

**CONSULTATION ON CORE STRATEGY
ISSUES AND OPTIONS
SPRING 2007**

**Sheet 10
Economy**



Peak District National Park Authority

Aldern House
Baslow Road
Bakewell
Derbyshire
DE45 1AE

Tel: (01629) 816 200
Text: (01629) 816 319
Fax: (01629) 816 310
Email: customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk
Website: www.peakdistrict.gov.uk

Your comments and views on this options paper are welcomed up to 29 June 2007. Enquiries can be directed to Brian Taylor, Policy Planning Manager on 01629 816 303. This report is also accessible from our website located under www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/plansandpolicies.htm .

We are happy to provide this information in alternative formats on request where reasonable.

Published April 2007

Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for effective integration of agricultural and forestry development with landscape and design objectives • Need to diversify rural economy • Need to safeguard existing employment sites • Need to support viability of landscape management
Evidence	<p>National</p> <p>PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development; PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural areas; PPS4 Industrial Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges a positive approach to economic development in rural areas, particularly to support farming enterprises. • Supports the reuse or replacement of existing agricultural buildings for economic development. • Recognises the role of agriculture in maintaining and managing the countryside and valued landscapes, • Supports proposals which enable it to diversify into new agricultural opportunities and add value to primary produce • Urges a balance between countryside protection and a sustainable rural economy. • Stresses the need for a positive approach to economic development in rural areas, particularly to support farming enterprises. • Asks that new building should be strictly controlled in open countryside • Asks that buildings are mainly focused on towns and villages, where improvements to access and public transport should be sought. • Encourages Authorities to be flexible on the reuse or replacement of existing buildings for businesses. • Asks Authorities to ensure that there is sufficient land available that is readily capable of development and well served by infrastructure. • Seeks to ensure that home businesses and ancillary activities are effectively controlled, in terms of visitors, traffic and noise <p>Regional</p> <p>East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises the need for strategies to diversify incomes, add value to local produce, improve skills and broaden the economy; whilst protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment. • Encourages Farm based enterprises and the appropriately scaled growth of new and existing rural businesses. • Wants employment development to strengthen the vitality and viability of market towns but accepts that office and industrial space is constrained in the Park. • Encourages partners to work together to promote diversification and sustainable patterns of development alongside environmentally sound management of the countryside. • Seeks an adequate supply of good quality land for office and industrial uses in sustainable locations. • Advises authorities to review land allocations and consider beneficial alternative uses for surplus land.

Local

Structure Plan

policy C6

- Permits agricultural or forestry development where it conserves and enhances landscapes and settlements.
- May permit agricultural and forestry workers dwellings if there is an essential need to be based on the site and where that need cannot be met in a nearby settlement.
- Permission will not be granted where a dwelling or other building which previously met this need has recently been disposed of for another purpose.

policy C7

- Permits development that diversifies the source of a farm's income but sustains agriculture as the primary land use.
- Must not adversely affect the function or character of the main group of farm buildings,
- Must not use a non-vernacular farm building which would otherwise be inappropriate in the area, or result in a foreseeable need for a replacement agricultural building.

policy E1

- Permits employment development of a scale and type which meets local needs.
- Permits the development in the open countryside for the following purposes, (agriculture, landscape maintenance, forestry, mineral working, farm diversification, recreation and tourism, conservation of buildings of special merit.
- Steers new employment or business development to towns and villages.

policy E4

- Safeguards existing industrial land and buildings or premises for similar business uses unless they cause severe problems for the amenity of the surrounding area.

policy E3

- Supports home working or an extension by change of use, as long as the main use remains residential and the surrounding area does not lose its residential character.

Local Plan policies

- Safeguard existing employment sites from changes to other uses,
- Allocated employment sites in Bakewell and the Hope Valley, (with mixed success in achieving development.)
- Anticipated a relatively simple employment market and limited development on the three sites in Bakewell to Use Classes B1 and B2.

- There is now little or no demand for pure office or industrial space, and an increased demand for mixed manufacturing / warehousing / teaching / retail use. These are generally unacceptable under existing policy.
- Relaxed policies would enable other types of employment-generating development and increase the potential for development on these sites
- There is some pressure to release sites for housing in Bakewell.
- The importance of Bakewell as the only market town and the difficulty in finding new sites suggests that the existing policy to safeguard sites should continue,
- More detailed research is needed to justify a change in the current policy

[Survey 2004 results](#)

Total number of responses = 388

Where were responses generated?

