive context for housing delivery that has existed over successive plan periods and which has been accepted as a successful way of addressing local need for affordable homes.	The preferred approach was to rely on the strategic principles of the Core Strategy to deliver traffic restraint rather than to bring forward detailed DMP Policy. This is the approach that was undertaken.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/59	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				the incremental development of sites with open market housing but no contribution is contrary to the intent of HC1 but would mean someone wanting to develop a house on a large plot of land or curtilage would be disadvantaged by either a refusal or the requirement to sign up to whole site development.	Incremental re-development of brownfield sites may enable the developer to avoid affordable housing contributions, but may also prevent the developer achieving future permissions (if done poorly and with no longer term plan for the site) Subdivision of greenfield exception sites simply creates more green field exception sites so it does not threaten HC1 other than HC1Cii.	The preferred approach was to rely on the strategic principles of the Core Strategy to deliver traffic restraint rather than to bring forward detailed DMP Policy. This is the approach that was undertaken.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/60	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				responder thinks it is unworkable because land could simply be divided into plots and developed piecemeal over time	The subdivision of land does not remove the requirement to comply with policy but might enable holders of large plots of land to realise some monetary value on land they no longer need. The value is however suppressed by the restrictive context for housing delivery that has existed over successive plan periods and which has been an accepted and successful way of addressing local need for affordable homes.	The preferred approach was to rely on the strategic principles of the Core Strategy to deliver traffic restraint rather than to bring forward detailed DMP Policy. This is the approach that was undertaken.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/22	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	No			The grounds for requiring a legal obligation are not consistent with NPPF paragraph 204.	The Authority will use the normal planning process to determine applications and, where land has been subdivided, will treat each case on its merits. Legal agreements will only be used where the tests of paragraph 204 can be met	The preferred approach was to rely on the strategic principles of the Core Strategy to deliver traffic restraint rather than to bring forward detailed DMP Policy. This is the approach that was undertaken. The DMP policies contain no references to reducing speed limits or road user charging.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/23	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	No			EPP points to previous planning guidance which prevented artificial shrinking of sites to avoid affordable house provision.	Subdivision would undoubtedly affect viability but could also affect the enhancement prospects so taking this step to avoid affordable housing contributions could damage the development potential of the site(s)	The preferred approach was to combine this issue with relating to provision for cycling, horse riders and pedestrians. However, moving forward the issue was split across the DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way underpart D(iv), and the Transport Infrastructure Design Guide SPD that is currently under development.

045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/24	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	No			EPP think danger of artificial site shrinkage should be dealt with at application stage	Supporting text discourages shrinking of sites but policy does not penalise those who do. Pre application advice could warn of the dangers of shrinking sites to avoid affordable housing contributions in terms of the danger of damaging enhancement potential	The preferred approach was to combine this issue with relating to provision for cycling, horse riders and pedestrians. However, moving forward the issue was split across the DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way underpart D(iv), and the Transport Infrastructure Design Guide SPD that is currently under development.
042	Friends of Peak District	042/38	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	No			We would favour a spatial approach to these policies, enabling a variation in the emphasis of the policies, and of how tightly drawn the definitions and boundaries for local need might be, based on a classification or hierarchy of settlements. The Lake District Core Strategy (policy CS18) may offer a starting point for how some sites might be specifically prioritised for affordable housing: this could inform issues 35 (replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions), 40 (change of use from shop to any other use) and 43 (re-use of un-occupied business sites), and 51 (holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation) in which there could be a spatial and/or site-specific presumption in favour of affordable housing; and a corresponding presumption against open market housing or holiday accommodation.	This is considered over-elaborate and unnecessary. Such rigid demarcation of uses by location only serves to reduce development options not increase them. The Core Strategy DS1 settlement hierarchy has been judged sound. A detailed spatial approach is for core strategy review. The Authority understands the approach taken in the Lake District and why this is attractive to the responder but conditions here would need to be the same to merit a similar policy approach to the Lake District. This needs to be explored at core strategy review.	See response to 034/69
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 034/69
034	National Trust		Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 034/69
034	National Trust	034/34	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted	The preferred approach was to bring forward detailed criteria with regard to both 'Design for transport infrastructure' and 'Mitigation of wildlife severance effects'. This is achieved through a combination of the DMP Policy DMT2: Access and design criteria and the Design Guide SPD that is currently under development.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/60	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				the incremental development of sites with open market housing but no contribution is contrary to the intent of HC1 but would mean someone wanting to develop a house on a large plot of land or curtilage would be disadvantaged by either a refusal or the requirement to sign up to whole site development.	Incremental re-development of brownfield sites may enable the developer to avoid affordable housing contributions, but may also prevent the developer achieving future permissions (if done poorly and with no longer term plan for the site) Subdivision of greenfield exception sites simply creates more green field exception sites so it does not threaten HC1 other than HC1Cii.	The preferred approach was to bring forward detailed criteria with regard to both 'Design for transport infrastructure' and 'Mitigation of wildlife severance effects'. This is achieved through a combination of the DMP Policy DMT2: Access and design criteria and the Design Guide SPD that is currently under development.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/61	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				responder thinks it is unworkable because land could simply be divided into plots and developed piecemeal over time	The subdivision of land does not remove the requirement to comply with policy but might enable holders of large plots of land to realise some monetary value on land they no longer need. The value is however suppressed by the restrictive context for housing delivery that has existed over successive plan periods and which has been an accepted and successful way of addressing local need for affordable homes.	See response to 037/33
053	Peak Watch	053/33	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted but ability to achieve whole site re-development and therefore possibly affordable housing is uncertain	See response to 037/33
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/3	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	No			preferred approach is not feasible	objection noted	See response to 037/33
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Yes			supported	support noted but ability to achieve whole site re-development and therefore possibly affordable housing is uncertain	See response to 037/33

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				the incremental development of sites with open market housing but no contribution is contrary to the intent of HC1 but would mean someone wanting to develop a house on a large plot of land or curtilage would be disadvantaged by either a refusal or the requirement to sign up to whole site development.	Incremental re-development of brownfield sites may enable the developer to avoid affordable housing contributions, but may also prevent the developer achieving future permissions (if done poorly and with no longer term plan for the site) Subdivision of greenfield exception sites simply creates more green field exception sites so it does not threaten HC1 other than HC1Cii.	See response to 037/33
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				responder thinks it is unworkable because land could simply be divided into plots and developed piecemeal over time	Incremental re-development of brownfield sites may enable the developer to avoid affordable housing contributions, but may also prevent the developer achieving future permissions (if done poorly and with no longer term plan for the site) Subdivision of greenfield exception sites simply creates more green field exception sites so it does not threaten HC1 other than HC1Cii.	The preferred approach was to bring forward a detailed policy on rights of way, and seeking alternative alignments for the Trans-pennine and Monsal Trails. The removal of safeguarding of the Woodhead Tunnels removes the threat of reinstatement of the Woodhead Line. In the case of the Monsal Trail, recent investment and the resulting popularity of the route have resulted in a strengthening of the criteria that would need to be met in order to provide an alternative route to the Monsal Trail. This detail is contained within the DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/60	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				the incremental development of sites with open market housing but no contribution is contrary to the intent of HC1 but would mean someone wanting to develop a house on a large plot of land or curtilage would be disadvantaged by either a refusal or the requirement to sign up to whole site development.	Incremental re-development of brownfield sites may enable the developer to avoid affordable housing contributions, but may also prevent the developer achieving future permissions (if done poorly and with no longer term plan for the site) Subdivision of greenfield exception sites simply creates more green field exception sites so it does not threaten HC1 other than HC1Cii.	The preferred approach was to bring forward a detailed policy on rights of way, and seeking alternative alignments for the Trans-pennine and Monsal Trails. The removal of safeguarding of the Woodhead Tunnels removes the threat of reinstatement of the Woodhead Line. In the case of the Monsal Trail, recent investment and the resulting popularity of the route have resulted in a strengthening of the criteria that would need to be met in order to provide an alternative route to the Monsal Trail. This detail is contained within the DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/61	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				responder thinks it is unworkable because land could simply be divided into plots and developed piecemeal over time	The subdivision of land does not remove the requirement to comply with policy but might enable holders of large plots of land to realise some monetary value on land they no longer need. The value is however suppressed by the restrictive context for housing delivery that has existed over successive plan periods and which has been an accepted and successful way of addressing local need for affordable homes.	See response to 0034/71
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/59	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				the incremental development of sites with open market housing but no contribution is contrary to the intent of HC1 but would mean someone wanting to develop a house on a large plot of land or curtilage would be disadvantaged by either a refusal or the requirement to sign up to whole site development.	Incremental re-development of brownfield sites may enable the developer to avoid affordable housing contributions, but may also prevent the developer achieving future permissions (if done poorly and with no longer term plan for the site) Subdivision of greenfield exception sites simply creates more green field exception sites so it does not threaten HC1 other than HC1Cii.	See response to 0034/71
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/60	Housing	32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing				responder thinks it is unworkable because land could simply be divided into plots and developed piecemeal over time	The subdivision of land does not remove the requirement to comply with policy but might enable holders of large plots of land to realise some monetary value on land they no longer need. The value is however suppressed by the restrictive context for housing delivery that has existed over successive plan periods and which has been an accepted and successful way of addressing local need for affordable homes.	See response to 0034/71
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/62	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				the responder considers that housing people in housing need as defined by LH2 will do nothing for the vibrancy of villages and considers that on that argument the definition should be widened	The responder is again questioning the intention of policy in order to change the eligibility criteria for affordable homes. The intent of HC1 is clear and responds to a clear need derived from evidence. The Authority contends that its policy is sound because it is delivering against plan objectives to address the lack of affordable housing in the Park.	The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria for new provision and provide detailed proposals for new routes. The DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way provides the criteria for new routes for walking, cycling and horse riding. In terms of potential new routes, this has been undertaken within the development of the Wider Peak District Cycling Strategy.

016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/63	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				The responder prioritises the desire of people with local connection to live near to their family, (even where they have the ability to afford accommodation that meets their need, including by renting) over the need of people with a local connection and a need for different accommodation.	The responder is prioritising local connection above housing need. It is unsustainable for the Authority to meet both need and demand for housing but its policies allow both social and market housing in different ways to ensure a balanced provision of new housing	The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria for new provision and provide detailed proposals for new routes. The DMP Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way provides the criteria for new routes for walking, cycling and horse riding. In terms of potential new routes, this has been undertaken within the development of the Wider Peak District Cycling Strategy.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/64	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				can a single person be a household?	This is considered to be too detailed for the plan but the answer is yes and the policy does not discriminate against single person if they have no dependants.	See response to 034/72
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/65	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				criteria (iii) not liked as thought to give more rights to people with local connection living outside parish than those living inside the parish	The text does infer a different approach between criteria (i) and criteria (iii) but the link to LH1 means there is no difference, and proven need requires proof of an individuals circumstances including present accommodation	See response to 034/72
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/66	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants flexibility offered by option 3 plus provision to build for armed forces returners	eligibility can be looked at again with members to determine strength of local connection required.	See response to 034/72
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/61	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				the responder considers that housing people in housing need as defined by LH2 will do nothing for the vibrancy of villages and considers that on that argument the definition should be widened	The responder is questioning the intention of policy in order to change the eligibility criteria for affordable homes. The intent of HC1 is clear and responds to a clear need derived from evidence. Policy is delivering against plan objectives to address the lack of affordable housing in the Park.	The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria for providing access to sites and buildings for those with a mobility difficulty; this is addressed under DMP Policy DMT2: Access and design criteria Part B.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/62	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				The responder prioritises the desire of people with local connection to live near to their family, (even where they have the ability to afford accommodation that meets their need, including by renting) over the need of people with a local connection and a need for different accommodation.	The Authority considers ability to rent, but not buy, to be justification for a local need house, but local people may well be earning to the level that doesn't enable buying. However this is often the case anywhere and many people need to rent for some time before they can buy. It does however raise the question as to whether it is fair that local people who earn should not have the disparity between wages and Park house prices recognised through ability to part buy a local needs house.	The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria for providing access to sites and buildings for those with a mobility difficulty; this is addressed under DMP Policy DMT2: Access and design criteria Part B.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/63	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				can a single person be a household?	This is considered to be too detailed for the plan but the answer is yes and the policy does not discriminate against single person if they have no dependants.	See response to 034/73
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/64	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				criteria (iii) not liked as thought to give more rights to people with local connection living outside parish than those living inside the parish	The text does infer a different approach between criteria (i) and criteria (iii) but the link to LH1 means there is no difference, and proven need requires proof of an individuals circumstances including present accommodation	See response to 034/73
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/65	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants flexibility offered by option 3 plus provision to build for armed forces returners	Eligibility was discussed subsequent to this consultation with members of the Authority to determine strength of local connection required.	See response to 034/73
025	CLA	025/27	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants the local connection requirement reduced to five as opposed to ten years. The Shropshire policy is interesting but redefines local need and the type of settlements that can take housing to address it.	the impact of such a change is explained in paragraph 2.172. See views across respondents before deciding what to propose.	The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria related to the use of land within the National Park for the take-off and landing for powered flight. DMP Policy DMT8: Air transport provides this criteria, but has been expanded to include non-powered flight, drones and model aircraft within the criteria.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/25	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No	Option 3		responder wants relaxation to 5 years connection and retention of essential worker	views noted, and not dissimilar to others	The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria related to the use of land within the National Park for the take-off and landing for powered flight. DMP Policy DMT8: Air transport provides this criteria, but has been expanded to include non-powered flight, drones and model aircraft within the criteria.

042	Friends of Peak District	042/39	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			We would favour a spatial approach to these policies, enabling a variation in the emphasis of the policies, and of how tightly drawn the definitions and boundaries for local need might be, based on a classification or hierarchy of settlements. The Lake District Core Strategy (policy CS18) may offer a starting point for how some sites might be specifically prioritised for affordable housing: this could inform issues 35 (replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions), 40 (change of use from shop to any other use) and 43 (re-use of un-occupied business sites), and 51 (holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation) in which there could be a spatial and/or site-specific presumption in favour of affordable housing; and a corresponding presumption against open market housing or holiday accommodation.	I don't think such a spatial approach would facilitate easier development or greater level of interest in development. The core strategy already enables development in line with housing need, and it is obvious where most need occurs i.e. in larger places. A more complicated strategy would require clear evidence. Such evidence wasn't required for the core strategy so is not required for policies to implement that core strategy.	See response to 034/74
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 034/74
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/63	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				The responder prioritises the desire of people with local connection to live near to their family, (even where they have the ability to afford accommodation that meets their need, including by renting) over the need of people with a local connection and a need for different accommodation.	The Authority considers ability to rent, but not buy, to be justification for a local need house, but local people may well be earning to the level that doesn't enable buying. However this is often the case anywhere and many people need to rent for some time before they can buy. It does however raise the question as to whether it is fair that local people who earn should not have the disparity between wages and Park house prices recognised through ability to part buy a local needs house.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park; criteria E outlines the Authority's approach to non conforming uses
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/64	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				can a single person be a household?	This is considered to be too detailed for the plan but the answer is yes and the policy does not discriminate against single person if they have no dependants.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/65	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				criteria (iii) not liked as thought to give more rights to people with local connection living outside parish than those living inside the parish	The text does infer a different approach between criteria (i) and criteria (iii) but the link to LH1 means there is no difference, and proven need requires proof of an individuals circumstances including present accommodation	Central Shopping Area boundary has been determined by neighbourhood planning group in consultation with NPA and no changes have been made.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/66	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants flexibility offered by option 3 plus provision to build for armed forces returners	Eligibility was discussed subsequent to this consultation with members of the Authority to determine strength of local connection required.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
053	Peak Watch	053/34	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				amend LH2 to reasonable need with a 5 year connection by residence. Increase affordable house supply by allowing people with large open market dwellings to build small affordable dwellings	This is illogical since it wont provide a house that is needed. People with large houses can already downsize within existing stock. The 5 year residency can be explored and agreed if necessary but reasonable need is hard to define, and is not something a planning (not a housing authority) should stray into without strong evidence of a different type of housing need	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/ 4	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			preferred approach is too inflexible and should state reasonable need as opposed to proven need	accords with pp. view but hard to implement.	The Core Strategy removed the safeguarding of the route for a potential Bakewell Relief Road. At the issues and options stages, the preferred approach with regard to traffic management in Bakewell was to discuss options with the community. The emerging Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan includes 4 policies relating to traffic management within Bakewell. These include Policy TC1: Improvements for non-car users and TC3: Safeguarding a route for a relief road.
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 019/14

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				the responder considers that housing people in housing need as defined by LH2 will do nothing for the vibrancy of villages and considers that on that argument the definition should be widened	The responder is questioning the intention of policy in order to change the eligibility criteria for affordable homes. The intent of HC1 is clear and responds to a clear need derived from evidence. Policy is delivering against plan objectives to address the lack of affordable housing in the Park.	See response to 019/14
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				The responder prioritises the desire of people with local connection to live near to their family, (even where they have the ability to afford accommodation that meets their need, including by renting) over the need of people with a local connection and a need for different accommodation.	The Authority considers ability to rent, but not buy, to be justification for a local need house, but local people may well be earning to the level that doesn't enable buying. However this is often the case anywhere and many people need to rent for some time before they can buy. It does however raise the question as to whether it is fair that local people who earn should not have the disparity between wages and Park house prices recognised through ability to part buy a local needs house.	See response to 019/14
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				can a single person be a household?	This is considered to be too detailed for the plan but the answer is yes and the policy does not discriminate against single person if they have no dependants.	See response to 019/14
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				criteria (iii) not liked as thought to give more rights to people with local connection living outside parish than those living inside the parish	The text does infer a different approach between criteria (i) and criteria (iii) but the link to LH1 means there is no difference, and proven need requires proof of an individuals circumstances including present accommodation	See response to 019/14
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants flexibility offered by option 3 plus provision to build for armed forces returners	Eligibility was discussed subsequent to this consultation with members of the Authority to determine strength of local connection required.	See response to 019/14
024	Tissington Estate	024/17	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 019/14
017	Winster Parish Council	005/62	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				the responder considers that housing people in housing need as defined by LH2 will do nothing for the vibrancy of villages and considers that on that argument the definition should be widened	The responder is questioning the intention of policy in order to change the eligibility criteria for affordable homes. The intent of HC1 is clear and responds to a clear need derived from evidence. Policy is delivering against plan objectives to address the lack of affordable housing in the Park.	
017	Winster Parish Council	005/63	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				The responder prioritises the desire of people with local connection to live near to their family, (even where they have the ability to afford accommodation that meets their need, including by renting) over the need of people with a local connection and a need for different accommodation.	The Authority considers ability to rent, but not buy, to be justification for a local need house, but local people may well be earning to the level that doesn't enable buying. However this is often the case anywhere and many people need to rent for some time before they can buy. It does however raise the question as to whether it is fair that local people who earn should not have the disparity between wages and Park house prices recognised through ability to part buy a local needs house.	DME3: Safeguarding employment sites; and supporting text sets the context for development at Lumford Mill and creates spaces for the neighbourhood plan to influence the development provided evidence supports any neighbourhood plan policy and it is in general conformity with the Authority's development plan. Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use, and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/64	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				can a single person be a household?	This is considered to be too detailed for the plan but the answer is yes and the policy does not discriminate against single person if they have no dependants.	DME3: Safeguarding employment sites; and supporting text sets the context for development at Lumford Mill and creates spaces for the neighbourhood plan to influence the development provided evidence supports any neighbourhood plan policy and it is in general conformity with the Authority's development plan. Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use, and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/65	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				criteria (iii) not liked as thought to give more rights to people with local connection living outside parish than those living inside the parish	The text does infer a different approach between criteria (i) and criteria (iii) but the link to LH1 means there is no difference, and proven need requires proof of an individuals circumstances including present accommodation	DME3: Safeguarding employment sites; and supporting text

