



Local Plan Review Workshop Summary

Workshop Topic: Housing and the Spatial Strategy
Date: 8th June 2021
Time: 2pm
Workshop led by: Ian Fullilove, Adele Metcalfe

Summary of Attendees:

Number of external attendees:	35
Organisations Represented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDNPA Members • Greater Manchester and High Peak Area Ramblers • Peak District Rural Housing Association • National Farmers Union • NHS Derby and Derbyshire Clinical Commissioning Group • Nottingham Community Housing Association • Severn Trent • Derbyshire Dales District Council • Environment Agency • Oldham Council • Stoney Middleton Parish Council • High Peak Borough Council • Staffordshire Moorlands District Council • Hucklow Parish Council • Peak Park Parishes Forum • Stanton in the Peak Parish Council • Friends of Loxley Valley • Tameside MBC • Tissington Estate • Hope Valley Climate Action • Chatsworth • Quaker Community

Link to topic paper:

[Topic Papers: Peak District National Park](#)

Link to presentation:

[Housing and the Spatial Strategy: Peak District National Park](#)

Questions asked for workshops:

Spatial Strategy:

1. Is this 'spatial split' of the Park into three broad areas based on landscape character fit for purpose? If not – what other 'spatial splits' might work better?

For example:

- groups of villages such as Hope Valley
 - National Park constituent authority boundaries
2. Is it sustainable to continue to identify a spread of villages where development could happen in principle? Or, alternatively, should we respond to community need for development wherever that arises and permit development in any size village or hamlet, subject to it conserving and enhancing any valued built environment or landscape character?

Housing

3. Should we shift focus away from social affordable housing and permit a wider range of house types including smaller housing for an ageing and increasingly dependent population, as well as permitting housing for younger generations and those who want or need to work from home?
4. Should we give more certainty to developers by allocating sites for housing, or should we continue our approach of identifying a community's housing need and then working with communities and housing associations to identify suitable sites?

Summary of responses given:

Question 1

- It was felt the Natural Zone worked well, but the use of landscape strategy, whilst acceptable to recognise different character of landscapes across three broad areas of the Park, was perhaps of limited value in terms of its impacts on planning decisions. There were no strong alternative suggestions.

- It was felt that the National Park Authority (NPA) lacks robust evidence on demographic supply and demand factors (eg population growth forecasts, landscape capacity & employment location) in relation to sustainability appraisal objectives.

Question 2

- Most development should be in Bakewell and the larger villages, but some flexibility for development elsewhere is needed. The development strategy was seen as too prescriptive and it was felt that all settlements should be allowed to evolve so that their communities can thrive. (Evolution through flexibility.) There was however a caution that we need objective evidence of community needs over and above the evidence gathered by Parish Statements.

Question 3

- There was general consensus that we needed to recognise the changing needs of the Park communities and create policy that enables the changing needs to be addressed. This might mean for example additional housing for the elderly to downsize to, or extra care units for those who cannot live independently.
- There was support to re-visit our size limits on affordable housing in recognition of the increased need for housing to serve as office workspace as well as home.
- There was support to widen our definition of essential worker to those who provide support roles to the local population for example in care roles.
- There was support to re-focus our policy of favouring holiday accommodation on farms in favour of an 'in principle' support for converting to accommodation that would be permanently lived in.
- There was support for protecting smaller and more affordable housing stock by resisting proposals to demolish and re-build with luxury houses.
- There was recognition of the difficulty of funding affordable housing, and a request that we explore different mechanisms, materials and designs to help housing providers deliver affordable housing. This could also have benefits for the carbon footprint and energy efficiency of housing.

Question 4

- There was a suggestion to allocate sites in larger settlements to give greater likelihood of delivering their greater housing need. There was also recognition that this would alter the tried and tested model of exception site development which helps keep land values low to ensure social housing providers can deliver social housing.
- There was also recognition that Housing Associations have good links with the planners, the housing enabler and the communities, and can usually find good

sites for development without the need for allocations. (so allocations may still be unnecessary)

- Given the low level of new housing development across the NP and small size of many sites, it is unlikely to be feasible or necessary to identify all housing sites for allocation at the time of adoption of the LP, i.e. the process of identifying suitable sites (esp. within the smallest settlements) will come about through community-led processes.
- It should not be assumed that it will only be 'local communities and housing associations' that will have the capacity to identify or suggest suitable sites. Reliance on potentially over-prescriptive model/processes to identify sites should be avoided.

Additional requests

- There was a feeling that the local connection requirement limiting eligibility for affordable housing needs to be relaxed. (Our requirement that someone has lived in the Parish for at least 10 in the last 20 years before they qualify for an affordable home is seen as too tough)
- There was some support for a development tax to generate income to fund affordable housing and an offer of help to model the potential for this in the Peak District.