- 28.6% from the Bakewell Show.
- 19.1% from the Penistone show.
- 15.5% from the Manifold show.
- 14.9% from the Hope show.
- 10.3% from the Tourist Information Centres.
- 6.2% from the Staffordshire Moorlands CVS.
- 4.4% from our local libraries (Bakewell, Matlock, Buxton and Ashbourne).

Where do these people live?

- 63.1% described themselves as visitors to the park.
- 34.3% described themselves as residents of the park.
- 2.6% gave no response.

How do you think farming should develop in the National Park?

- 14.2% said 'No change'
- 17% said 'Economic diversification'
- 34.8% said 'Environment and landscape management'
- 42% said 'Linking Environment and Economy'
- 11% said 'Other'
- 2.3 % did not reply

Farmers within the Peak District find it difficult to make a good economic return from their land – would it be acceptable for them to change the landscape to improve their income?

- 58.8% felt 'Yes' it would be acceptable
- 33.2% felt 'No' it would not be acceptable
- 3.9% had 'No opinion'
- 4.9% did not reply.

[Community Strategies](#)

Derbyshire Dales and High Peak – thriving local economy

Sheffield City Council – A stronger economy

Chesterfield and NE Derbyshire – Economic regeneration

Staffordshire County Council – economic Development and Enterprise

Macclesfield Borough Council – balancing economic and environmental issues in

	<p>new development Cheshire County Council – shared prosperity</p> <p>National Park Management Plan</p> <p>By 2011, prosperity has been improved by businesses, social enterprise and the public sector: working together; raising productivity; capitalising on their location in a special and distinctive environment; and developing a sustainable economy.</p> <p>Rural Action Zone</p> <p>The RAZ identifies problems including a shortage of appropriate development sites, a lack of private sector investment, poor ICT infrastructure, and the inability to match the financial incentives offered by neighbouring areas to attract business.</p> <p>Demand forecasts for the Peak sub-region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • total employment will remain virtually unchanged over the next 10 years, • office employment will remain almost static, • manufacturing employment will decline by around 6%. • Consequently, the requirement for employment land falls by about 1 hectare per year (QUELS 2002). <p>2006 East Midlands Employment Land Provision Study (Roger Tym and Partners)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is unlikely to be demand for additional employment land in the NP. • There appears to be limited demand for business units in Bakewell and a relative abundance of allocated land. <p>Officers report several requests for business/storage/retail uses which do not fall within current policies.</p> <p>A respondent to recent consultation welcomed a review of the need for employment sites in order to encourage businesses to move in and set up in the Peak District.</p> <p>Recent consultation responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supportive of sustainable farm diversification, whilst acknowledging that it rarely generates much income, and financial assistance may be needed to set it up. • Several warnings that requiring economic development to be ‘linked to the farm’ may be too restrictive. • Refusing re-use of agricultural buildings could limit economic potential and increase commuting as employment development is driven elsewhere. <p>Additional evidence still to emerge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint employment land review – expected October 2007
<p>Option 10.1.1</p>	<p>Issue1: new and existing employment sites</p> <p>Should we allocate more employment sites in case demand rises? If so should these only be in Bakewell or are there other locations where these should go?</p>

Option 10.1.2	Should we safeguard existing employment sites and not bring any more forward (on the basis that we don't foresee a sudden surge in demand)
Option 10.1.3	Should we allow changes of use on existing sites? (Losing employment sites to housing for example)
Option 10.2.1	<p>Issue 2: spatial distribution of employment sites</p> <p>Should we retain the possibility for employment development across all settlements (depending on agreed settlement policy)</p>
Option 10.2.2	Should we limit the spread of new employment development to just the larger settlements
Option 10.3.1	<p>Issue 3: agriculture and diversifying the rural economy</p> <p>Retain current policy for agricultural development and diversification which seeks to retain agriculture as the primary land use and does not permit the re-use of modern farm buildings for other uses and does not permit the inappropriate use of traditional farm buildings.</p>
Option 10.3.2	Allow more diversified economic uses in new and traditional buildings (including those for promoting understanding and enjoyment of the National Park) where they deliver conservation and enhancement of the National Park landscape and have an essential need to be on site (subject to strong environmental criteria, informed by LCA.)

Do you have a preferred option or is there another option you would prefer to see?