017	Winster Parish Council	005/66	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants flexibility offered by option 3 plus provision to build for armed forces returners	Eligibility was discussed subsequent to this consultation with members of the Authority to determine strength of local connection required.	Neighbourhood Plan Draft Policy TC1: Improvements for non-car users in the town centre encourages such improvements and would be compatible with the Authority's development plan.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/61	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				the responder considers that housing people in housing need as defined by LH2 will do nothing for the vibrancy of villages and considers that on that argument the definition should be widened	The responder is questioning the intention of policy in order to change the eligibility criteria for affordable homes. The intent of HC1 is clear and responds to a clear need derived from evidence. Policy is delivering against plan objectives to address the lack of affordable housing in the Park.	no policy response needed
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/62	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				The responder prioritises the desire of people with local connection to live near to their family, (even where they have the ability to afford accommodation that meets their need, including by renting) over the need of people with a local connection and a need for different accommodation.	The Authority considers ability to rent, but not buy, to be justification for a local need house, but local people may well be earning to the level that doesn't enable buying. However this is often the case anywhere and many people need to rent for some time before they can buy. It does however raise the question as to whether it is fair that local people who earn should not have the disparity between wages and Park house prices recognised through ability to part buy a local needs house.	Policy DME3: Safeguarding employment sites safeguards business sites in principle but NPPF and guidance means the Authority is cautious of being overly protective towards those for which business has shown little interest either through economic spikes and troughs, whilst remembering that there is no environmental capacity to replace the existing business sites with new allocations.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/63	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				can a single person be a household?	This is considered to be too detailed for the plan but the answer is yes and the policy does not discriminate against single person if they have no dependants.	Policy DME3: Safeguarding employment sites safeguards Deepdale for B1 B2 or B8 use (in so far as that can be achieved against the backdrop of changes to permitted development and successful appeal decisions) unless a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted that enables other uses in which case the predominant use should remain B1,B2 and/or B8
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/64	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification				criteria (iii) not liked as thought to give more rights to people with local connection living outside parish than those living inside the parish	The text does infer a different approach between criteria (i) and criteria (iii) but the link to LH1 means there is no difference, and proven need requires proof of an individuals circumstances including present accommodation	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/65	Housing	33	The definition of people with a local qualification	No			responder wants flexibility offered by option 3 plus provision to build for armed forces returners	Eligibility was discussed subsequent to this consultation with members of the Authority to determine strength of local connection required.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/67	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			care needs policy agreed	support noted	There was no preferred approach, and the assumption was that the Bakewell Neighbourhood Group would inform a policy approach. The emerging Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC2: Parking seeks to safeguard existing parking facilities against future development.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/66	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			care needs policy agreed	support noted	See response to 011/1
042	Friends of Peak District	042/40	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/1
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/1
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/67	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			care needs policy agreed	support noted	See response to 011/1
053	Peak Watch	053/35	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/1
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/5	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/1
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/1
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			care needs policy agreed	support noted	See response to 011/1
017	Winster Parish Council	005/67	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			care needs policy agreed	support noted	See response to 011/1
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/66	Housing	34	Assessing Care needs	Yes			care needs policy agreed	support noted	See response to 011/1
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/68	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			but condition (b) not thought to be reasonable	It is felt justified to retain the dwellings in occupancy that benefits the community because the house would not have been permitted other than to serve the needs of the community (in this case the business need for people to work in agriculture and land management. However policy does allow for release of an occupancy restriction where the business need has ceased altogether and will not return.	See response to 011/1

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/67	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			but condition (b) not thought to be reasonable	It is felt justified to retain the dwellings in occupancy that benefits the community because the house would not have been permitted other than to serve the needs of the community (in this case the business need for people to work in agriculture and land management. However policy does allow for release of an occupancy restriction where the business need has ceased altogether and will not return.	See response to 011/1
025	CLA	025/28	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	No			responder wants the occupancy restriction to be removed at first opportunity rather than temporarily suspended	The policy approach deliberately guards against the abuse that such a policy change would encourage.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
042	Friends of Peak District	042/41	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions				The approach to holiday accommodation presents 2 risks. Firstly, replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions could create an opportunity to supply affordable housing, but doesn't, so an applicant is instead forced to abuse the planning system to provide living accommodation for extended family by creating temporary holiday accommodation which continues indefinitely. Secondly, former agricultural dwellings become used ostensibly as temporary holiday accommodation (in name) but actually become used as second homes. This removes the potential for these dwellings to meet local affordable housing need, and does so indefinitely. The Lake District NPA provides for control mechanisms that can be triggered where holiday houses come at the expense of community sustainability. The Cumbria Housing Strategy 2006/11 says that a supply of second homes over 10% of the housing stock is deemed to have negative effects on the sustainability of a community, and a similar approach maybe useful in the Peak District.	The notion that people are forced to abuse the system is not accepted though it is not disputed that this might be happening. This is a matter for monitoring and if necessary enforcement as opposed to policy. Policy does allow temporary use by those qualifying as being in local need but if people are abusing that facility it is a matter for monitoring and enforcement.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
034	National Trust	034/35	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/68	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			but condition (b) not thought to be reasonable	would need to check with officers to know if it works or not but the intent is that houses built for a local need either continue to fulfil that function or fulfil another need in line with purpose 2	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
053	Peak Watch	053/36	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	No		LH3 should be linked to LC12	LH3 should be linked to LC12	one justifies the house, the other justifies the status of the occupant of the house. I don't see the value of joining them together unless we do the same for every type of dwelling.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.

033	Rainow Parish Council	033/6	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			Condition (b) is not thought to be reasonable	It is felt justified to retain the dwellings in occupancy that benefits the community because the house would not have been permitted other than to serve the needs of the community (in this case the business need for people to work in agriculture and land management. However policy does allow for release of an occupancy restriction where the business need has ceased altogether and will not return.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/68	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			Condition (b) is not thought to be reasonable	It is felt justified to retain the dwellings in occupancy that benefits the community because the house would not have been permitted other than to serve the needs of the community (in this case the business need for people to work in agriculture and land management. However policy does allow for release of an occupancy restriction where the business need has ceased altogether and will not return.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/67	Housing	35	Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	Yes			Condition (b) is not thought to be reasonable	It is felt justified to retain the dwellings in occupancy that benefits the community because the house would not have been permitted other than to serve the needs of the community (in this case the business need for people to work in agriculture and land management. However policy does allow for release of an occupancy restriction where the business need has ceased altogether and will not return.	Policy DME3: Safeguarding employment sites. This safeguards sites for B1 B2 or B8 use (in so far as that can be achieved against the backdrop of changes to permitted development and successful appeal decisions) unless a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted that enables other uses in which case the predominant use should remain B1,B2 and/or B8
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/69	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder states that the size of dwellings is not discussed in the consultation document	The issue relates to extensions and alterations to existing housing and states that extensions and alterations are important in the context of retaining homes that were intended to be affordable or more affordable. The issue of dwelling size in a general sense has no relevance to policy on extension and alteration.	Policy DME3: Safeguarding employment sites including Riverside Business Park for B1 B2 or B8 use (in so far as that can be achieved against the backdrop of changes to permitted development and successful appeal decisions) unless a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted that enables other uses in which case the predominant use should remain B1,B2 and/or B8. the neighbourhood plan emerging policy is not advocating bridge first, but is encouraging careful phasing that ensures the bridge is resolved in a timely fashion
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/70	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder wants no restrictions on house size for a local person with proven need and ability to build a house although they imply that that the house should fall within criteria (without stating which)	The extent to which shared ownership or rental prices on a property of unrestricted size can be sustained in perpetuity (i.e. beyond first occupant) is questionable. If the person simply has land and wants to build a house because they are local, the logic for permitting it is flawed since the impact of new open market housing in the landscape or settlements is the same whoever it's built for.	Policy DME3: Safeguarding employment sites. This safeguards sites for B1 B2 or B8 use (in so far as that can be achieved against the backdrop of changes to permitted development and successful appeal decisions) unless a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted that enables other uses in which case the predominant use should remain B1,B2 and/or B8
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/71	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder questions the need to restrict extensions on affordable homes	evidence needed of where extensions have resulted in loss of affordable homes.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/68	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder states that the size of dwellings is not discussed in the consultation document	The issue relates to extensions and alterations to existing housing and states that extensions and alterations are important in the context of retaining homes that were intended to be affordable or more affordable. The issue of dwelling size in a general sense has no relevance to policy on extension and alteration.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/69	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder wants no restrictions on house size for a local person with proven need and ability to build a house although they imply that the house should fall within criteria (without stating which)	The extent to which shared ownership or rental prices on a property of unrestricted size are useful in perpetuity (i.e. beyond first occupant) is questionable. If the person simply has land and wants to build a house because they are local, the logic for permitting it is flawed since the impact of new open market housing in the landscape or settlements is the same whoever its built for.	The preferred approach was to continue to safeguard the route of the old Matlock to Buxton railway and Bakewell Station. This is done through the Core Strategy Policy T5: Managing the demand for rail, and reuse of former railway routes. The emerging Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC4 favours consideration of the reopening of the Matlock to Buxton Railway providing an alternative route can be found for the Monsal Trail
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/70	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder questions the need to restrict extensions on affordable homes	evidence needed of where extensions have resulted in loss of affordable homes.	See response to 011/2
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/26	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			support is caveated with a desire that local needs housing be allowed to grow with the family	this isn't a sensible approach as it will discourage movement within social housing stock and logically means that smaller houses will always disappear and need replacing, rather than a balanced stock being achieved. Once there is no room to replace small houses lost, the fact that the stock is unbalanced cannot be remedied, it is an unsustainable argument to let affordable homes grow.	See response to 011/2
010	English Heritage	010/26	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			support for protecting heritage significance which can be artistic architectural archaeological and historic	point understood and agreed	See response to 011/2
042	Friends of Peak District	042/42	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/2
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			supported	support noted	See response to 011/2
034	National Trust	034/36	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			issue understood and support given	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
034	National Trust		Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			Approach agreed, including as suggested advice re-curtillages and locally needed affordable homes.	support noted	Core Strategy CC2: Low carbon and renewable energy development and emerging neighbourhood plan policy TC1: Improvements for non-car users in the town centre which the Authority supports because it seeks to improve the environment of Bakewell for non car users, to the benefit of both residents and visitors.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/69	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder states that the size of dwellings is not discussed in the consultation document	The issue relates to extensions and alterations to existing housing and states that extensions and alterations are important in the context of retaining homes that were intended to be affordable or more affordable. The issue of dwelling size in a general sense has no relevance to policy on extension and alteration.	Policy DME3: Safeguarding employment sites. This safeguards sites for B1 B2 or B8 use (in so far as that can be achieved against the backdrop of changes to permitted development and successful appeal decisions) Core Strategy CC2: Low carbon and renewable energy development and emerging neighbourhood plan policy TC1: Improvements for non-car users in the town centre which the Authority supports because it seeks to improve the environment of Bakewell for non car users, to the benefit of both residents and visitors.
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/70	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder wants no restrictions on house size for a local person with proven need and ability to build a house although they imply that the house should fall within criteria (without stating which)	The extent to which shared ownership or rental prices on a property of unrestricted size can be sustained in perpetuity (i.e. beyond first occupant) is questionable. If the person simply has land and wants to build a house because they are local, the logic for permitting it is flawed since the impact of new open market housing in the landscape or settlements is the same whoever it's built for.	no further response required
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/71	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder questions the need to restrict extensions on affordable homes	In cases where houses have been extended beyond the limits imposed by policy the Authority has lost applications to remove conditions restricting occupancy. This is because the valuation is beyond what can be considered to be affordable to those in housing need	no further response required

053	Peak Watch	053/37	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations			allow extensions on affordable housing but only up to the floorspace of affordable 5 bed house		Novel approach has been adopted but the policy refers to 5 person houses rather than 5 be houses since 5 bedroom houses are not ordinarily sustainable as affordable homes.	no further response required
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/7	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			supported	support noted	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations	Yes			supported	support noted	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder states that the size of dwellings is not discussed in the consultation document	The issue relates to extensions and alterations to existing housing and states that extensions and alterations are important in the context of retaining homes that were intended to be affordable or more affordable. The issue of dwelling size in a general sense has no relevance to policy on extension and alteration.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder wants no restrictions on house size for a local person with proven need and ability to build a house although they imply that the house should fall within criteria (without stating which)	The extent to which shared ownership or rental prices on a property of unrestricted size can be sustained in perpetuity (i.e. beyond first occupant) is questionable. If the person simply has land and wants to build a house because they are local, the logic for permitting it is flawed since the impact of new open market housing in the landscape or settlements is the same whoever it's built for.	No policy to limit particular uses but is being brought forward by neighbourhood planning group and the Authority would consider use of an Article 4 direction if permitted development rights were used in preference to planning applications (experience shows that most proposals come forward as planning applications so could be dealt with through the plan led system)
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder questions the need to restrict extensions on affordable homes	In cases where houses have been extended beyond the limits imposed by policy the Authority has lost applications to remove conditions restricting occupancy. This is because the valuation is beyond what can be considered to be affordable to those in housing need	General policies enable this without the need for Bakewell specific policy.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/69	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder states that the size of dwellings is not discussed in the consultation document	The issue relates to extensions and alterations to existing housing and states that extensions and alterations are important in the context of retaining homes that were intended to be affordable or more affordable. The issue of dwelling size in a general sense has no relevance to policy on extension and alteration.	General policies enable this without the need for Bakewell specific policy.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/70	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder wants no restrictions on house size for a local person with proven need and ability to build a house although they imply that the house should fall within criteria (without stating which)	The extent to which shared ownership or rental prices on a property of unrestricted size can be sustained in perpetuity (i.e. beyond first occupant) is questionable. If the person simply has land and wants to build a house because they are local, the logic for permitting it is flawed since the impact of new open market housing in the landscape or settlements is the same whoever it's built for.	General policies enable this without the need for Bakewell specific policy.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/71	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder questions the need to restrict extensions on affordable homes	In cases where houses have been extended beyond the limits imposed by policy the Authority has lost applications to remove conditions restricting occupancy. This is because the valuation is beyond what can be considered to be affordable to those in housing need	General policies enable this without the need for Bakewell specific policy.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/68	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder states that the size of dwellings is not discussed in the consultation document	The issue relates to extensions and alteration to existing dwelling and states that extensions and alterations are important in the context of retaining homes that were intended to be affordable or more affordable. The issue of dwelling size in a general sense has no relevance to policy on extension and alteration.	General policies enable this without the need for Bakewell specific policy.

036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/69	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder wants no restrictions on house size for a local person with proven need and ability to build a house although they imply that the house should fall within criteria (without stating which)	The extent to which shared ownership or rental prices on a property of unrestricted size can be sustained in perpetuity (i.e. beyond first occupant) is questionable. If the person simply has land and wants to build a house because they are local, the logic for permitting it is flawed since the impact of new open market housing in the landscape or settlements is the same whoever it's built for.	Site search work was undertaken for hotel use as part of the neighbourhood plan work and by interested parties through pre application advice. Neither the Authority's plan nor the merging neighbourhood plan is allocating sites for development so the acceptability of any proposed site would be judged against other policies of the plan particularly those relating to the built environment such as policy for Conservation Areas policy DMC8.
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/70	Housing	36	Extensions and Alterations				responder questions the need to restrict extensions on affordable homes	In cases where houses have been extended beyond the limits imposed by policy the Authority has lost applications to remove conditions restricting occupancy. This is because the valuation is beyond what can be considered to be affordable to those in housing need	Site search work was undertaken for hotel use as part of the neighbourhood plan work and by interested parties through pre application advice. Neither the Authority's plan nor the merging neighbourhood plan is allocating sites for development so the acceptability of any proposed site would be judged against other policies of the plan particularly those relating to the built environment such as policy for Conservation Areas policy DMC8.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/72	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		the responder wants the state of the building to be disregarded when decisions over replacement dwellings are made. The responder also wants policy to permit replacement of one with two or more houses	The state of the building has been disregarded from a policy perspective though issues such as neighbours residential amenity and public safety would be material planning considerations in any application to replace a dwelling. The policy now allows for replacement of one with more than one house provided it is in a DS1 settlement where the DS1 settlement strategy accepts new housing in principle.	Site search work was undertaken for hotel use as part of the neighbourhood plan work and by interested parties through pre application advice. Neither the Authority's plan nor the merging neighbourhood plan is allocating sites for development so the acceptability of any proposed site would be judged against other policies of the plan particularly those relating to the built environment such as policy for Conservation Areas policy DMC8.
032	Chatsworth Estate	032/14	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	Yes			support for the preferred approach	support noted	Site search work was undertaken for hotel use as part of the neighbourhood plan work and by interested parties through pre application advice. Neither the Authority's plan nor the merging neighbourhood plan is allocating sites for development so the acceptability of any proposed site would be judged against other policies of the plan particularly those relating to the built environment such as policy for Conservation Areas policy DMC8.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/71	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		the responder wants the state of the building to be disregarded when decisions over replacement dwellings are made. The responder also wants policy to permit replacement of one with two or more houses	The state of the building has been disregarded from a policy perspective though issues such as neighbours residential amenity and public safety would be material planning considerations in any application to replace a dwelling. The policy now allows for replacement of one with more than one house provided it is in a DS1 settlement where the DS1 settlement strategy accepts new housing in principle.	Core Strategy DS1: Development Strategy
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/27	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	Option 2		responder doesn't like the idea of size restrictions and wants ability to argue for larger or smaller based on site and landscape	The policy no longer requires the replacement to be of similar size so proposals can be larger or smaller to reflect the site and its landscape or built environment setting. Where a proposal is for a bigger replacement however the Authority requires significant overall enhancement.	Policy DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance
010	English Heritage	010/27	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	Yes			LH4 criteria but must consider defining non designated heritage assets	The point is understood and agreed and the plan has responded to it	no policy response required

042	Friends of Peak District	042/43	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No		Strong enabling commitment needed in development management policies that recognises the need for development that simultaneously mitigate climate change impacts and future proof dwellings , underpinned by a vision for a sustainable, and climate-responsive built environment in which enables future built heritage to co-exist happily alongside protected assets. A spatial approach to these issues, would recognise the different characteristics and capacity for change in	Issues to address 1) Prioritising 'old-looking' designs and constructional techniques over those that have genuine merit but are more contemporary, resulting in the future absence of any historic imprint of present-day design and architecture that is appropriate to a valued rural setting; 2) Giving insufficient emphasis to sustainable and energy-efficient designs, including retrofitting to existing buildings, such that dwellings and business premises become unfavourably costly to run and become under-maintained, compared to their counterparts outside the National Park.	These are interesting points with some merit in the context of debates about the use of contemporary design. The spatial approach is also interesting since it has clearly influenced different design and settlement patterns from the start, with those differences now celebrated. The challenge is achieving a new vernacular within the SPD framework	no policy response required
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	Yes			supported	support noted	no policy response required
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/72	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		the responder wants the state of the building to be disregarded when decisions over replacement dwellings are made. The responder also wants policy to permit replacement of one with two or more houses	The state of the building has been disregarded from a policy perspective though issues such as neighbours residential amenity and public safety would be material planning considerations in any application to replace a dwelling. The policy now allows for replacement of one with more than one house provided it is in a DS1 settlement where the DS1 settlement strategy accepts new housing in principle.	no policy response required
053	Peak Watch	053/38	Housing (37)	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	Option 2		responder doesn't like the idea of size restrictions and wants ability to argue for larger or smaller based on site and landscape	The policy no longer requires the replacement to be of similar size so proposals can be larger or smaller to reflect the site and its landscape or built environment setting. Where a proposal is for a bigger replacement however the Authority requires significant overall enhancement.	no policy response required
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/8	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		supported	support noted	no policy response but recreation hubs work will cover this point and in the mean time development may be accepted provided wider landscape quality is not compromised
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy HC1 and supporting text and DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text outline the Authority's approach to assessing housing need and why that is considered a sustainable approach to housing delivery in the National Park
023	Rowsley Parish Council	023/2	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No			Criteria 3 and 5 of LH5 are abused	The Authority considers that removing the policy enabling replacement homes is not sensible but agrees that the criteria should be amended. The Authority cannot agree that a larger development automatically has damaging landscape implications though the impact will be different.	Core Strategy HC1 and HC2 and DMH1 - DMH11 outlines the Authority's approach to housing delivery
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		the responder wants the state of the building to be disregarded when decisions over replacement dwellings are made. The responder also wants policy to permit replacement of one with two or more houses. The responder wants some limitations on size of replacement buildings and extensions	The state of the building has been disregarded from a policy perspective though issues such as neighbours residential amenity and public safety would be material planning considerations in any application to replace a dwelling. The policy now allows for replacement of one with more than one house provided it is in a DS1 settlement where the DS1 settlement strategy accepts new housing in principle.	Core Strategy HC1 and HC2 and DMH1 - DMH11 outlines the Authority's approach to housing delivery

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/8	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	Yes			broad agreement with pp. but see a case for limiting size of replacement dwellings to keep a range of smaller and therefore more affordable dwellings	The comment supports the preferred approach but on balance The Authority considers that policy should not restrict size for reasons of maintaining a supply of smaller houses unless the housing authority express concern at the loss of such houses. Because they view all these houses as unaffordable in the first instance, their replacement has no impact on the housing stock balance between affordable and unaffordable.	DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilages of existing buildings by conversion or new build ; and supporting text.
024	Tissington Estate	024/19	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy HC1 and HC2 and DMH1 - DMH11 outlines the Authority's approach to housing delivery
017	Winster Parish Council	005/72	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		the responder wants the state of the building to be disregarded when decisions over replacement dwellings are made. The responder also wants policy to permit replacement of one with two or more houses	The state of the building has been disregarded from a policy perspective though issues such as neighbours residential amenity and public safety would be material planning considerations in any application to replace a dwelling. The policy now allows for replacement of one with more than one house provided it is in a DS1 settlement where the DS1 settlement strategy accepts new housing in principle.	Core Strategy HC1 and HC2 and DMH1 - DMH11 outlines the Authority's approach to housing delivery
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/71	Housing	37	Replacement Dwellings	No	option 2		the responder wants the state of the building to be disregarded when decisions over replacement dwellings are made. The responder also wants policy to permit replacement of one with two or more houses	The state of the building has been disregarded from a policy perspective though issues such as neighbours residential amenity and public safety would be material planning considerations in any application to replace a dwelling. The policy now allows for replacement of one with more than one house provided it is in a DS1 settlement where the DS1 settlement strategy accepts new housing in principle.	See DMH2: First occupation of affordable housing and DMH3: Second and subsequent occupation of affordable housing (the occupancy cascade) and supporting text.
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/73	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		responder thinks breaches of the policy on ancillary dwellings from conversion of existing building is perceived and not real and on that basis they think a more restrictive policy is usually unjustified. They don't give any weight to the other reasons for tightening the policy through use of a section 106 agreement and favour option 1 which is criteria based on LH6 of the Local Plan.	The Authority explains the reason for wanting to tighten this policy through use of 106 agreements	Core Strategy HC1 and HC2 and DMH1 - DMH11 outlines the Authority's approach to housing delivery
032	Chatsworth Estate	032/15	Housing	38		No			responder doesn't want greater control than already exists	The Authority explains the reason for wanting to tighten this policy through use of 106 agreements	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/72	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		responder thinks breaches of the policy on ancillary dwellings from conversion of existing building is perceived and not real and on that basis they think a more restrictive policy is usually unjustified. They don't give any weight to the other reasons for tightening the policy through use of a section 106 agreement	Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text explain why ancillary accommodation is useful in the context of enabling generations of families to remain together controlling the overall impact of development in a National Park. Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation but retain the tie between the ancillary and main house.	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park is the main policy route justifying re-development of the Cintrides site (which is not safeguarded for business use), and although not in the central shopping area, now has permission for a supermarket following justification of need and sequential testing to find other sites.
025	CLA	025/29	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No			responder doesn't want us to use legal obligations to tie this use down.	The Authority seeks to retain the tie between the ancillary and main house to prevent the establishment of separate open market dwelling houses with all the permitted development rights that such status would afford. Such a change of status would generally compromise the Authority's ability to protect the built environment and landscape and undermine the conservation and/or enhancement achieved in creating the ancillary unit.	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/28	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No			responder thinks LH6 is unnecessary because they contend that pp is not required for ancillary use as dwelling of any curtilage building.	GPDO doesn't permit ancillary dwellings use of curtilage buildings without planning permission.	No specific policy is necessary but DMC2 is offered here as an example of the proportionate use of policy to remove pd rights.

045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/29	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No			Responder strongly disagrees to preferred approach and claim that NPPF and circular 11/95 discourages use of section 106 agreements.	Conditions are used where sufficient to achieve the desired outcome of policy, but if the Authority considers conditions can't work or are ripe for abuse, it is considered justified in order to achieve conservation that Section 106 agreements are used.	DMU3: Development close to utility installations and supporting text
042	Friends of Peak District	042/44	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes			supported	support noted	No policy response required
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes			supported	support noted	DMU3: Development close to utility installations and supporting text
034	National Trust	034/37	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes			issue understood and support given	support noted	DMU2: New and upgraded utilities services
034	National Trust		Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes			The issues that such developments can give rise to our noted and agreed; in the circumstances proposed approach 2 is supported.	support noted	DMU2: New and upgraded utilities services
037	Natural England	037/18	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes			needs to include requirement to protect habitat in criteria (i). We question the findings of the SA with regard to this issue and suggest the threat to habitats and wildlife is such that any proposed development should be subject to a full wildlife survey and suggestions for mitigation measures and/or compensation measures.	The qualified support is noted and consider the need for stronger criteria in light of concerns about the SA scoring.	DMU2: New and upgraded utilities services
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/73	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		responder thinks breaches of the policy on ancillary dwellings from conversion of existing building is perceived and not real and on that basis they think a more restrictive policy is usually unjustified. They don't give any weight to the other reasons for tightening the policy through use of a section 106 agreement	Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text explain why ancillary accommodation is useful in the context of enabling generations of families to remain together controlling the overall impact of development in a National Park. Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation but retain the tie between the ancillary and main house.	DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings; and DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets; and the supporting text to both policies
053	Peak Watch	053/39	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes		amend to make it easier to change to holiday accommodation		In some circumstances this might be appropriate but in others it wont be appropriate to allow for holiday accommodation	No policy response required
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/9	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		supported	Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text explain why ancillary accommodation is useful in the context of enabling generations of families to remain together controlling the overall impact of development in a National Park. Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation but retain the tie between the ancillary and main house.	Sustainability appraisal and SEA completed November 2016
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Yes			supported	support noted	Sustainability appraisal and SEA completed November 2016

056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		responder thinks breaches of the policy on ancillary dwellings from conversion of existing building is perceived and not real and on that basis they think a more restrictive policy is usually unjustified. They don't give any weight to the other reasons for tightening the policy through use of a section 106 agreement	Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text explain why ancillary accommodation is useful in the context of enabling generations of families to remain together controlling the overall impact of development in a National Park. Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation but retain the tie between the ancillary and main house.	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
024	Tissington Estate	024/20	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	Qualified Yes			supported provided useful living space is not sacrificed to restrict the size to affordable housing size	The concern is noted	No specific policy is necessary but DMC2 is offered here as an example of the proportionate use of policy to remove pd rights.
017	Winster Parish Council	005/73	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		responder thinks breaches of the policy on ancillary dwellings from conversion of existing building is perceived and not real and on that basis they think a more restrictive policy is usually unjustified. They don't give any weight to the other reasons for tightening the policy through use of a section 106 agreement	Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text explain why ancillary accommodation is useful in the context of enabling generations of families to remain together controlling the overall impact of development in a National Park. Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation but retain the tie between the ancillary and main house.	no further response required
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/72	Housing	38	Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings (including farm houses) to ancillary residential use	No	option 1		responder thinks breaches of the policy on ancillary dwellings from conversion of existing building is perceived and not real and on that basis they think a more restrictive policy is usually unjustified. They don't give any weight to the other reasons for tightening the policy through use of a section 106 agreement	Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text explain why ancillary accommodation is useful in the context of enabling generations of families to remain together controlling the overall impact of development in a National Park. Policy DMH11: Section 106 Agreements explains that legal agreements will only be used where conditions cannot achieve the objective of policy which is to enable ancillary accommodation but retain the tie between the ancillary and main house.	no further response required
025	CLA	025/30	Economy	41	Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements / Bakewell's development boundary	Yes			responder agrees with preferred option provided it gives greater flexibility to sell a wider range of produce	Policy DMS3: Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements gives some flexibility to sell a wider range of produce (e.g. where it is small scale and ancillary to tourism or recreation facilities or business uses that have been accepted under Core Strategy E2.	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	41	Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements / Bakewell's development boundary	Yes			supported	support noted	No specific policy is necessary but DMC2 is offered here as an example of the proportionate use of policy to remove pd rights.
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	41	Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements / Bakewell's development boundary	Yes			supported	support noted	no further response required
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/78	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No			the responder consider that good employment sites should be protected on plan and other sites should be retained or released with the decision being made against policy criteria.	The Authority prefers to use policy and additional development management criteria to determine whether sites are retained or not which is a responsive rather than proactive approach to potential redevelopment of employment land	no further response required
016	Bamford and Thornhill PC	005/79	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements				responder wants employment sites retained where alternatives are more remote and in towns around the area.	This view has led to stronger criteria against which to determine applications to release employment land to other uses.	no further response required
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/73	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No			the responder consider that good employment sites should be protected on plan and other sites should be retained or released with the decision being made against policy criteria.	The Authority prefers to use policy and additional development management criteria to determine whether sites are retained or not which is a responsive rather than proactive approach to potential redevelopment of employment land	no further response required

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/78	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements				responder wants employment sites retained where alternatives are more remote and in towns around the area.	This view has led to stronger criteria against which to determine applications to release employment land to other uses.	no further response required
042	Friends of Peak District	042/49	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No	Option 1	more proactive identification and protection of B1 sites to allow small local firms to grow within the area, plus specific live work policy	Responder wants the Authority to resist loss of business space to housing in most cases and protect a supply of sites for B1 uses for indigenous firms to move within the park. They request a live work unit policy that reduces permitted development rights to revert to either sole business or sole residential use	The Authority cannot protect sites solely for local businesses even if there might be a need. The Authority explored the merits of a live work units policy and determined on the basis of evidence from the economic development manager for the largest constituent district (by population) that there was insufficient interest in such units to warrant a separate policy. The Authority contends that the figures show that many people work from home perfectly legally already albeit not in bespoke live work units and that provided this isn't permitted to compromise others' residential amenity or harm landscapes and built environments it is acceptable in planning terms.	No specific policy but issue of demolition covered by DMC7 and supporting text
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	Yes			supported	support noted	'Landscape first' approach addresses this issue.
034	National Trust	034/39	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	Yes			supported	support noted	Heritage asset language brought into supporting text to policy DMC10 in order to clarify intent of policy. This includes indicative preferred uses for particular types of heritage asset in particular locations
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/78	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No			the responder consider that good employment sites should be protected on plan and other sites should be retained or released with the decision being made against policy criteria.	The Authority prefers to use policy and additional development management criteria to determine whether sites are retained or not which is a responsive rather than proactive approach to potential redevelopment of employment land	See DMC9 and text
005	Peak Park Parishes forum	005/79	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements				responder wants employment sites retained where alternatives are more remote and in towns around the area.	This view has led to stronger criteria against which to determine applications to release employment land to other uses.	DMS4 and text
053	Peak Watch	053/44	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	Yes			supported	support noted	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising and text discourages proliferation of signage that spoils street scene and other qualities of areas such as Bakewell Central Shopping Area.
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	Yes			supported	support noted	See DME1: Agriculture or forestry operational development; and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No			the responder consider that good employment sites should be protected on plan and other sites should be retained or released with the decision being made against policy criteria.	The Authority prefers to use policy and additional development management criteria to determine whether sites are retained or not which is a responsive rather than proactive approach to potential redevelopment of employment land	See DME2: Farm Diversification, and supporting text.
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements				responder wants employment sites retained where alternatives are more remote and in towns around the area.	This view has led to stronger criteria against which to determine applications to release employment land to other uses.	This issue is now covered by Core Strategy GSP2D, through the use of conditions and section 215 notices, and by incorporation into policy DMC1
017	Winster Parish Council	005/78	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No			the responder consider that good employment sites should be protected on plan and other sites should be retained or released with the decision being made against policy criteria.	The Authority prefers to use policy and additional development management criteria to determine whether sites are retained or not which is a responsive rather than proactive approach to potential redevelopment of employment land	Core Strategy DS1 and HC4
017	Winster Parish Council	005/79	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements				responder wants employment sites retained where alternatives are more remote and in towns around the area.	This view has led to stronger criteria against which to determine applications to release employment land to other uses.	See DMC4:Settlement Limits and supporting text
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/73	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements	No			the responder consider that good employment sites should be protected on plan and other sites should be retained or released with the decision being made against policy criteria.	The Authority prefers to use policy and additional development management criteria to determine whether sites are retained or not which is a responsive rather than proactive approach to potential redevelopment of employment land	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text, which now avoids any reference to PPS8
036	Youlgrave Parish Council	036/78	Economy	43	Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements				responder wants employment sites retained where alternatives are more remote and in towns around the area.	This view has led to stronger criteria against which to determine applications to release employment land to other uses.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text, which now avoids any reference to PPS8

025	CLA	025/33	Economy	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses	No			responder wants routine consideration of neighbourhood amenity alongside core strategy E1 and E2 rather than criteria such as those in LE2. They state that LE2 is contrary to the NPPF but without saying which bit of the NPPF.	The Authority considers its policies are NPPF compatible and that the criteria in DME5 logically suggest the sort of conditions necessary on any permissions. This enables the applicant to resolve any issues prior to them applying for permission.	See policy DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure and supporting text, which now avoids any reference to PPS8
042	Friends of Peak District	042/50	Economy	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses	No		more proactive identification and protection of B1 sites to allow small local firms to grow within the area, plus specific live work policy	Responder wants the Authority to resist loss of business space to housing in most cases and protect a supply of sites for B1 uses for indigenous firms to move within the park. They request a live work unit policy that reduces permitted development rights to revert to either sole business or sole residential use	The Authority cannot protect sites solely for local businesses even if there might be a need. The Authority explored the merits of a live work units policy and determined on the basis of evidence from the economic development manager for the largest constituent district (by population) that there was insufficient interest in such units to warrant a separate policy. The Authority contends that the figures show that many people work from home perfectly legally already albeit not in bespoke live work units and that provided this isn't permitted to compromise others' residential amenity or harm landscapes and built environments it is acceptable in planning terms.	See DMU5: restoration of utility and telecommunications infrastructure
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses	Yes			supported	support noted	Flexibility has been retained for the neighbourhood planning process by incorporating development management criteria on open spaces in general in the Design Policy.
034	National Trust	034/40	Economy	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses	Yes			none made	support noted	This is covered by the supplementary planning document Climate Change and Sustainable Building
053	Peak Watch	053/45	Economy	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses	No	Option 2			preference noted but not considered justified when viewed against preferred approach and support for that approach	See policy DMC8 and supporting text
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy DS1: Development Strategy, and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text, and DMB1: Bakewell's development boundary (which directs development to within the boundary)
024	Tissington Estate	024/22	Economy	44	Exceptional permission for B1 employment uses				supported provided personal rather than time limited permissions are allowed to provide security for tenants of the buildings and the estate	comment noted and acted upon	no policy response required
025	CLA	025/34	Economy	45	Home Working	No	Option 3		option 3 is preferred because it advocates decisions on a case by case basis rather than establishing an in principle policy position	The plan could take this approach but this would be unhelpful in offering no clear guidance to the applicant. Text could outline the position and explain the factors that would be taken into consideration on each case, but if we do this we might as well have a policy.	See policy DMC7 and supporting text
042	Friends of Peak District	042/51	Economy	45	Home Working	No			Request specific live work policy	The Authority explored the merits of a live work units policy and determined on the basis of evidence from the economic development manager for the largest constituent district (by population) that there was insufficient interest in such units to warrant a separate policy. Many people work from home perfectly legally already albeit not in bespoke live work units and that provided this isn't permitted to compromise others' residential amenity or harm landscapes and built environments it is acceptable in planning terms.	no policy response required
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Housing	45	Home Working	Yes			supported	support noted	DMS6, DMS7 and appendix 9
034	National Trust	034/41	Economy	45	Home Working	No	Option 2		concern over ability to retain live work units in live work use the Trust prefers live work to be considered differently to home working for the reasons given in that option	concern noted	N/a
053	Peak Watch	053/46	Economy	45	Home Working	Yes			supported	support noted	N/a
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	45	Home Working	Yes			supported	support noted	N/a
024	Tissington Estate	024/24	Economy	45	Home Working				supported	support noted	N/a
025	CLA	025/35	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	No			The approach doesn't help business to expand.	The Authority policies to safeguard business space in line with employment land requirements, and protect against its loss in DS1 settlements, along with its policies that allow expansion of business outside of DS1 settlements give scope for business to expand within the context of conserving and enhancing a protected landscape.	The existing Core Strategy Policies, the emerging DMP Policies and the Sustainable Transport Action Plan all support more sustainable means of transport.

042	Friends of Peak District	042/52	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	No		more proactive identification and protection of B1 sites to allow small local firms to grow within the area, plus specific live work policy	need to resist loss of business space to housing in most cases and protect a supply of sites for B1 uses for indigenous firms to move within the park.	The Authority policies to safeguard business space in line with employment land requirements, and protect against its loss in DS1 settlements, along with its policies that allow expansion of business outside of DS1 settlements give scope for business to expand within the context of conserving and enhancing a protected landscape.	This is beyond the scope / remit of the DMP Policies
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	Yes			supported	support noted	no further response required
034	National Trust	034/42	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	Yes			supported	support noted	DMC14: Pollution and Disturbance provides protection for water courses.
037	Natural England	037/19	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	Yes			assuming criteria protect landscape and biodiversity as well	qualified support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park; criteria E outlines the Authority's approach to non conforming uses
053	Peak Watch	053/47	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park; criteria E outlines the Authority's approach to non conforming uses
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	Yes			supported	support noted	DME4: Change of use of non safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements and supporting text is considered an appropriate compromise that requires strong evidence before releasing business space to other use but does not rule out that possibility in principle
024	Tissington Estate	024/25	Economy	46	Industrial and business expansion	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park; criteria E outlines the Authority's approach to non conforming uses
042	Friends of Peak District	042/53	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Yes			supported	support noted	no policy response required
028	indigo	028/2	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	No			responder says the policy LE5 is contrary to NPPF paragraph 14 in that it doesn't have sufficient flexibility to respond to rapid change and thereby meet objectively assessed needs. Paragraph 22 says employment land should be given over to other uses in the interests of the community if there is no identified need for continued business use	Paragraph 14 contains caveats for protected areas. Paragraph 22 is already in line with core strategy policies E1 and E2.	DMS6, DMS7 and appendix 9
028	indigo	028/3	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	No			see response to 028/2	Paragraph 14 contains caveats for protected areas. Paragraph 22 is already in line with core strategy policies E1 and E2.	no policy response required
028	Indigo	028/4	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	No			responder wants amended LE5 to recognise that retail use of employment sites doesn't lose them as an employment use.	The Authority has protected a strategic level of employment space but when evidence suggests strategic need has changed its policies only require that sites are retained predominantly for business use, which gives scope for retail use.	Whilst it is understood that the Coal Authority do not see a requirement for specific safeguarding areas, it is considered necessary to have DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development, as a policy in the National Park
028	Indigo	028/5	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	No			responder is interested in supermarket development of employment sites as a retail operation but also a major employer.	The use of strategically important business sites for supermarket use is largely resisted since the Authority's evidence would suggest there are no better alternative business sites.	See DMMW1: The justification for mineral and waste development; and supporting text
009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Yes			supported	support noted	See DMM57: Restoration and Aftercare; and supporting text.
048	Litton Properties	048/4	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	No			responder wants greater flexibility for small scale and ancillary retail development and claims this is in line with the NPPF	The Authority considers that its policies DMS3 and DME3 give scope for small scale ancillary retail development	no policy response required
048	Litton Properties	048/6	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	No			responder wants greater flexibility for small scale and ancillary retail development and claims this is in line with the NPPF	The Authority considers that its policies DMS3 and DME3 give scope for small scale ancillary retail development	no policy response required
034	National Trust	034/43	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Yes			supported	support noted	no policy response required
053	Peak Watch	053/48	Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Yes			supported	support noted	no policy response required
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Yes			supported	support noted	no policy response required
042	Friends of Peak District	042/54	Economy	48	Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	Yes			supported	support noted	No policy response required

009	Kirklees Council	009/1	Economy	48	Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
034	National Trust	034/44	Economy	48	Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	Yes			supported	support noted	No policy response required
037	Natural England	037/20	Economy	48	Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	Yes			particularly support criteria (i) (v) and (vi)	support noted	This refers to the Core Strategy, and the potential for a more sustainable approach to travel across the National Park.
053	Peak Watch	053/49	Economy	48	Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	Yes			supported	support noted	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park; criteria E outlines the Authority's approach to non conforming uses
018	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Economy	48	Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	Yes			supported	support noted	See DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/85	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/85	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/85	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/20	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/45	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/85	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
037	Natural England	037/21	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites				Consideration should be given to protection of valued characteristics, and wildlife in particular, rather than landscaped setting.	Whilst this policy does not specifically stress impact on valued characteristics, the policy would be applied alongside other core strategy and development management policies such as L2: Sites of biodiversity or geodiversity importance and DMC: Siting, design, layout and landscaping; DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/55	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/85	Recreation and Tourism	49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/86	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/86	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/86	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/21	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/46	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/86	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/56	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/86	Recreation and Tourism	50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013

005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/87	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/87	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/87	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/22	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/26	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/47	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/87	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/57	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	No			Clearer and more straight forward to say that any self catering accommodation that is not suitable for a self-contained dwelling should not be used as such unless a planning application to convert it is approved.	Noted.	DMC3:Siting design layout and landscaping requires particular attention to flood risk ,water conservation, and sustainable drainage and links back (through supporting text) to CC1 and CC5 of the Core Strategy and the Climate Change and Sustainable Building SPD adopted in 2013
045	Emery Planning Partnership	045/30	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/87	Recreation and Tourism	51	Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/88	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and supporting text
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/88	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and supporting text
017	Winster Parish Council ()	005/88	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes				Support noted.	See DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and supporting text

018	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/23	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes				Support noted.	The prominence given to landscape character biodiversity and cultural heritage in DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes; DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone; and specific policies for biodiversity and cultural heritage are to be read together and collectively enable decisions in line with Park purposes, which the Authority considers is not overtly ecosystems led but will indirectly lead to the same weight being given to factors that could be considered to comprise and ecosystems approach.
025	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/36	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	No	Option 1			Simpler design standards for stabling was offered by option 1 but this didn't receive widespread support	See DMC14 Pollution and Disturbance and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/48	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land and supporting text
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/88	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/58	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/53	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land and supporting text
056	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	005/88	Recreation and Tourism	52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Yes			supported	Support noted.	See DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land and supporting text
001	National Grid (gas)	001/01	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Please inform National Grid of the outcome of strategy choice with more detail about size-loads likely to be connected in order to enable reinforcement of gas supply where necessary (a reactive approach in line with regulations).	This response does not affect policy. It may affect detailed settlement capacity work and should be taken up at that stage.	There was no specific policy requirement from the preferred approach and the Authority will use site briefs as required.
001	National Grid (gas)	001/02	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Building on 001/1 requests a plan on which capacity advice can be based, pointing out that the main constraint to any growth is the timescale needed to reinforce supply	This response does not affect policy. It may affect detailed settlement capacity work and should be taken up at that stage.	There was no specific policy requirement from the preferred approach and the Authority will use site briefs as required.
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/07	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				WDP contends that saved local plan policy LU1 contradicts the statutory requirements placed on it under the Electricity Act 1989 (with ref to offering terms for connection and to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system).	The comment is not specific in relation to sections of the Act. In addition it appears to have misunderstood Policy LU1 which applies to permission that would be given or refused for "the development" that requires new or upgraded services and not the services alone.	There was no specific policy requirement from the preferred approach and the Authority will use site briefs as required.
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/10	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				As for 008/7,8,&9	The comment is not specific in relation to the sections of the Act. In cases where the decision is made by government (formerly DECC) the saved policy would be the starting point for the National Park's comments and the relevant decision maker for decisions made under planning legislation. Other material matters would be taken into account and would not be "fettered" by the policy. It is difficult to see, therefore, how the policy can contradict the Electricity Act, as opposed to being required to be read alongside it and placed into the balance in any decision making process. Government did not object to Local Plan Policy LU4 when it was subject to examination in 1998.	There was no specific policy requirement from the preferred approach and the Authority will use site briefs as required.
009	Kirklees Council	009/02	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure	Yes			Responder is supportive of the preferred approaches and wish to be consulted on detailed wording.	Support noted.	The ecosystems approach is not overtly pushed through policies though the collective policies for the National Park could be argued to represent an ecosystems approach to land use planning that would not be obvious in areas not subject to such a high level of environmental protection.
037	Natural England	037/22	Landscape and Conservation	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure	Yes				Support noted.	There was no specific policy requirement from the preferred approach and the Authority will use site briefs as required.

041	United Utilities	041/01	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Responder points out that water and waste water service are vital for health and protection of the environment. LPA needs to ensure that infrastructure capacity is available or alternative development solutions sought.	United Utilities and other service providers were consulted on this specific matter during preparation of the Core Strategy and informed the Authority that there is no service provision issue with regard to likely scales of development within the National Park. Further checks will be made on a case by case basis.	DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need , the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach does not prevent people from forming households although the extent to which this helps hidden households is not known because occupancy of such property is not subject to occupancy restrictions
041	United Utilities	041/02	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Responder points out that managing flood risk and water resources are very important.	Noted and agreed.	DMH1 - 11 complements core strategy policy DS1 and HC1 and represents the Authority's approach to housing provision in a protected landscape
041	United Utilities	041/03	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Responder points out that drought measures highlight the need to manage water resources carefully in a period of less certainty about rainfall patterns.	Noted and agreed	The Part 2 policies DMH1 - 11 necessarily adds detail to the Core Strategy rather than opening up new debates about the role of housing to wider community issues
041	United Utilities	041/05	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Responder states that in considering any planning application the LPA or applicant must demonstrate that infrastructure capacity is available and if not the application should be removed.	This is not relevant to applications for domestic extensions. Nevertheless the response is taken on board in existing policy (Local Plan policy LU1) and reflected in Issue 53	DMH1: New affordable housing and supporting text explains the approach and why it is justified.
041	United Utilities	041/06	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure	Yes				Support noted.	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need , the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/59	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure				Responder is unsure whether this policy should be retained or rolled into one policy about all utilities but states that this is a minor consideration.	Noted but not agreed as the issues are distinct and the policy response needs to be specific.	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need , the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
049	Severn Trent Water	049/11	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure	Yes			Responder considers this is adequate in recognising the supportive role of infrastructure and the policy context acceptable.	Support noted.	See DMH 2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.

053	Peak Park Watch	053/54	Utilities	53	Development that requires new or upgraded utility service infrastructure	Yes				Support noted.	See DMH2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/08	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				WDP contends that saved local plan policy LU1 contradicts the statutory requirements placed on it under the Electricity Act 1989 (with ref to offering terms for connection and to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system).	The comment is not specific in relation to the sections of the Act. It omits to make reference to a) Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 and the specific duty on relevant bodies to have regard to National Park purposes when carrying out their activities or b) the monies made available by Ofgem for the undergrounding of electricity supply in National Parks.	Core Strategy HC1 and supporting text and DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text outline the Authority's approach to assessing housing need and why that is considered a sustainable approach to housing delivery in the National Park
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/12	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				WDP considers the wording for issues 54 and 56 are contradictory in nature with regard to overhead lines (the first acknowledging exceptional circumstances whilst the second does not).	The Authority believes this is not a contradiction: Issue 54 deals with new or upgraded utility services in general. Issue 56 deals specifically with transmission between a newly proposed renewable source of generation and the user or the grid. If transmission lines were to cause additional landscape impact because they could not be placed underground, the new source of generation would not be permitted, thereby removing the need for the lines.	no policy response needed
037	Natural England	037/23	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services	Yes			Responder supports criteria to ensure that when new services are above ground they are routed so as to have least environmental impact.	Noted. Additional concern is covered in DMU2(a)	See DMH1 and supporting text
041	United Utilities	041/04	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				United Utilities would seek the support of the Council to protect and secure land for infrastructure use. Failure could jeopardise additional capacity needed to support growth plans and delivery of the development plan.	United Utilities and other service providers were consulted on this specific matter during preparation of the Core Strategy and informed the Authority that there is no service provision issue with regard to likely scales of development within the National Park. Further checks will be made on a case by case basis.	policy criteria retained because it doesn't make good planning sense to give over more land if existing property can do the job.
041	United Utilities	041/07	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services			Yes	Responder considers that the guidance in NPPF paras 157 and 162 is not adequately reflected within the Core Strategy or through maintenance of policy LU2. A more positive framework is needed with linkage to the SPD guidance referred to in issue 2 (Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions). The wording stating that new reservoirs will not be permitted is unhelpful and unsatisfactory and should be deleted - proposals being treated on their merits.	Demand for the provision of new reservoirs is a matter of strategic scale that could have been addressed as part of the Core Strategy but Utility service providers did not raise it at that time. A change of policy approach from that which was previously found to be acceptable is a significant matter that may require amendment to the Core Strategy rather than the Development Management Plan. Further consideration is needed when the core strategy is reviewed.	DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach does not prevent people from forming households although the extent to which this helps hidden households is not known because occupancy of such property is not subject to occupancy restrictions
041	United Utilities	041/08	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				SEE 041/7	SEE 041/7	DMH1 - 11 complements core strategy policy DS1 and HC1 and represents the Authority's approach to housing provision in a protected landscape
041	United Utilities	041/09	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				SEE 041/7	SEE 041/7	The Part 2 policies DMH1 - 11 necessarily adds detail to the Core Strategy rather than opening up new debates about the role of housing to wider community issues
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/60	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				The responder requests specific text and policy related to this issue that refers to undergrounding National Grid EHV cables both within and just outside the National Park.	Text in the National Park Development Plan has no force outside the Park but clearly states a preference for undergrounding where that is necessary to minimise the impact on the built and natural environment and established activities therein	DMH1: New affordable housing and supporting text explains the approach and why it is justified.

049	Severn Trent Water	049/12	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services				Responder considers that the guidance in NPPF paras 157 and 162 is not adequately reflected within the Core Strategy or through maintenance of policy LU2. A more positive framework is needed with linkage to the SPD guidance referred to in issue 2 (Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions). The wording stating that new reservoirs will not be permitted is unhelpful and unsatisfactory and should be deleted - proposals being treated on their merits.	Demand for the provision of new reservoirs is a matter of strategic scale that could have been addressed as part of the Core Strategy but Utility service providers did not raise it at that time. A change of policy approach from that which was previously found to be acceptable is a significant matter that may require amendment to the Core Strategy rather than the Development Management Plan. Further consideration is needed when the core strategy is reviewed.	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/55	Utilities	54	New and upgraded utility services	Yes				Support noted.	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/04	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations				Responder points out that provided minimum clearances etc. are observed they do not place restrictions on types of use. It would, however, be sensible for layouts and planning guidance to take WPD position in to account and choose best uses near to lines - e.g. parking / roads / commercial uses and open space.	Noted and agreed. Scale of development in the National Park will seldom give rise to issues.	See DMH 2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/05	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations				Responder believes that development proposals should be discussed with them at an early stage	Noted and agreed. Scale of development in the National Park will seldom give rise to issues.	See DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/06	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations				Responder believes that where there are sub-stations on land affected by development, WDP should be consulted on details in good time to ensure that access can be maintained and other requirements taken into account.	Noted and agreed. Scale of development in the National Park will seldom give rise to issues.	Core Strategy HC1 and supporting text and DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text outline the Authority's approach to assessing housing need and why that is considered a sustainable approach to housing delivery in the National Park
041	United Utilities	041/10	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations			Yes	Responder believes that saved policy LU3 should be modified to include water supply assets, reservoir treatment facilities; sewers and water mains. The response implies that policy should protect the assets as well as the new development. Alternative policy wording is suggested and combined with pollution avoidance.	The Authority has chosen not to include water supply assets in this policy but policy DMC14: Pollution and disturbance; and supporting text make it clear that water supply assets are to be protected not just for their importance to biodiversity and wildlife but also to residents and visitors.	policy defines need and by default it is what the Authority considers to be a reasonable definition of need.
041	United Utilities	041/11	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations			Yes	SEE 041/10	SEE 041/10	See DMH1 and supporting text
041	United Utilities	041/12	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations			Yes	SEE 041/10	SEE 041/10	See DMH1 and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/61	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations	Yes				Support noted	Much of the SPG 'Meeting the local need for affordable housing in the Peak District National Park' is brought through to policy. The SPG will be updated following adoption of the Part 2 document

049	Severn Trent Water	049/13	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations	Yes			Responder supports detailed management principles for this issue. The Code of Practice on Odour Nuisance from Sewerage Treatment Works (Defra 2006) is relevant. The onus needs to be on developers demonstrating that proximity to a (water or waste water) utility installation is acceptable in terms of odour, noise or other potential consideration.	Support noted	Much of the SPG 'Meeting the local need for affordable housing in the Peak District National Park' is brought through to policy. The SPG will be updated following adoption of the Part 2 document and in line with the statutory requirements for producing SPD.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/56	Utilities	55	Development close to utility installations	Yes				Support noted	Floorspace standards have been reviewed and increased as shown in new policy DMH1
008	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/09	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation				WDP contends that saved local plan policy LU1 contradicts the statutory requirements placed on it under the Electricity Act 1989 (with ref to offering terms for connection and to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system).	The comment is not specific in relation to sections of the Act. In addition it appears to have misunderstood Policy LU4 which applies to permission that would be given or refused for "the renewable energy source" that requires transmission lines and not the lines alone.	policy does not include spatial approach suggested.
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/16	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation				Policy LU4(c) is contrary to NPPF and to Core Strategy - acceptability should be a matter of scale, nature and location (not policy per se). LU4(c) also unreasonably limits consumer choice/demand and diminishes prospects for farm diversification.	Windfarms are not the part of the policy that refers to ancillary development. In the context of the discussion at and findings of the public examination of the Core Strategy and also of NPPF paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115 (with footnote 25). The Authority agrees on the point about scale, and the inclusion of reference to windfarms can do that - helping to clarify matters for potential developers in the context of major development in National Parks.	See DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text
037	Natural England	037/24	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation	Yes			specific support given to retention of statement that windfarms will not be permitted.		See DMC10 Conversion of heritage assets; DMH4 Essential worker dwellings; DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilages of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text to those policies
041	United Utilities	041/13	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation	Yes			If preferred approach is not adopted a list of points relevant to windfarm development damage to peat and hydrology is supplied for consideration.	Support noted	See DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text
041	United Utilities	041/14	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation				SEE 041/13	SEE 041/13	The Authority considers that DMH1 - DMH3 plus other policies the Authority are a positive response to the English National Parks and the Broads Park Vision and Circular 2010.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/62	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation	Yes				Noted	DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach does not prevent people from forming households although the extent to which this helps hidden households is not known because occupancy of such property is not subject to occupancy restrictions
049	Severn Trent Water	049/14	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation			Yes	Severn Trent Water would like to see detailed criteria on the types and scale of renewable energy appropriate within the National Park.	This comment is not addressed to the substance of the issue. In addition the guidance requested is already provided by the Supplementary Planning Document Climate Change and Sustainable Building adopted in 2013.	DMH1 - 11 complements core strategy policy DS1 and HC1 and represents the Authority's approach to housing provision in a protected landscape
053	Peak Park Watch	053/57	Utilities	56	Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation					Noted	The Part 2 policies DMH1 - 11 necessarily adds detail to the Core Strategy rather than opening up new debates about the role of housing to wider community issues
007	Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants Ltd)	007/01	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				Support inclusion of a policy for telecommunications but seek amendments to saved LU5	The text requested has not been brought into the plan but the Authority considers that in so far as it is appropriate to recognise the importance of telecommunications and by association the infrastructure necessary to achieve acceptable levels of telecommunications, it has done so within its policy and supporting text.	DMH1: New affordable housing and supporting text explains the approach and why it is justified.

007	Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants Ltd)	007/02	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				Quotes NPPF paras 42 and 43 with emphasis on economic growth, and minimising infrastructure as long as expansion of networks and efficient operation is supported.	The text requested has not been brought into the plan but the Authority considers that in so far as it is appropriate to recognise the importance of telecommunications and by association the infrastructure necessary to achieve acceptable levels of telecommunications, it has done so within its policy and supporting text.	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
007	Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants Ltd)	007/03	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				Cites Code of Best Practice for Mobile Phone Network Development (2002) and its emphasis on consultation.	Noted	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
007	Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants Ltd)	007/04	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				Urge the inclusion of a concise and flexible policy with clear indications of issues that development will be assessed against.	The policy is not concise but the detail is deemed necessary and does give clear criteria against which development proposals will be assessed.	See DMH 2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
007	Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants Ltd)	007/05	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				Suggests policy wording with criteria for siting and design including on existing buildings; new masts with preference for existing buildings; sensitive areas and buildings the need to avoid an unacceptable effect; and the need to have regard to technical limitations	To consider in relation to National Park purposes and noting that this suggestion includes the avoidance of unacceptable effects.	See DMH2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
007	Mobile Operators Association (Mono Consultants Ltd)	007/06	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				Suggests that the policy be introduced with wording that emphasises essential nature of mobile phones and the NPA's commitment to its promotion whilst minimising impact and encouraging mast sharing.	To consider in relation to National Park purposes and noting that this suggestion includes the avoidance of unacceptable effects.	Core Strategy HC1 and supporting text and DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text outline the Authority's approach to assessing housing need and why that is considered a sustainable approach to housing delivery in the National Park
037	Natural England	037/25	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure	Yes			welcomes recognition of the potential harm from this type of infrastructure and policy to afford protection.	Support noted	policy defines need and by default it is what the Authority considers to be a reasonable definition of need.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/63	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure	Yes			Para 2.289 refers to PPS8 which is now deleted. Government is therefore unlikely to consider those former considerations as constraints. Suggest avoidance of ref to these in future text.	Support noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
046	Derbyshire County Council	046/30	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				draws attention to Derbyshire-wide superfast broadband roll out, but does not comment on options.	Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text

046	Derbyshire County Council	046/31	Utilities	57	Telecommunications infrastructure				NPPF identifies the need to support communications infrastructures as key to delivering sustainable development and states that local planning authorities should support this, including high speed broadband.	The Authority considers that its policy and text does recognise the need and does support measures to meet it but only within the context of a protected landscape.	The policy LHC5 is a re-write of LH6 with a slight clarification as to what constitutes 'remains under control of the main house. The supporting text explains that the Authority agrees that there should be greater recognition of the role of ancillary accommodation, but also specifies that legal agreements will be required to enable future generations of families to benefit from the same arrangement and avoid creating pressure to create further property for other generations were ancillary dwellings to achieve independent status (and break the groupings of accommodation)
053	Peak Park Watch	053/58	Landscape and Conservation	57	Telecommunications infrastructure	Yes				Support noted	The policy LHC5 is a re-write of LH6 with a slight clarification as to what constitutes 'remains under control of the main house. The supporting text explains that the Authority agrees that there should be greater recognition of the role of ancillary accommodation, but also specifies that legal agreements will be required to enable future generations of families to benefit from the same arrangement and avoid creating pressure to create further property for other generations were ancillary dwellings to achieve independent status (and break the groupings of accommodation)
041	United Utilities	041/15	Utilities	58	Restoration of utility infrastructure sites				no additional issues need to be covered	Noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/64	Utilities	58	Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	Yes				Support noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
049	Severn Trent Water	049/15	Utilities	58	Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	Yes				Support noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/95	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
015	The Coal Authority	015/2	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach does not prevent people from forming households although the extent to which this helps hidden households is not known because occupancy of such property is not subject to occupancy restrictions
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/95	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	DMH1 - 11 complements core strategy policy DS1 and HC1 and represents the Authority's approach to housing provision in a protected landscape
017	Winster Parish Council	017/95	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	No			Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	The support is noted	The Part 2 policies DMH1 - 11 necessarily adds detail to the Core Strategy rather than opening up new debates about the role of housing to wider community issues

023	Rowsley Parish Council	023/3	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	No			Policy Min 3 encourages local small-scale building and roof tiles. However, LM1 (a) from experience appears to be just plain platitudes and ignored by operators. Our Parish Council is also extremely concerned that i), iii), iv) and viii) are continually disregarded by not only operators but officers who have a commitment to safeguard our heritage, that being in our case Stanton Moor, because it is contiguous to the unacceptable scale of quarrying being allowed to continue seemingly out of control. We need to stress that Stanton Moor is believed to be the largest and finest Bronze Age settlement in England and may be the UK, which everyone needs to take on board including officers, operators and landowners. This has not been the case.	The Parish Council do not appear to have an issue with saved policy LM1 content per se, but do take issue with the implementation of those development management criteria, particularly in relation to proposals at Stanton Moor. The general support for the policy criteria is welcomed. In order to achieve the protection that the Parish Council appear to want will rely upon a sound and thorough development management policy which sets out clear and defined criteria for the assessment of proposals. The DPD will also set out policy criteria beyond just the immediate minerals policy(s) that will seek to protect heritage assets such as the Stanton Moor Scheduled Ancient Monument and surrounding area	DMH1: New affordable housing and supporting text explains the approach and why it is justified.
026	Staffordshire County Council	026/6	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	No			To complement Core Strategy policy MIN1 it is suggested that applicants be required to demonstrate that long term management of restored sites has/can be secured	The Core Strategy sets out the framework for addressing restoration and aftercare. The Authority can only secure 5 years of aftercare through the relevant legislation, but does where necessary secure longer periods of aftercare through a s106 planning obligation. The criteria suggested is considered to potentially be beyond the scope of planning policy but development management criteria on restoration are included within DPD policy	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/39	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
034	National Trust	034/55	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes			Approach agreed, minerals policy is one of the most important areas where it is necessary to ensure that a 'policy void' does not materialise	Support noted	See DMH 2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/95	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	See DMH2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.

037	Natural England	037/26	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes			We support the preferred approach of bringing forward the previous policies. We support the retention of policy wording that ensures that particular attention is paid to the risk and impact of potential pollution affecting the use of the land (including noise, dust, vibration and fumes), harm to landscape and any necessary screening or landscaping of the site, harm to nature conservation, harm to recreational interests including public rights of way, and harm to surface and ground water resources. We also support the consideration given to the cumulative impacts of operations. We would however welcome the policy wording is widened to include harm to soils, loss of tranquility and light pollution.	qualified support is noted and the matters outstanding are dealt with in policies DMMW2 and DMMW3 other than light pollution which is covered by policy DMC3: Siting, design, layout and landscaping; and supporting text paragraph 3.31	Core Strategy HC1 and supporting text and DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text outline the Authority's approach to assessing housing need and why that is considered a sustainable approach to housing delivery in the National Park
039	Cemex UK	039/1	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	No	Yes	No	We express a clear preference for option 1. If saved policy LM1 is a guide to the content of a new proposed new policy, we cannot see that it will add anything to what is already contained in NPPF and as such, is unnecessary	The proposed approach will not see the re-casting of the content of National Policy into this DPD as such, but will instead see the setting of development management criteria to complement the Core Strategy. The Government is aiming to reduce and simplify policy, however the suggestion from the MPA would leave the National Park without any development management policies for a highly controversial area of development which is considered to be an untenable position and would be highly unsatisfactory. Some national planning policy on minerals remains in the NPPF and the accompanying Technical Guide along with some retained MPGs. However the content of the remaining MPGs and the NPPF Technical Guide are under review and may not remain. Given this uncertainty and the fact that s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 still requires a plan led approach, a suitable suite of development management policies on minerals is still considered necessary	policy defines need and by default it is what the Authority considers to be a reasonable definition of need.
040	Mineral Products Association	040/1	Minerals (Issue 59)	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	No	Yes	No	We express a clear preference for option 1. If saved policy LM1 is a guide to the content of a new proposed new policy, we cannot see that it will add anything to what is already contained in NPPF and as such, is unnecessary	The proposed approach will not see the re-casting of the content of National Policy into this DPD as such, but will instead see the setting of development management criteria to complement the Core Strategy. The Government is aiming to reduce and simplify policy, however the suggestion from the MPA would leave the National Park without any development management policies for a highly controversial area of development which is considered to be an untenable position and would be highly unsatisfactory. Some national planning policy on minerals remains in the NPPF and the accompanying Technical Guide along with some retained MPGs. However the content of the remaining MPGs and the NPPF Technical Guide are under review and may not remain. Given this uncertainty and the fact that s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 still requires a plan led approach, a suitable suite of development management policies on minerals is still considered necessary	See DMH1 and supporting text
040	Mineral Products Association	040/2	Minerals (Issue 59)	59	Yes	No	No		However we acknowledge that the substance of LM9 could form a new policy in the DPD	The support is noted	See DMH1 and supporting text

040	Mineral Products Association	040/3	Minerals (Issue 59)	59		No	Yes	No	In general we would not advise that the NPA tries to reinvent the wheel of revoked national planning guidance for minerals. Certain documents including MPS1 Practice Guide and some MPGs plus NPPF Technical Guidance and the Aggregates National Guidelines remain extant. In addition, government ministers have made public statements that all non policy guidance is being reviewed and that they want to see guidance developed in future co-operatively by regulators and industry and professional bodies, which we would like to see too. There is a danger if every mpa develops its own guidance, of significant differences opening up around the country introducing areas of relative disadvantage to the industry and barriers to effective competition. We see enormous merit in ministers' suggestions and we would prefer that the Peak District NPA joined in this collaborative approach to guidance and did not try and do it for itself in a new Plan	The proposed approach will not see the re-casting of the content of National Policy into this DPD as such, but will instead see the setting of development management criteria to complement the Core Strategy. The Government is aiming to reduce and simplify policy, however the suggestion from the MPA would leave the National Park without any development management policies for a highly controversial area of development which is considered to be an untenable position and would be highly unsatisfactory. Some national planning policy on minerals remains in the NPPF and the accompanying Technical Guide along with some retained MPGs. However the content of the remaining MPGs and the NPPF Technical Guide are under review and may not remain. Given this uncertainty and the fact that s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 still requires a plan led approach, a suitable suite of development management policies on minerals is still considered necessary	LHC1, LHC2, and LHC3 update the Local plan LHC1, and the policies will be followed up with an SPD in line with the LDS
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/65	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach does not prevent people from forming households although the extent to which this helps hidden households is not known because occupancy of such property is not subject to occupancy restrictions
044	Stoney Middleton Parish Council	044/2	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	The policy does not have the objective of making a significant contribution to thriving villages but does tackle one aspect of a villages needs that the Authority continues to consider requires attention.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/60	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	The Part 2 policies DMH1 - 11 necessarily adds detail to the Core Strategy rather than opening up new debates about the role of housing to wider community issues
059	Dr Martin Beer	059/8	Minerals	59	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development)	Yes				Support noted	DMH1: New affordable housing and supporting text explains the approach and why it is justified.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/96	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes				Support noted	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.

016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/96	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes				Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	The support is noted	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need , the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
017	Winster Parish Council	017/96	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes				Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	The support is noted	See DMH 2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
033	Rainow Parish Council	033/40	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes						See DMH2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
034	National Trust	034/56	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes					Support noted	Policy enables housing for local persons holding land and assets but not being in need of housing. Policies LHC6 and LHC7 allows for this and in very few cases will require any contribution towards community needs for affordable housing
035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/96	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes				Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	Support noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/66	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes					Support noted	See DMH1 and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/61	Minerals	60	Small scale calcite workings	Yes					Support noted	policy defines need and by default it is what the Authority considers to be a reasonable definition of need.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum	005/97	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes					Support noted	DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need , the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach does not prevent people from forming households although the extent to which this helps hidden households is not known because occupancy of such property is not subject to occupancy restrictions
016	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/97	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes				Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	The support is noted	The policy does not have the objective of making a significant contribution to thriving villages but does tackle one aspect of a villages needs that the Authority continues to consider requires attention.
017	Winster Parish Council	017/97	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes				Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	The support is noted	The Part 2 policies DMH1 - 11 necessarily adds detail to the Core Strategy rather than opening up new debates about the role of housing to wider community issues
034	National Trust	034/57	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes					Support noted	DMH1: New affordable housing and supporting text explains the approach and why it is justified.

035	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/97	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes			Agreed (Supporting Peak Park Parish Forum)	Support noted	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
037	Natural England	037/27	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes			We support the preferred approach of bringing forward the previous policies. We support the retention of policy wording that ensures that particular attention is paid to the risk and impact of potential pollution affecting the use of the land (including noise, dust, vibration and fumes), harm to landscape and any necessary screening or landscaping of the site, harm to nature conservation, harm to recreational interests including public rights of way, and harm to surface and ground water resources. We also support the consideration given to the cumulative impacts of operations. We would however welcome the policy wording is widened to include harm to soils, loss of tranquility and light pollution.	qualified support is noted and the matters outstanding are dealt with in policies DMMW2 and DMMW3 other than light pollution which is covered by policy DMC3: Siting, design, layout and landscaping; and supporting text paragraph 3.31	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets and supporting text and DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use and DMH9 Replacement dwellings (in Core Strategy DS1 settlements) allow for open market housing and in the sense that this housing is not justified for purpose of addressing objectively assessed need, the Authority has no preference for type or size of housing in general terms. The new housing will be delivered on enhancement sites and by conversion and over the plan period will significantly increase open market options to buy in the National Park. AMR figures show market housing outstripping affordable housing in the first 10 years of the plan so the policy approach presents opportunities for landowners developers and communities for housing that would be outside of the social housing sector and therefore address the needs of communities for other forms of housing.
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/68	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	No	No	Yes	We recommend the emerging policy should: encourage, and not hinder, the development of on-farm, multi-farm and other forms of anaerobic development facilities	This comment relates to an issue which was determined in the Core Strategy in policies CC3 and CC4. This is not a matter for this DPD to revisit or resolve.	See DMH 2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
043	John Youatt	N/A	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	No	No	Yes	A number of changes are put forward to amend the wording of policies CC3 and CC4 from the Core Strategy	This comment relates to an issue which was determined in the Core Strategy in policies CC3 and CC4. This is not a representation which is pertinent to the development management policies and as such this is not a matter for this DPD.	See DMH2 and DMH3 and supporting text. It is only workable as a policy if the Authority clearly defines 'need' and 'local'. It would not work as a policy if that determination was decided on a case by case by a third party such as a parish council, or by Authority members in the absence of any policy criteria.
053	Peak Park Watch	053/62	Waste Management	61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Yes				Support noted	Policy enables housing for local persons holding land and assets but not being in need of housing. Policies LHC6 and LHC7 allows for this and in very few cases will require any contribution towards community needs for affordable housing
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/98	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic	Supported			Respondent supports preferred approach for Issue 62 - Reducing and Directing Traffic	Respondent supports preferred approach for Issue 62 - Reducing and Directing Traffic	policy defines need and by default it is what the Authority considers to be a reasonable definition of need.
020	Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire (Graham Broome)	020/1	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic				The Agency is keen for policies that reduce demand on the strategic road network.	All our policies seek to do this, so no change in policy required.	See DMH1 and supporting text
020	Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire (Graham Broome)	020/2	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic				The Agency supports the emphasis on travel plans and sustainable modes of travel.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH1 and supporting text
021	Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)	021/1	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic				The Agency is keen for policies that reduce demand on the strategic road network.	All our policies seek to do this, so no change in policy required.	DMH1 - 11 complements core strategy policy DS1 and HC1 and represents the Authority's approach to housing provision in a protected landscape

021	Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)	021/2	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic				The Agency supports the emphasis on travel plans and sustainable modes of travel.	No change in policy needed.	Policy itself can only help in the release of good land by being used to reject poor land and narrow options to the good sites. Only use of CPO powers could force this issue and this is not a position the Authority is clear it wants to take.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/58	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic	support principle			The respondent states we require criteria for requesting a travel plan in different areas of the National Park so it is not to the detriment of visitor movements.	We do not feel this is necessary, as criteria would take account of the type and scale of development, so would take account of local circumstances.	See DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/69	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Core Strategy HC1 and supporting text and DMH1 - DMH3 and supporting text outline the Authority's approach to assessing housing need and why that is considered a sustainable approach to housing delivery in the National Park
046	Derbyshire County Council (Environmental Services)	046/32	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic				The respondent states that being more restrictive on travel plans will require more resources to monitor them and ensure that targets have been met.	This is agreed, but does not change the preferred approach.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/63	Transport	62	Reducing and Directing Traffic	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/99	Transport	63	Implementing the road hierarchy - very minor roads	Supported			Respondent supports preferred approach for Issue 63 - Implementing the Road Hierarchy provided we do not absolve highway authorities in their role of protecting minor routes.	Respondent supports preferred approach for Issue 63 - Implementing the Road Hierarchy. We would always work with the highway authorities.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/59	Transport	63	Implementing the road hierarchy - very minor roads	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/70	Transport	63	Implementing the road hierarchy - very minor roads	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
044	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/6	Transport	63	Implementing the road hierarchy - very minor roads				This is a comment that the transport section is missing reference to off road vehicles damaging foot and bridle paths.	This is considered in Issue 63.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/64	Transport	63	Implementing the road hierarchy - very minor roads	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	no policy provision for cross subsidy on exception sites
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/100	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail	Supported			Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69	Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69	no policy provision for cross subsidy on exception sites
012	Mr Peter Simon	012/01	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail				The respondent doesn't feel sufficient need for the preferred approach has been provided, therefore they would like to reserve further comment.	We feel there is sufficient need for the preferred approach has been provided in the consultation document. In addition, the consultation document references the fact that the preferred approach was written at the preferred approach stage for the Core Strategy, so they could even have looked at the wording of the preferred approach for this stage.	Policies in both the Conservation and Housing Chapters enable market housing to help the Authority achieve the indicative figures for housing delivery outlined in the Core Strategy
012	Mr Peter Simon	012/02	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail				The respondent doesn't feel sufficient need for the preferred approach has been provided, therefore they would like to reserve further comment.	We feel there is sufficient need for the preferred approach has been provided in the consultation document. In addition, the consultation document references the fact that the preferred approach was written at the preferred approach stage for the Core Strategy, so they could even have looked at the wording of the preferred approach for this stage.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
012	Mr Peter Simon	012/03	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail				The respondent doesn't feel sufficient need for the preferred approach has been provided, therefore they would like to reserve further comment.	We feel there is sufficient need for the preferred approach has been provided in the consultation document. In addition, the consultation document references the fact that the preferred approach was written at the preferred approach stage for the Core Strategy, so they could even have looked at the wording of the preferred approach for this stage.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
012	Mr Peter Simon	012/04	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail				The comment is in relation to the Core Strategy.	The comment is in relation to the Core Strategy.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
020	Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire (Graham Broome)	020/3	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail				The Agency feels it is helpful to have criteria for where new road schemes would be permitted, and would like to be consulted on this criteria.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
021	Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)	021/3	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail				The Agency feels it is helpful to have criteria for where new road schemes would be permitted, and would like to be consulted on this criteria.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/60	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text

037	Natural England (John King)	037/28	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/71	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	policy does not include spatial approach suggested.
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/65	Transport	64	Cross Park traffic: road and rail	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/100	Transport	65	Public Transport: route enhancement	Supported			Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/61	Transport	65	Public Transport: route enhancement	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policies LHC6 and LHC7 make clear that below 10 units there is no requirement for affordable so to that extent, for many sites in the National Park, no viability assessment will be required. Up to that level the developer is not constrained in terms of type and mix of houses other than in the sense that design and scale must accord with design policies and achieve overall conservation and enhancement of sites and buildings and the wider built environment and landscape. Above that level, the viability of schemes will be assessed in line with NPPF requirements.
037	Natural England (John King)	037/29	Transport	65	Public Transport: route enhancement	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	The policies do not place onerous expectations for either affordable housing or commuted sums. Viability testing of schemes will be undertaken where necessary to a standard methodology as advised in NPPG on the back of Pp. requirements
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/72	Transport	65	Public Transport: route enhancement	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/66	Transport	65	Public Transport: route enhancement	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/100	Transport	66	Railway Construction	Supported			Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/62	Transport	66	Railway Construction	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/73	Transport	66	Railway Construction	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/67	Transport	66	Railway Construction	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/100	Transport	67	Public transport and the pattern of development	Supported			Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/63	Transport	67	Public transport and the pattern of development	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/74	Transport	67	Public transport and the pattern of development	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/68	Transport	67	Public transport and the pattern of development	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/100	Transport	68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	Supported			Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
032	Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)	032/18	Transport	68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth				Do not agree with the preferred approach, with the reason being we need to discuss.	Suggest meeting to discuss why they cannot support the preferred approach.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/64	Transport	68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/75	Transport	68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/69	Transport	68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/100	Transport	69	Freight Transport and lorry parking	Supported			Respondent supports Issues 64 to 69		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/65	Transport	69	Freight Transport and lorry parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
037	Natural England (John King)	037/30	Transport	69	Freight Transport and lorry parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/76	Transport	69	Freight Transport and lorry parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/70	Transport	69	Freight Transport and lorry parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/101	Transport	70	Car Parking	N/A			The respondent requests a more consistent approach to parking, for example having pay and display car parks when people park in an uncontrolled manner on the nearby verges.	Agree that this is an issue, but it goes beyond the scope of the LDF. Suggest referencing the issue of consistency within the text surrounding the policy, but does not impact on the policy itself.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.

	005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/102	Transport	70	Car Parking	N/A			The respondent notes that it is on street parking that is the problem, particularly when there are lots of visitors. The number of cars parked on the roads is harmful to the character of the National Park.	Agree that this is an issue in some locations at peak times. This is why reference is made to the 28 day rule at paragraph 2.357 of the consultation document. This comment therefore does not impact on the policy, as it is covered in the surrounding text.	policy does not include spatial approach suggested.
	005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/103	Transport	70	Car Parking	N/A			The respondent's point is linked to comment number 005/102. They request that all new development have sufficient off street parking, to promote additional off street parking where it doesn't harm the character, and to provide visitor parking.	The level of off street parking for new development would be limited and linked to on street parking rather than seeking to provide spaces for all situations, as this is not appropriate for the National Park. Additional off street parking can be provided through the 28 day rule, and this is referenced at paragraph 2.357 of the consultation document. As with the first point of this comment, we would not seek to provide specific visitor parking, as this is either provided privately by attractions or can be catered for under the 28 day rule. Therefore, suggest no change to policy is required.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/104	Transport	70	Car Parking	N/A			The Authority should accept most visitors travel by car and so policies should not make providing car parks difficult.	One of the overall aims is to increase the proportion of sustainable travel, therefore we would not wish to provide car parks at a higher level than the existing preferred option. Suggest no change in policy is required.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/105	Transport	70	Car Parking	N/A			The policies should require local consultation on proposals.	Consultation is already undertaken at the planning permission stage, so no change in policy is required.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/27	Transport	70	70) Car Parking	Supported			Parking is important to Tissington. The Estate is concerned that the current parking on the roadside is spoiling the visitor experience and the verges.	We are currently working with the Estate on parking issues. Their consultation response does not change the preferred approach.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	024	Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)	024/28	Transport	70	Car Parking	Supported			Parking is important to Tissington. The Estate is concerned that the current parking on the roadside is spoiling the visitor experience and the verges.	We are currently working with the Estate on parking issues. Their consultation response does not change the preferred approach.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	026	Staffordshire County Council	026/9	Transport	70	Car Parking				The respondent asks whether any research has been undertaken on the viability of a park and ride with limited car parking spaces.	The viability of a park and ride scheme would be assessed if any proposals came forward, as where it was and for what purpose would have an impact on the size of car park required.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/66	Transport	70	Car Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	036	Youlgrave Parish Council (Matthew Lovell)	036/01	Transport	70	Car Parking				The respondent requests more flexibility in the parking policy of Issue 70 so that small scale off street parking can be provided as parking in Youlgrave is a greater problem than sunny weekends.	This is a common concern for many places in the National Park. The preferred options gives some flexibility in terms of using the 28 day rule. The preferred option would not prevent additional car parks, but all the criteria would need to be met. Therefore, there is no need to change the preferred option.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	037	Natural England (John King)	037/31	Transport	70	Car Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/77	Transport	70	Car Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/71	Transport	70	Car Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach. They make the point that more off street resident and visitor parking is required.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	056	Taddington & Prestcliffe Parish Council (S Bramwell)	056/9	Transport	70	Car Parking				The respondent does not want to see the philosophy of 'very limited' parking continued. They state further developments at Millers Dale must provide parking facilities.		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	056	Taddington & Prestcliffe Parish Council (S Bramwell)	056/10	Transport	70	Car Parking				The respondent states there should be enough space for off street parking for residents. Valued characteristics should incorporate the impact of parking on residents.		See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/106	Transport	71	Coach Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach for Issues 71 and 72.	The respondent supports the preferred approach for Issues 71 and 72.	See DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use; and supporting text.
	034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/67	Transport	71	Coach Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH2: First occupation of affordable housing and and DMH3: Second and subsequent occupation of affordable housing (The occupancy cascade) and supporting text

042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/78	Transport	71	Coach Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH2: First occupation of affordable housing and and DMH3: Second and subsequent occupation of affordable housing (The occupancy cascade) and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/72	Transport	71	Coach Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Consider clarifying for new SPD
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/106	Transport	72	Traffic Restraint	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach for Issues 71 and 72.		DM2: First Occupation of new affordable housing A and B provide consistency and remove any confusion
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/68	Transport	72	Traffic Restraint	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	When looked at with members it was decided to stick with the strength of connection we require but not include specific provision for armed forces returners as this could be permitted as an exception for the few cases it might occur
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/79	Transport	72	Traffic Restraint	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH2 and DMH3 enables a response to clear evidence of housing need. Policy does not claim that the vibrancy of villages will be altered by housing provision alone
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/73	Transport	72	Traffic Restraint	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy is based on the presumption that private rented accommodation is a valid source of housing that some people can afford to live in if they want to stay in the area but cannot afford to buy a house. Policy DS1 enables housing in a wide range of settlements and thus enables housing for local people in all parts of the Park to live relatively near to their family and support networks. It does not allow for new housing for those who are not in housing need (as that term is understood by housing authorities) simply to satisfy a desire to stay where they were born and raised.
056	Taddington & Prestcliffe Parish Council (S Bramwell)	056/11	Transport	72	Traffic Restraint				The respondent is opposed to lowering the speed limits and road pricing.		Consider clarifying for new SPD
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/107	Transport	73	Cycle Parking				The respondent questions whether cycle parking at new development is realistic in a hilly area.	We feel that it is realistic, particularly at a time when there is a lot of investment in cycling. Therefore, suggest there is no change in the preferred approach.	DM2: First Occupation of new affordable housing A and B provide consistency and remove any confusion
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/69	Transport	73	Cycle Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Officers and members decided to retain the existing policy strength of connection requirement but meet specific requirement for armed forces returners as an exception for the few cases that might occur
037	Natural England (John King)	037/32	Transport	73	Cycle Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	The local connection requirement is held at 10 in the last 20 years by consensus with the parishes forum. The Shropshire policy isn't adopted because it considers that ability to rent does not lift someone out of the category of being in housing need. This unreasonably mitigates against private renting as a means of finding satisfactory accommodation.
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/80	Transport	73	Cycle Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	essential worker policy retained but following discussion with members, the relaxation to five years connection was not agreed
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/74	Transport	73	Cycle Parking	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Spatial approaches may evolve as neighbourhood plans take shape but we are not allocating sites as other NPAs have done, and this means we can retain the 100% affordable housing principle that other NPAs are now struggling with on small sites (due to changes in government guidance for development of small sites and reduced obligations on developers)
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/108	Transport	74	Design Criteria	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach for Issue 74.	The respondent supports the preferred approach for Issue 74.	
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/70	Transport	74	Design Criteria	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy is based on the presumption that private rented accommodation is a valid source of housing that some people can afford to live in if they want to stay in the area but cannot afford to buy a house. Policy DS1 enables housing in a wide range of settlements and thus enables housing for local people in all parts of the Park to live relatively near to their family and support networks. It does not allow for new housing for those who are not in housing need (as that term is understood by housing authorities) simply to satisfy a desire to stay where they were born and raised.
037	Natural England (John King)	037/33	Transport	74	Design Criteria	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Consider clarifying for new SPD
037	Natural England (John King)	037/34	Transport	74	Design Criteria	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach. They support inclusion of taking LT19 forward.	No change in policy needed.	DM2: First Occupation of new affordable housing A and B provide consistency and remove any confusion

042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/81	Transport	74	Design Criteria	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Officers and members decided to retain the existing policy strength of connection requirement but meet specific requirement for armed forces returners as an exception for the few cases that might occur
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/75	Transport	74	Design Criteria	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy needs to be clear what housing need means, and avoid terms like 'reasonable need' which cant be clear. The length of local connection has been discussed with members and on balance it is felt that 5 years is too short. It is already possible for a person to build an affordable house provided they are in housing need, but policy does not allow someone to build a house simply to downsize. This course of action could be replicated by anyone wanting to build a home because their current home doesn't suit them. This is open market housing to satisfy personal desires rather than to increase the stock of housing for which there is a clear and evidenced need.
056	Taddington & Preistcliffe Parish Council (S Bramwell)	056/12	Transport	74	Design Criteria				The respondent would like to see a more positive approach that will encourage highway authorities to use well designed traffic measures.		Need is defined in policy LHC1 and LHC2 and is considered to be a reasonable definition where it can be proven that such a need as defined by the criteria exists.
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/109	Transport	75	Public Rights Of Way				The respondent feels that the preferred approach needs adding as some rights of way, for historic or scenic value, should be protected from development where this would mean a diversion to the route.	We are not sure this is appropriate, as a key example would be the Monsal Trail, which if used as a railway may mean diverting the right of way, but it may be deemed that on balance, the loss of scenic value of the right of way is outweighed by the use of the route as rail. Worth a quick debate at the officer meetings.	
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/71	Transport	75	Public Rights Of Way	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH2 and DMH3 enables a response to clear evidence of housing need. Policy does not claim that the vibrancy of villages will be altered by housing provision alone
037	Natural England (John King)	037/35	Transport	75	Public Rights Of Way	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy is based on the presumption that private rented accommodation is a valid source of housing that some people can afford to live in if they want to stay in the area but cannot afford to buy a house. Policy DS1 enables housing in a wide range of settlements and thus enables housing for local people in all parts of the Park to live relatively near to their family and support networks. It does not allow for new housing for those who are not in housing need (as that term is understood by housing authorities) simply to satisfy a desire to stay where they were born and raised.
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/82	Transport	75	Public Rights Of Way	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Consider clarifying for new SPD
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/76	Transport	75	Public Rights Of Way	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	DM2: First Occupation of new affordable housing A and B provide consistency and remove any confusion
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/110	Transport	76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approaches of Issues 76 to 78.		Officers and members decided to retain the existing policy strength of connection requirement but meet specific requirement for armed forces returners as an exception for the few cases that might occur
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/72	Transport	76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	
037	Natural England (John King)	037/36	Transport	76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH2 and DMH3 enables a response to clear evidence of housing need. Policy does not claim that the vibrancy of villages will be altered by housing provision alone
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/83	Transport	76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy is based on the presumption that private rented accommodation is a valid source of housing that some people can afford to live in if they want to stay in the area but cannot afford to buy a house. Policy DS1 enables housing in a wide range of settlements and thus enables housing for local people in all parts of the Park to live relatively near to their family and support networks. It does not allow for new housing for those who are not in housing need (as that term is understood by housing authorities) simply to satisfy a desire to stay where they were born and raised.
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/77	Transport	76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Consider clarifying for new SPD

005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/110	Transport	77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approaches of Issues 76 to 78.		DM2: First Occupation of new affordable housing A and B provide consistency and remove any confusion
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/73	Transport	77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Officers and members decided to retain the existing policy strength of connection requirement but meet specific requirement for armed forces returners as an exception for the few cases that might occur
037	Natural England (John King)	037/37	Transport	77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH2 and DMH3 enables a response to clear evidence of housing need. Policy does not claim that the vibrancy of villages will be altered by housing provision alone
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/84	Transport	77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy is based on the presumption that private rented accommodation is a valid source of housing that some people can afford to live in if they want to stay in the area but cannot afford to buy a house. Policy DS1 enables housing in a wide range of settlements and thus enables housing for local people in all parts of the Park to live relatively near to their family and support networks. It does not allow for new housing for those who are not in housing need (as that term is understood by housing authorities) simply to satisfy a desire to stay where they were born and raised.
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/78	Transport	77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Consider clarifying for new SPD
005	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/110	Transport	78	Air Transport	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approaches of Issues 76 to 78.		DM2: First Occupation of new affordable housing A and B provide consistency and remove any confusion
034	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/74	Transport	78	Air Transport	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Officers and members decided to retain the existing policy strength of connection requirement but meet specific requirement for armed forces returners as an exception for the few cases that might occur
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/85	Transport	78	Air Transport	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/79	Transport	78	Air Transport	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
035	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/1	Bakewell	79		none suggested so nothing to agree with			suggests extension of development at Stoney Close	This site would be acceptable in principle but will come through the neighbourhood plan process outlining a new development boundary inside of which land at Stoney Close may be present.	See DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development.
036	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/33	Bakewell	79		none suggested so nothing to agree with			see 019/1 = same comment	This site would be acceptable in principle but will come through the neighbourhood plan process outlining a new development boundary inside of which land at Stoney Close may be present.	See DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development.
036	Bakewell Partnership	029/1	Housing	79		Yes			support boundary review provided any space brought into the development envelope is prioritised for local need affordable housing	Under housing policy any land brought into the envelope would be eligible for 100% affordable housing unless they were enhancement sites or unless the proposal was for another use permissible under core strategy DS1 (in which case subject to its acceptability in planning terms it could be permitted instead of housing)	See DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development.
036	Peak Watch	053/81	Bakewell	80		n/a			consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	See minerals safeguarding maps
044	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	80		Yes			supported	support noted	See DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non mineral development.
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/3	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/4	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/5	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/6	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only

029	Bakewell Partnership	029/3	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
029	Bakewell Partnership	029/4	Bakewell	81	81) Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/88	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation could be undertaken with Bakewell residents through Neighbourhood Planning.	The respondent has not stated whether they support the preferred option.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/82	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation is needed before these policies are finalised.	No change in policy needed.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
017	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/3	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Work to County Council standards but respond to the needs of the local population only
017	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/4	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
017	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/5	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
017	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/6	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
017	Bakewell Partnership	029/3	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Policies enable conversions to open market use or ancillary dwelling use as appropriate to the buildings, family or business needs. The retention of lawful uses with flexibility for other uses retains flexibility for different users needs without losing the ability to use the house for its permitted purpose. The legal ability to prevent second home use has been allowed through neighbourhood plans where strong arguments have been advanced that the level of second homes is damaging community cohesion. Evidence is not considered to justify such an approach here because the census doesn't indicate more than about 4% of stock in use a second homes across the whole stock. Where 'hot spots' occur, it could be that neighbourhood plans try and introduce a policy to restrict occupation of homes to permanent residents only. The NPA could support this in principle as a locally distinctive policy for a locally distinctive problem provided the evidence was considered sufficiently robust to pass a neighbourhood plan examination.
017	Bakewell Partnership	029/4	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
018	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/88	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation could be undertaken with Bakewell residents through Neighbourhood Planning.	The respondent has not stated whether they support the preferred option.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
018	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/82	Bakewell	81	Traffic management in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation is needed before these policies are finalised.	No change in policy needed.	criteria b) of LH3 is not carried through to the new policy.
056	Peak Watch	053/82	Bakewell	81		n/a			consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	Core Strategy GSP2: Enhancing the National Park; criteria E outlines the Authority's approach to non conforming uses
056	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	81		Yes			supported	support noted	No policy response required
011	Bakewell Town Council	011/1	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				There is no preferred option for this issue. The respondent's preferred approach is option 2.		we haven't joined them together but the replacement of agricultural worker conditions and legal agreements issue is dealt with by a policy covering Section 106 agreements.
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/7	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	

019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/8	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/9	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/10	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/11	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	DMH11: Section 106 Agreements; and supporting text
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/12	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	The size of dwellings is now covered by policy and text and covers the issue of extensions (Paragraph 6.89 and DMH7:Extensions and Alterations; and absolute upper limits on floorspace for affordable houses (DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text)
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/13	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing enables a local person to build a house within the floorspace guidelines for affordable housing but not bigger.
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/14	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	extensions allowed up to upper limit for affordable homes but not beyond since larger homes do not get valued at prices rendering them affordable in perpetuity.
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/15	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	The size of dwellings is now covered by policy and text and covers the issue of extensions (Paragraph 6.89 and DMH7:Extensions and Alterations; and absolute upper limits on floorspace for affordable houses (DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text)
029	Bakewell Partnership	029/5	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				There is no preferred option for this issue. The respondent's preferred approach is option 2.		policy enables a local person to build a house within the floorspace guidelines for affordable housing but not bigger.
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/89	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation could be undertaken with Bakewell residents through Neighbourhood Planning.	The respondent has not stated whether they support the preferred option.	extensions allowed up to upper limit for affordable homes but not beyond since larger homes do not get valued at prices rendering them affordable in perpetuity.
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/83	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation is needed before these policies are finalised.	No change in policy needed.	extensions allowed up to upper limit for affordable homes but not beyond since larger homes do not get valued at prices rendering them affordable in perpetuity.
018	Bakewell Town Council	011/1	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				There is no preferred option for this issue. The respondent's preferred approach is option 2.		LL policies cover this
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/7	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	policy LHC8 includes criteria to cover the issue of land grab for curtilage extension and over large extensions on the back of that land grab
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/8	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	policy LHC8 includes criteria to cover the issue of land grab for curtilage extension and over large extensions on the back of that land grab
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/9	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	policy LHC8 includes criteria to cover the issue of land grab for curtilage extension and over large extensions on the back of that land grab
022	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/10	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	policy LHC8 includes criteria to cover the issue of land grab for curtilage extension and over large extensions on the back of that land grab
022	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/11	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	The size of dwellings is now covered by policy and text and covers the issue of extensions (Paragraph 6.89 and DMH7:Extensions and Alterations; and absolute upper limits on floorspace for affordable houses (DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text)

022	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/12	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing enables a local person to build a house within the floorspace guidelines for affordable housing but not bigger.
022	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/13	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits.
022	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/14	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits. It also explains that the intent of policy is not to exclude larger households but deal with the few cases where they require affordable housing as exceptions to the norm
022	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/15	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits.
022	Bakewell Partnership	029/5	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				There is no preferred option for this issue. The respondent's preferred approach is option 2.		Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits.
025	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/89	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation could be undertaken with Bakewell residents through Neighbourhood Planning.	The respondent has not stated whether they support the preferred option.	The size of dwellings is now covered by policy and text and covers the issue of extensions (Paragraph 6.89 and DMH7:Extensions and Alterations; and absolute upper limits on floorspace for affordable houses (DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text)
026	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/83	Bakewell	82	Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation is needed before these policies are finalised.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing enables a local person to build a house within the floorspace guidelines for affordable housing but not bigger.
056	Peak Watch	053/83	Bakewell	82		n/a			consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	No policy response required
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	82		Yes			supported	support noted	No policy response required
011	Bakewell Town Council	011/2	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell				Agree that Bakewell Station should be safeguarded for use should the railway line be reinstated.		Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits.
019	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/16	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	The size of dwellings is now covered by policy and text and covers the issue of extensions (Paragraph 6.89 and DMH7:Extensions and Alterations; and absolute upper limits on floorspace for affordable houses (DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text)
029	Bakewell Partnership	029/6	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell	Supported			Agree that Bakewell Station should be safeguarded for use should the railway line be reinstated.		Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing enables a local person to build a house within the floorspace guidelines for affordable housing but not bigger.
037	Natural England (John King)	037/39	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits.
042	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/90	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation could be undertaken with Bakewell residents through Neighbourhood Planning.	The respondent has not stated whether they support the preferred option.	size of dwellings is now covered by policy and text and covers the issue of extensions and absolute upper limits on floorspace.
053	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/84	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation is needed before these policies are finalised.	No change in policy needed.	Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing enables a local person to build a house within the floorspace guidelines for affordable housing but not bigger.
026	Bakewell Town Council	011/2	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell				Agree that Bakewell Station should be safeguarded for use should the railway line be reinstated.		Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing and supporting text explains the scope for extension and the reasons for limits.
030	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/16	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell					Detailed traffic in Bakewell points that do not impact on the preferred approach. However, these should be taken up within the context of the Bakewell group.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
031	Bakewell Partnership	029/6	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell	Supported			Agree that Bakewell Station should be safeguarded for use should the railway line be reinstated.		See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
031	Natural England (John King)	037/39	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell	Supported			The respondent supports the preferred approach.	No change in policy needed.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
031	Friends of the Peak District (Andy Tickle)	042/90	Bakewell	83	83) Public Transport in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation could be undertaken with Bakewell residents through Neighbourhood Planning.	The respondent has not stated whether they support the preferred option.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
031	Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)	053/84	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell				The respondent states that further consultation is needed before these policies are finalised.	No change in policy needed.	See Policy DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings; and supporting text from 3.49 - 3.51

	Peak Watch	053/84	Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell	n/a			consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	No policy response required
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	83	Public Transport in Bakewell	Yes			supported	support noted	no further response required
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/17	Bakewell	84		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder suggests a revised planning brief sought for Lumford and Cintrides	This has been overtaken by events as both sites have been subject to applications and, in Cintrides case, permissions for development. At the time of writing, development of a hotel at Lumford Mill is subject to an appeal decision	No policy response required
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/18	Bakewell	84		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder thinks Cintrides is ripe for industry business or hotel	This has been overtaken by events as both sites have been subject to applications and, in Cintrides case, permissions for development. At the time of writing, development of a hotel at Lumford Mill is subject to an appeal decision	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/19	Bakewell	84		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder thinks Deepdale should be retained for business use	DME3: Safeguarding employment sites sets out the Authority's intent for Deepdale but the changes to permitted development, resultant loss of office space, new build additional residential units (granted on appeal) are making this site more mixed use than intended.	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/20	Bakewell	84		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder would like policy to improved pedestrian access to and from the town.	DMT:2 Access and Design criteria and supporting text set the policy context for new transport related infrastructure.	No specific policy is necessary but DMC2 is offered here as an example of the proportionate use of policy to remove pd rights.
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/21	Bakewell	84		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder wants to encourage variety of employment uses to give best chance of meeting local peoples work needs	Within the Use Classes permitted, the NPA can't prevent the market deciding types of business or require those businesses to employ local people	no further response required
	Bakewell partnership	028/7	Economy	84		N/A			Responder asks that we consider sites separately for policy purposes	This is not considered necessary for the Part 2 of the Local Plan but could be dealt with within this context by the neighbourhood plan if that was the community's wish. The emerging neighbourhood plan policy does this for Riverside (Lumford Mill) but not others.	no further response required
	Bakewell partnership	029/8	Economy	84		N/A			The Partnership thinks option 1 (B1 or B2) is right for Deepdale and doesn't want to lose the space to residential unless an updated employment land review forces the issue.	Option 1 for Deepdale accords with the Authority position but planning decisions and appeals since 2012 have changed the mix at this site to mixed residential and business	no further response required
	Bakewell partnership	029/9	Economy	84		N/A			The Partnership feels option 2 (more scope for mixed use including a hotel) is a better option for Cintrides site.	The Authority has made the decision to permit supermarket development on this site to achieve necessary enhancement to the site and to fulfil an evidenced justification to introduce competition in the town. The decision was made in 2015 so is not considered premature given the stage the development plan was at	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.
	Bakewell Town Council	011/3	Bakewell	84		n/a			recommend support for option 2 review the scope for mixed uses focussed on community needs	The Authority has made the decision to permit supermarket development on this site to achieve necessary enhancement to the site and to fulfil an evidenced justification to introduce competition in the town. The decision was made in 2015 so is not considered premature given the stage the development plan was at	No specific policy is necessary but DMC2 is offered here as an example of the proportionate use of policy to remove pd rights.
	Coverland UK John Church	002/1	Bakewell	84		Yes			It is important to consult Bakewell community before agreeing on policy for cintrides	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together but the Town Council offered support to the application for a supermarket and the survey by Aldi received high levels of support and little objection from residents	no policy response required
	Coverland UK John Church	002/2	Bakewell	84		Yes			It is important to consult Bakewell community before agreeing on policy for cintrides	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together but the Town Council offered support to the application for a supermarket and the survey by Aldi received high levels of support and little objection from residents	no further response required
	Coverland UK John Church	002/3	Bakewell	84		Yes			site redevelopment negotiation ongoing and will be consulted on widely later on in 2013	The Authority has made the decision to permit supermarket development on this site to achieve necessary enhancement to the site and to fulfil an evidenced justification to introduce competition in the town. The decision was made in 2015 so is not considered premature given the stage the development plan was at	Core Strategy CC1 - CC5 and SPD Climate Change and Sustainable Building.

	Coverland UK John Church	002/4	Bakewell	84		Yes			site redevelopment negotiation ongoing and will be consulted on widely later on in 2013	The Authority has made the decision to permit supermarket development on this site to achieve necessary enhancement to the site and to fulfil an evidenced justification to introduce competition in the town. The decision was made in 2015 so is not considered premature given the stage the development plan was at	No specific policy is necessary but DMC2 is offered here as an example of the proportionate use of policy to remove pd rights.
	Coverland UK John Church	002/5	Bakewell	84		Yes			Responder supports wider consultation	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together but the Town Council offered support to the application for a supermarket and the survey by Aldi received high levels of support and little objection from residents	
	Coverland UK John Church	002/6	Bakewell	84					Responder points out that LH1 allows for housing on sites such as cintrides and this should be retained where there is wider planning benefit	Policy would have enabled this subject to flood risk concerns as expressed by Civic Trust for the Riverside site but this has been overtaken by the change to supermarket retail use	
	Peak Watch	053/85	Bakewell	84		n/a			Consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together but the Town Council offered support to the application for a supermarket and the survey by Aldi received high levels of support and little objection from residents	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	84		Yes			supported	The Authority has made the decision to permit supermarket development on this site to achieve necessary enhancement to the site and to fulfil an evidenced justification to introduce competition in the town. The decision was made in 2015 so is not considered premature given the stage the development plan was at	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/22	Bakewell	85		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder asks that business space is retained through periods of low demand	The Authority has safeguarded business space	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/23	Bakewell	85		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder request that a new bridge is provided early on in the development	This is a development management matter rather than a policy matter	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/24	Bakewell	85		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder asserts that housing is unsuitable because of flood risk	Flood risk was identified for previous applications but the scheme was refused because of the mix of housing applied for rather than the flood risk. Planning applications since 2012 have moved away from residential use towards mixed business uses	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/25	Bakewell	85		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder suggests that a new planning brief is needed for cintrides	This has been overtaken by permissions for development.	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/26	Bakewell	85		none suggested so nothing to agree with			hydro scheme, better access to Bakewell and good interpretation of the historical interest of the site should be part of planning gain for the site	Improved interpretation and access can be addressed through neighbourhood plan policies; and the hydro element is acceptable in principle through core strategy policies such as CC2: Low Carbon and renewable energy development	
	Bakewell partnership	029/10	Economy	85		N/A			Option 1 (have similar to LB7) is preferred and planning gain is encouraged to reflect the historic buildings on the site, the potential for hydro power and options for a pedestrian route linking Ashford to the town through the development.	The Authority has not chosen to have a specific policy for Lumford Mill but has policies that safeguard business space and allow improved access and small scale renewable energy generation	
	Bakewell Town Council	011/4	Bakewell	85		n/a			recommend adopting option 2 reviewing mix of uses at Lumford Mill for overall benefit of the town	New policy DME3 creates the space for a neighbourhood plan to influence uses provided the business use remains predominant and there is evidence to justify any other use alongside business use	
	Litton Properties	048/1	Economy	85		n/a	Option2		Responder recommends adopting option 2 reviewing mix of uses at Lumford Mill for overall benefit of the town	New policy DME3 creates the space for a neighbourhood plan to influence uses provided the business use remains predominant and there is evidence to justify any other use alongside business use	
	Litton Properties	048/2	Economy	85		n/a			Responder simply reminds us of the most recent planning decision and withdrawn appeal	reminder noted	
	Litton Properties	048/3	Economy	85		n/a			Responder requests involvement in future policy formulation for Riverside.	Litton properties have been involved in all stages of this plans development and the neighbourhood plan development	

	Natural England	037/40	Economy	85					Responder concerns that any policy must have full regard to the River Wye and potential impacts of development	Other conservation policies provide protection	
	Peak Watch	053/86	Bakewell	85		n/a			Responder asks that the Authority consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	All these stakeholders can input to the plan preparation stages and in response the point about non conforming uses it is not thought necessary to have a Bakewell specific policy.	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	85		Yes			supported	support noted but it is not thought necessary to have a Bakewell specific policy.	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/27	Bakewell	86		Yes			resistance to loss of business sites to residential in the centre unless sites are poor for business use	Policy protects business space to an extent but does rule out loss of business space if the sites are proven to be poor for ongoing business use	
	Bakewell partnership	029/11	Economy	86		Yes			Partnership agrees that GSP2(E) removes the need for LB8.	support noted .	
	Bakewell Town Council	011/5	Bakewell	86		n/a			recommend keeping LB8	support noted but it is not thought necessary to have a Bakewell specific policy.	
	Peak Watch	053/87	Bakewell	86		n/a			Responder asks that the Authority consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	All these stakeholders can input to the plan preparation stages and in response the point about non conforming uses it is not thought necessary to have a Bakewell specific policy.	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	86		Yes			supported	support noted but it is not thought necessary to have a Bakewell specific policy.	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/28	Bakewell	87		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Responder asks that policy limits shops that only serve tourists e.g. cafes	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/29	Bakewell	87		none suggested so nothing to agree with			Bring Torne Valley and petrol station on Haddon Rd into the Central Shopping Area and	The neighbourhood planning group has decided they do not want to do this and the Authority agrees.	
	Bakewell residents informal grouping of residents	056/	Economy	87		n/a	option 2		residents want absolute limits to different shop uses	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Bakewell residents informal grouping of residents	056/	Economy	87		n/a	option 2		residents want absolute limits to different shop uses	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Bakewell Town Council	011/6	Bakewell	87					option 2 is preferred	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Nigel Johns	055/1	Bakewell	87		Option 2			support to protect against oversupply of touristy shops	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	

	Nigel Johns	055/2	Bakewell	87		Option 2			evidence supplied	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Nigel Johns	055/3	Bakewell	87		Option 2			evidence supplied	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Peak Watch	053/88	Bakewell	87		n/a			Responder asks that the Authority consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	87		Yes			no comment	The Authority does not have an in principle policy position that would support this, but in the context of sustaining the health of the town for both residents and visitors it has stated that it would consider a neighbourhood plan policy to be in conformity with the strategic objectives of the core strategy provided there was evidence to support a re-balancing of the retail offer in the town centre	
	Bakewell and District Civic Society	019/30	Bakewell	88		none suggested so nothing to agree with			keep the current policy which enables seasonal events to bring life to the town e.g. Christmas markets	This is a reasonable approach but doesn't require a policy to enable it to continue to happen	
	Peak Watch	053/89	Bakewell	88		n/a			Responder asks that the Authority consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	88		Yes			supported	support noted but doesn't require a policy to enable it to continue to happen	
	Peak Watch	053/90	Bakewell	89		n/a			Responder asks that the Authority consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	89		Yes			supported	support noted but doesn't require a policy to enable it to continue to happen	
	Peak Watch	053/91	Bakewell	90		n/a			Responder asks that the Authority consult Bakewell Town Council businesses and residents and then re-consult more widely	Neighbourhood Plan work has brought the community views together	
	Rambler Association Manchester and High peak		Bakewell	90		Yes			supported	support noted	
053	Peak Park Watch	053/12	Landscape and Conservation	12	Guiding new uses for traditional buildings in different locations	Yes			but should combine with issue 11	Noted	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
	Indigo Planning (Andrew Astin)	028/12		41/79	Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements / Bakewell's development boundary				Responder objects to LS3 claiming it is neither positively prepared nor consistent with National Policy or the Authority's retail study because it seeks to prevent retail development outside of Bakewell's Central Shopping Area and doesn't require a sequential test.	Core Strategy DS1 objective is to protect the range and integrity of the Central Shopping Area (CSA) but it doesn't prevent retail development outside the CSA and the Authority has permitted a supermarket on a site outside the CSA in order to achieve enhancement and in response to a following of the sequential test that justified the site in question.	See policy DMH9: replacement dwellings and supporting text
053	Peak Park Watch	053/59	Landscape and Conservation	58	Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	Yes				Support noted	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
	Bakewell Partnership	029/15	Bakewell + Landscape & Conservation	87/25	Shopping in Bakewell / Pollution and disturbance				Pollution and disturbance issue should specify that applications that include extraction fans, flues or air conditioning units (usually A3-A5 uses) should be supported by noise surveys and air quality info.	Policy DMC14: Pollution and Disturbance requires adequate control measures in respect of noise and odour generated by development	See Policy DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and supporting text and Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text

	Bakewell Partnership	029/14	Bakewell	87/4 0	Shopping in Bakewell / Change of use from a shop to any other use				The problem of high rents in Bakewell leads to shops to be classed as unviable and risking their loss.	This cannot be controlled by planning.	See Policy DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and supporting text and Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text
	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	052/01	Landscape and Conservation	All					Defence training in the National Park is essential in the national interest. Future training needs are likely to increase and the requirements/impact is currently being scoped.	Noted	See Policy DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and supporting text and Policy DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text
	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	052/02	Landscape and Conservation	All					The MOD seeks to manage its land in line with the National Park's policy approach and will seek to apply this to any new proposals for development at the Leek Training Area.	Noted	Core Strategy policy L2 and DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance; and their supporting text provide the necessary protections for sites features or species of wildlife geological or geomorphological importance across all development types so it is not considered necessary to specify it in a policy specific to ancillary accommodation.
020	Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire (Graham Broome)	020/4	Transport	General	General				The Agency is pleased we have taken heed of the Duty to Cooperate brought forward in the Localism Act 2012.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
021	Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)	021/4	Transport	General	General				The Agency is pleased we have taken heed of the Duty to Cooperate brought forward in the Localism Act 2012.	No change in policy needed.	Conditions are used to enable the flexible use where that is appropriate and desired.
027	Highway Agency Asset Development	027/1	Transport	General	General				This comment sets out the Agency's role.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
027	Highway Agency Asset Development	027/2	Transport	General	General				This comment says the Agency has no comment to make.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
044	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/3	Transport	General	General				This is a general comment that the balance between car use and carbon dioxide emissions is correct. They then state more emphasis should be put on public transport within the National Park.	This is a general comment that doesn't impact on the policies.	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
044	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/4	Transport	General	General				This is a general comment that although the majority of the population is increasingly mobile, some, like the elderly, are not. They go on to say that a joined up approach where rural buses feed into rail routes would be helpful.	This is a general comment that doesn't impact on the policies.	Policy DMH5 Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; only restricts size in so far as it retains the physical dominance of the main house and the relationship between main and ancillary dwelling units. This is to prevent harm to the setting of the main house.
031	Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire (Graham Broome)	020/4	Transport	General	General				The Agency is pleased we have taken heed of the Duty to Cooperate brought forward in the Localism Act 2012.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
031	Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)	021/4	Transport	General	General				The Agency is pleased we have taken heed of the Duty to Cooperate brought forward in the Localism Act 2012.	No change in policy needed.	See DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilage of existing dwellings by conversion or new build; and supporting text; and DMH11 Section 106 Agreements and supporting text.
031	Highway Agency Asset Development	027/1	Transport	General	General				This comment sets out the Agency's role.	No change in policy needed.	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
033	Highway Agency Asset Development	027/2	Transport	General	General				This comment says the Agency has no comment to make.	No change in policy needed.	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
034	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/3	Transport	General	General				This is a general comment that the balance between car use and carbon dioxide emissions is correct. They then state more emphasis should be put on public transport within the National Park.	This is a general comment that doesn't impact on the policies.	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
035	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/4	Transport	General	General				This is a general comment that although the majority of the population is increasingly mobile, some, like the elderly, are not. They go on to say that a joined up approach where rural buses feed into rail routes would be helpful.	This is a general comment that doesn't impact on the policies.	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Severn Trent Water	049/08	Recreation and Tourism	General					Management of Upper Derwent Valley Tittesworth and Carsington honeypot locations and gateways.	Noted	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Severn Trent Water	049/09	Recreation and Tourism	General					Creating deeper understanding of water treatment, supply and consumption through visitor centres. Investigations into colour water quality in Derwent Valley reservoir catchments.	Noted	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements

	Severn Trent Water	049/10	Recreation and Tourism	General					Positive policy context should be provided which supports wider objectives for Fairholmes in context of para 28 of NPPF.	Noted	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
015	The Coal Authority	015/1	Minerals	Minerals General		Yes			I confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage. The issues of principal interest to The Coal Authority were addressed in the adopted Core Strategy and it is not considered necessary to have further development management policies on mineral safeguarding	noted	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.
025	Country Landowners Association	025/39	Minerals	Minerals General	No	Yes	No		There needs to be a future for the Minerals industry within the National Park. Much of the area has been fashioned over centuries of quarrying and should continue within the National Park. Planning policies can be framed to allow quarrying to continue whilst at the same time safeguarding the Park. 12% of the workforce in the National Park is employed in quarrying and the Park need jobs - it is important that the drive for small tourism development does not drive out opportunities for full time skilled employment in favour of part-time seasonal low paid jobs	In fact only 185 people resident in the National Park are directly employed in Mining & Quarrying according to the 2011 Census, this is only 1% of the current workforce. Further people will be employed in associated and support sectors such as transportation, however there is no evidence put forward to quantify the claim of 12%. It is accepted that quarrying has shaped the landscape of the National Park, however future planning strategy has been set by policy MIN1 of the Core Strategy which has established the balance between future quarrying and the protection of the Park. This comment raises concern about the Core Strategy approach as opposed to the likely content of development management policies. It will be appropriate however for the economic considerations arising from any proposal to be considered as part of the suite of development management criteria	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
032	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	032/1	Minerals	Minerals General		No	Yes	No	Unnecessary costs and delays. We have experienced these on key developments (e.g. biomass boiler at the Estate Office, hydropower scheme on the Derwent, re-opening Burnt Wood to provide stone for House restoration). We feel the Park often adopts an overly cautious approach to landscape; we are therefore unsure of its commitment to and/or interpretation of "sustainable development" in reality.	The Estate undertook unauthorised mineral extraction at Burnt Wood quarry initially before an application was submitted. This site is highly sensitive and as such the application needs to address a wide range of planning issues. The comment about the balance between competing factors is more of an issue for the Core Strategy rather than for development management criteria specifically for minerals development. The DPD will include policy content on the approach to landscape enhancement and protection, to which this comment is more targeted	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Peak Park Watch	053/30	Housing	n/a		n/a			Responder wants vast increase in local needs affordable housing to encourage companies to come in and employ young local people. Responder also questions whether young people who have already moved away get included in housing surveys	Policy HC1 of the Core Strategy and DMH1 enables this, but it is down to finance as to whether houses get built. In terms of whether young 'leavers' get housing need survey forms, they do if their family alerts the body doing the need survey or the family include their need on the forms. There is no other way of knowing where they might be.	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/01	Housing	n/a		n/a			Responder believes that the present housing policy does not lead to sustainable communities and will make matters worse as the population ages	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/02	Housing	n/a		n/a			the responder considers that the mix of housing enabled by policy is not in line with the nappy	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	Policy LE3 continues to safeguard sites because evidence suggest the National park should retain a supply of business space. A new policy LE4 has criteria to govern proposals to re-use other non safeguarded business space including requirements for marketing of premises as part of the process of determining whether they should be granted alternative uses.

	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/03	Housing	n/a		n/a			The responder wants the Authority to support people who have a family connection to the village irrespective of their housing need. They think the policy is breaking up families and undermining support networks	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	Policy LE3 continues to safeguard sites because evidence suggest the National park should retain a supply of business space. A new policy LE4 has criteria to govern proposals to re-use other non safeguarded business space including requirements for marketing of premises as part of the process of determining whether they should be granted alternative uses.
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/04	Housing	n/a		n/a			The responder believes the concept of housing need is harmful and contrary to the NPPF and that a new definition of local need is needed	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/05	Housing	n/a		n/a			The responder claims that the Authority's policy HC1 is discouraging investment in property. They want us to permit market housing and forego the real housing needs of communities in order to give the developer a better return	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/06	Housing	n/a		n/a			The responder wants eligibility on basis of local connection over need.	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/07	Housing	n/a		n/a			The responder links the consultation documents thoughts on involving volunteers with housing, claiming that the ageing population only volunteers to sustain itself rather than the wider park, and that therefore different housing policies are needed to redress the ageing population and improve the likelihood of harnessing volunteer help for wide park objectives.	The Authority's approach was considered sustainable when examined for the Core Strategy but such comments would form the basis of Core Strategy review	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
044	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/5	Transport	Refers to Core Strategy	Refers to Core Strategy				The respondent questions what is meant by 'there will be innovative and sustainable mechanisms for alleviating traffic impacts on settlements on the A623.'	This is a general comment that doesn't impact on the policies.	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
035	Stoney Middleton Parish Council (Dulcie Jones)	044/5	Transport	Refers to Core Strategy	Refers to Core Strategy				The respondent questions what is meant by 'there will be innovative and sustainable mechanisms for alleviating traffic impacts on settlements on the A623.'	This is a general comment that doesn't impact on the policies.	See policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements
010	English Heritage	010/28	Minerals		Mineral safeguarding for limestone and small scale local building and roofing stone	Yes			We consider that the safeguarding of sites or areas for limestone and small-scale local building and roofing stone is essential. There is a need to recognise the conservation and heritage importance of some minerals and to reconcile the need to secure a supply of these minerals with other conservation interests using the principle of proportionality. Certainly whilst limestone supplies are safeguarded within the core strategy, there is a need for policy protection of other such minerals. We look forward to reviewing the evidence base, particularly with regard to roofing stone, and the proposed outcomes following this in due course	This general support for the Authority's approach is welcomed. The evidence base for roofing stone and building stone has been shared with English Heritage and other MPAs, and the responses informed the determination of sites to be safeguarded through the DPD.	Policy DME5: Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 settlements is considered NPPF compliant. Policy DME4 allows for retention of business use on sites in DS1 settlements and uses issues such as neighbourhood amenity to help determine whether alternative uses are justified in place of business use.

023	Rowsley Parish Council	023/4	Minerals		Mineral safeguarding for limestone and small scale local building and roofing stone	No	No		Min 4 states that local small-scale building stone will be considered, therefore as Stanton Moor quarries cannot possibly be considered to be small-scale, but 3 super quarries, and therefore completely in opposition to this policy. Small-scale must mean small-scale. This can only be achieved by officers allowing only equitable amounts, and not letting operators dictate. We stated evidence of this when the Minerals Planning Authority recently suggested that Stanton Moor quarry had reserves of approximately 67,000 tonnes whereas the operators were quoting in the region of 147,000 tonnes. Fortunately, the Members were wiser than the operators and refused on these very grounds.	This comment relates more to the interpretation of how the policy will be applied. The evidence base for the safeguarding of local small-scale building and roofing stone is completed. It is likely however to suggest at least parts of Stanton Moor for safeguarding which it is assumed from the inference of the Parish Council may not be supported. As the evidence base has not yet been completed, officers have not made any decisions on what areas will be proposed for safeguarding. The Parish Council and all other interested parties will receive the first opportunity to comment on the suitability or not of individual areas at the next consultation stage. The safeguarding of local building and roofing stone resources does not set out a presumption that future extraction will be supported, indeed future extraction for building stone at Stanton Moor will be firstly assessed under Policy MIN3 or MIN1 of the Core Strategy depending upon its scale. Policy MIN3 will deal with local small scale proposals, whereas larger scale proposals will be considered against MIN1. Traditionally the proposals in the Stanton Moor area have been larger scale proposals which would fall within the remit of policy MIN1 which would not support new or additional extraction unless exceptional circumstances are demonstrated	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.
032	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	032/17	Minerals		Mineral safeguarding for limestone and small scale local building and roofing stone	No	Yes	No	We appreciate the Park requires a high standard of environmental protection, but are concerned that its precautionary approach to the environment is having an unintended negative impact on small-scale local stone extraction sites - the operation of which have minor impacts and the operators of which cannot afford the same degree of assessment as the commercial counterparts. As such, we would like to see a differentiation between commercial-scale quarries and local-scale extraction sites – with lower requirements (in terms of non-statutory environmental assessment) for the latter, since stone and slate from these sources for houses is a key part of the Peak landscape. Otherwise the small quarries will not be able to remain viable and the Park will suffer from a lack of supply in the long term	Core Strategy Policy MIN3 already introduces a differential between small scale local building stone schemes and larger scale building stone extraction. The development management policies do not alter this policy difference which is already based on the different planning impacts and considerations that apply. The DPD safeguard small-scale local building and roofing quarries. The issue raised about EIA is a matter for the interpretation of legislation rather than a matter for policy	See Policy DME5 Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 Settlements and supporting text
034	National Trust	034/56A	Minerals		Mineral safeguarding for limestone and small scale local building and roofing stone	Yes			The Trust is of the view that the Development Management DPD needs to bring forward a policy approach to building stone consistent with the commitment set out in the Core Strategy.		See Policy DME5 Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 Settlements and supporting text
040	Mineral Products Association	040/4	Minerals		Mineral safeguarding for limestone and small scale local building and roofing stone	Yes			We support the safeguarding of all deposits of economic minerals. Regarding the potential overlapping of MSAs, we do not believe there is any inconsistency in making such overlaps, particularly where deposits of national or vital local significance occur. For example, in judging the effects of a potentially damaging development on mineral resources, the Authority might conclude that the need for the development outweighed the mineral interest for a resource of lower value and widespread occurrence but not for a deposit of more restricted occurrence and greater importance. If the MSA only identified the lower value mineral but not the higher, then this distinction might be lost. Therefore, the MSAs should be identified for each mineral type being safeguarded even if they should overlap.	Noted, the DPD Policies Map will identify separate Mineral Safeguarding Areas for 'Limestone', 'High Purity Limestone', 'Local Roofing Stone', and 'Local Building Stone' as the elements identified for safeguarding in the Core Strategy and this DPD. The determination in principle of which mineral resources are to be safeguarded was determined in the Core Strategy and will not be revisited in this DPD	See Policy DME5 Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 Settlements and supporting text
042	Friends of the Peak District	042/67	Minerals		Mineral safeguarding for limestone and small scale local building and roofing stone	Yes			We recommend the emerging policy should: clearly relate the safeguarding of building and roofing stone sites to the geological and historic resource, and not necessarily subject to a pre-filter of what is deemed 'local/small scale'	The areas for safeguarding will focus on the evidence base which takes into account the geological and historic resource information.	See Policy DME5 Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 Settlements and supporting text

035											See Policy DME5 Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 Settlements and supporting text
	Coverland UK (John Church)	002/07	Housing				greater flexibility required within the current approach to enhancing sites such as cintrides		The responder is referring to the viability of Cintrides, and urging acceptance of higher levels of open market homes to finance the mixed use enhancement scheme.	This is a whole site viability issue across all uses rather than a housing specific issue though the responder uses the plans reticence towards open market housing as an undermining factor in viability terms	See Policy DME6: Home Working and supporting text.
	Coverland UK (John Church)	002/08	Housing				better use of cross subsidy requested		The responder is referring to the viability of Cintrides, and urging acceptance of higher levels of open market homes to finance the mixed use enhancement scheme.	The reference to cross subsidy in the NPPF must be viewed alongside the higher level of protection and the government recognition in the English National Parks and the Broads Vision and Circular that National Parks, which doesn't ask NPAs to meet general housing need; and the Inspector's examination report into the Core Strategy which stated that cross subsidy would not be sustainable in the medium to long term.	The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission), whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity. Avoiding live work units as a policy option avoids the dangers of abuse presented in the options document.
	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/12	Landscape and Conservation						Requests DMPs for development involving climate change measures rather than relying on SPD - and enabling detail to be opened up to examination	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See Policy DME6: Home Working and supporting text.
	Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)	005/13	Landscape and Conservation						Concerned that PD rights are frequently removed to impose control over design detail in a way that is contrary to parliament's intention. If this is to continue there should be a policy to cover it so that it may be open to public examination.	The Authority does not have a specific policy to cover this matter but specifies e.g. in DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone that permitted development rights would only be removed where necessary and appropriate. (i.e. to achieve the necessary level of control in areas such as this where permitted development rights exercised poorly would be especially damaging to the most sensitive areas of the National Park.)	The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission), whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity. Avoiding live work units as a policy option avoids the dangers of abuse presented in the options document.
	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/01	Utilities						WPD has a number of distribution circuits in the area and may also have sub-stations.	Policy provides protection for such assets	See Policy DME6: Home Working and supporting text.
	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/02	Utilities						Generally speaking WPD would expect developers to pay for diversion or undergrounding of 11kv of below distribution lines if these are affected by proposals	This is a procedural rather than policy point	See Policy DME6: Home Working and supporting text.
	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/03	Utilities						WPD would expect to retain circuits of 132kv and above in situ especially if there was a financial obligation to divert or underground the lines arising from development proposals.	Policy provides protection for such assets	See Policy DME6: Home Working and supporting text.
	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/11	Utilities						WDP advise that 1) even where underground cable is proposed, there may be associated overhead line works to achieve connections; 2) reinforcing the "backbone" network may require upgraded (larger) lines or new lines.	The Authority notes the requirement for flexibility but wishes to establish a strong policy context against which to assess proposals for new or upgraded infrastructure. This includes an expectation that services are undergrounded, which means that a strong case would have to be made to overground services and any decision to do so would be an exception to policy.	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.

	Western Power Distribution (Turley Associates)	008/13	Utilities						WDP seeks clarification of the term "transmission lines" in saved policy LU4. Points regarding supply obligations are reiterated.	This term relates to the lines needed to transmit electricity from the proposed source of renewable energy generation. The requirement for WDP to provide a service would be removed if the proposal was to be refused (see 08/12). Cases where government (formerly DECC) is the decision maker are dealt with in the response to 008/10.	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.
	English Heritage	010/21	Landscape and Conservation						EH consider there is scope to combine policies without reduction in effectiveness.	The Authority has considered the request and arrived at a suite of policies that it considers offers sufficient guidance to applicants on heritage assets	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.
	English Heritage	010/22	Landscape and Conservation						Responder requests recognition of cross boundary issues such as the fact that the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site needs high level protection but sits outside the National Park	The Authority responds to constituent authority plan consultations and emphasises the need for high quality conservation and enhancement for sites and buildings that constitute part of the setting of the National Park.	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.
	English Heritage	010/23	Landscape and Conservation						English Heritage producing guidance. Happy to advise.	Heritage England guidance and training on heritage assets and their conservation is known about and has been taken up by staff of this Authority in 2016	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.

	English Heritage	010/24	Landscape and Conservation						Wide range of other guidance on HELM.org.uk	Noted. To be used.	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses. The homeworking working policy DME6 does not cover live work units which are not considered to be relevant to the area (many already live and work from home without the need for planning permission, whilst the policy restricts the type of business that can be conducted from home to B1, and limited in size. Policy suggests conditions and if necessary legal obligations will be used as necessary to remove permitted development rights, and otherwise the business scale and intensity.
	English Heritage	010/32	Sustainability Appraisal SEA						Note that for issue 8, conservation areas, there is no text in response to analysis of 3a. Consider relevant and likely to be a positive impact.	Response forwarded to consultant and considered	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses.
	English Heritage	010/33	Sustainability Appraisal SEA						Issue 37 (replacement dwellings) may be impact on 3a if building of historic significance is replaced.	Response forwarded to consultant and considered	Policy DME3 and DME4 protects business space in sustainable locations whilst DME5 enables growth of B1 use outside DS1 settlements, and DME7 enables growth of business both inside and outside DS1 settlements. This suite of policies is considered sufficiently enabling of business development for new and indigenous existing businesses.
	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/12	Landscape and Conservation				???		Requests DMPs for development involving climate change measures rather than relying on SPD - and enabling detail to be opened up to examination	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	005/13	Landscape and Conservation				???		Concerned that PD rights are frequently removed to impose control over design detail in a way that is contrary to parliament's intention. If this is to continue there should be a policy to cover it so that it may be open to public examination.	The Authority does not have a specific policy to cover this matter but specifies e.g. in DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone that permitted development rights would only be removed where necessary and appropriate. (i.e. to achieve the necessary level of control in areas such as this where permitted development rights exercised poorly would be especially damaging to the most sensitive areas of the National Park.)	Policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements, allows for alternative uses but provides some brake on automatic switch to non business uses
	Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council	016/01							Same as Peak Park Parishes Forum.	Noted	Policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements, allows for alternative uses but provides some brake on automatic switch to non business uses
	Winster Parish Council ()	005/12	Landscape and Conservation				???		Requests DMPs for development involving climate change measures rather than relying on SPD - and enabling detail to be opened up to examination	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text and DME3: Safeguarding employment sites and supporting text.
	Winster Parish Council ()	005/13	Landscape and Conservation				???		Concerned that PD rights are frequently removed to impose control over design detail in a way that is contrary to parliament's intention. If this is to continue there should be a policy to cover it so that it may be open to public examination.	The Authority does not have a specific policy to cover this matter but specifies e.g. in DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone that permitted development rights would only be removed where necessary and appropriate. (i.e. to achieve the necessary level of control in areas such as this where permitted development rights exercised poorly would be especially damaging to the most sensitive areas of the National Park.)	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
	Winster Parish Council ()	017/01							Same as Peak Park Parishes Forum.	Noted	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
	Winster Parish Council ()	017/01	Landscape and Conservation						Endorses comments made by Peak Park Parishes Forum	Noted	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text and DME3: Safeguarding employment sites and supporting text.
	Winster Parish Council ()	017/31							No comments to make on Interim Sustainability Statement and Habitat Regulations Assessment	Noted	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text and DME3: Safeguarding employment sites and supporting text.
	Winster Parish Council ()	017/31	Interim Sustainability and Habitats				No comments.			Noted	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text

	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/01	Landscape and Conservation			Yes			Generally support all preferred approaches.	Noted	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/01	Utilities			Yes			Generally support all preferred approaches.	Noted	See DMS3:Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements; and supporting text
	Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester and High Peak area)	018/01				No comments.			Preferred approaches supported.	Noted	See policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots; and supporting text
	Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)	019/31	Bakewell			No preferred approach			Skateboard facility should be located near town centre, not unduly inconveniencing residents.	This can be covered by the neighbourhood plan but the Authority's policies notably Core Strategy DS1: Development Strategy and HC4: provision and retention of community services and facilities enable this type of development	See policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/01	Recreation and Tourism						Responder clarifies that the consultation document has been assessed in light of NPPF and advice in relation to sport.	Noted	See policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/02	Recreation and Tourism						Responder states that there is very little reference to community, social infrastructure for sport within the plan - assessment of need for indoor and outdoor sports facilities in the district.	The preferred approach of identifying and safeguarding community facilities on plan and having a policy to safeguard them is followed through in DMS6:Safeguarding sites for community facilities; and DMS7: Retention of community recreation sites and facilities. Supporting text and appendix 9: Sports England criteria for assessing applications for or affecting sports or recreation facilities give greater weight to the issue than shown in 2012 consultation on preferred approaches	See policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/04	Recreation and Tourism						Responder strongly recommends that indoor and outdoor (including a playing pitch) strategy is used to underpin Core Strategy.	The Authority is not producing a strategy but has contributed to such strategies produced by constituent district councils notably Derbyshire Dales District Council in the run up to their Local Plan submission	See policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/05	Recreation and Tourism						Responder states that such a strategy will also give weight to the protection of existing sports facilities where appropriate.	Policies DMS6 and DMS7 and appendix 9 are considered sufficient to protect existing facilities	See policy DME8: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/06	Recreation and Tourism						Responder states that High Peak and Derbyshire Dales Open Space, Sport and Recreation Strategy was not adopted.	This is a question for those Councils rather than this Authority	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/07	Recreation and Tourism						Responder informs this Authority that County Sports partnership are to undertake a county wide built facility strategy.	Noted	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Sport England (Maggie Taylor)	022/08	Recreation and Tourism						Responder says that the Authority needs to work with the CSP in preparing the document and adopt findings in relation to specific area and prepare a locally based outdoor sport and playing pitch strategy.	The Authority participates where invited to do so	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Country Land and Business Association (Caroline Bedell)	025/32	Economy						Responder is concerned that policy is likely to block inward investment	The policy approach has been tested by the inspectorate and has been flexed where the government felt it necessary to do so. The context for inward investment is therefore agreed .	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/07	Landscape and Conservation						Responder states that landscape is comprehensively covered. Then text about not understanding paragraph 5.11.	Enquiry was followed up but raised no further point for response	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)	026/08	Landscape and Conservation					Yes	Suggests the development of a local list of buildings of Architectural of historic interest as SPD - to aid the matters discussed in paragraph 2.33	This has been considered by officers and considered on balance to be unnecessary and potentially ineffective and misleading in the context of a protected landscape where the number of non designated heritage assets is believed to be beyond what can be created and kept usefully up to date	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Oldham Council (Clare Moran)	030/01	Landscape and Conservation						The council welcomes ongoing cooperation and requests that full regard be taken on Oldham's landscape character assessment.	The Authority welcomes the fact that there is a landscape character assessment for Oldham but points out that the Peak District National Park Landscape Character Assessment and strategy covers the Oldham area of the Park and as an exemplar of good practice is considered to be the document to refer to for development affecting the Oldham parts of the National Park.	See Core Strategy L2: Sites of biodiversity or geodiversity importance and DMC3: Siting, design, layout and landscaping; and DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests.

	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/01	Climate Change						Comment quotes core strategy paragraphs 11.18 and 11.25 which says that more detailed policy for combating climate change will be included in the Development Management document.	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/02	Climate Change						Comment is on Core Strategy CC2	CC2 is adopted policy and not subject of this consultation	See policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/03	Climate Change						Comment is on Core Strategy CC2	CC2 is adopted policy and not subject of this consultation	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/04	Climate Change						Comment is on Core Strategy CC2	CC2 is adopted policy and not subject of this consultation	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/05	Climate Change						Comment is on Core Strategy CC2	CC2 is adopted policy and not subject of this consultation	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/06	Climate Change						Comment urges encouragement for renewable energy generation in the DMP document	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies or text	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)	031/07	Climate Change						Comment urges definition on the issue of small scale wind turbines	The SPD: Climate Change and Sustainable Building provides such definition	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)	033/28	Landscape and Conservation			Yes				support noted	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	National Trust (Alan Hubbard)	034/02	Climate Change						Comment recognises unfinished business with regards to this policy area and ecosystems good and services.	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/12	Landscape and Conservation						Requests DMPs for development involving climate change measures rather than relying on SPD - and enabling detail to be opened up to examination	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites; and supporting text
	Chelmorton Parish Council	005/13	Landscape and Conservation						Concerned that PD rights are frequently removed to impose control over design detail in a way that is contrary to parliament's intention. If this is to continue there should be a policy to cover it so that it may be open to public examination.	The Authority does not have a specific policy to cover this matter but specifies e.g. in DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone that permitted development rights would only be removed where necessary and appropriate. (i.e. to achieve the necessary level of control in areas such as this where permitted development rights exercised poorly would be especially damaging to the most sensitive areas of the National Park.)	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Chelmorton Parish Council	035/01							Endorses comments made by Peak Park Parishes Forum	Noted	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Youlgrave	036/11	Landscape and Conservation						Requests DMPs for development involving climate change measures rather than relying on SPD - and enabling detail to be opened up to examination	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Youlgrave	036/12	Landscape and Conservation						Concerned that PD rights are frequently removed to impose control over design detail in a way that is contrary to parliament's intention. If this is to continue there should be a policy to cover it so that it may be open to public examination.	The Authority does not have a specific policy to cover this matter but specifies e.g. in DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone that permitted development rights would only be removed where necessary and appropriate. (i.e. to achieve the necessary level of control in areas such as this where permitted development rights exercised poorly would be especially damaging to the most sensitive areas of the National Park.)	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Stoney Middleton Parish Council	044/01	Housing						Responder bemoans problem of financing housing rather than the planning process to permit them	responders concerns do not relate to policy.	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/13							056/13 onwards to reflect Peak Park Parishes Forum responses.	Noted	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/20	Landscape and Conservation			???			Requests DMPs for development involving climate change measures rather than relying on SPD - and enabling detail to be opened up to examination	The Authority has chosen to supplement the Core Strategy suite of policies with SPD. It is considered this combination of policy and SPD negates need for further policies	See DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation; and supporting text
	Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council	056/21	Landscape and Conservation			???			Concerned that PD rights are frequently removed to impose control over design detail in a way that is contrary to parliament's intention. If this is to continue there should be a policy to cover it so that it may be open to public examination.	The Authority does not have a specific policy to cover this matter but specifies e.g. in DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone that permitted development rights would only be removed where necessary and appropriate. (i.e. to achieve the necessary level of control in areas such as this where permitted development rights exercised poorly would be especially damaging to the most sensitive areas of the National Park.)	

[illegible]