

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

**Sheet 6
Transport**



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reconciling transport demands with NP purposes by restraining the volume of traffic 2. The need to mitigate and manage the environmental impact of traffic and parking 3. Pressures on the existing public transport system 4. The need to encourage greater access to homes, jobs, services and leisure opportunities 5. The need to ensure that roads & transport infrastructure are in keeping with the National Park setting.
Evidence	<p>National</p> <p>1995 Environment Act –</p> <p>Purpose of National Parks; <i>“to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park”</i>; relates to issues 1 and 2 above</p> <p><i>“the promotion of opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities (of the National Park) by the public”</i> relates to issues 3 and 4 above</p> <p>additional duty placed by the act, <i>“seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities, co-operating with local authorities to do so</i>, relates to issues 3 and 4 above</p> <p>A New Deal for Transport – Better for Everyone White Paper (1997)</p> <p><i>“In rural areas, road user charging is most likely to be used where there are significant problems caused by very high levels of seasonal traffic, for example, in tourist areas such as the National Parks. We would welcome proposals for such initiatives to provide the basis for pilot schemes in rural areas”</i>.</p> <p>The Future of Transport White Paper (2004)</p> <p>Outlines a long-term strategy for a <i>“modern, efficient and sustainable transport system”</i>.</p> <p>Ch 3 examines the possibility of road user charging as part of a national scheme, but says there could be different charges for rural and urban areas</p> <p>Ch 10 deals with reducing the impacts of transport upon the environment, with relation to climate change and air quality in particular.</p> <p>Gives a strong presumption against new or expanded infrastructure that would significantly impact National Parks*.</p> <p>*In National Parks, any schemes must show how the net benefits clearly outweigh adverse environmental impacts. Schemes must include reasonable steps to mitigate the impacts. Alternative options must have been explored</p>

[DOE Circular 4/76 – Report of the National Park Policies Review Committee:](#)

statement of the conclusions of the Secretaries of State for the Environment and for Wales on the report (1976) –

“It is now the policy of Government that investment in trunk roads should be directed to developing routes for long distance traffic which avoid National Parks; and that no new road for long distance traffic should be constructed through a National Park, or existing road upgraded, unless it has been demonstrated that there is a compelling need which would not be met by any reasonable alternative means”.

[DOE Circular 125/77 – Roads and Traffic – National Parks \(1977\) –](#)

“Where there is a compelling need for some solution to be found to the problem of increased through traffic, or to problems of road safety, in a National Park, a determined search should be made for alternatives which do not involve upgrading the existing route or new construction”.

[DfT Circular 01/2006 – Setting Local Speed Limits \(August 2006\) –](#)

Section 6 – Rural Speed Management – lower speed limits would be appropriate on “*lower tier single carriageway roads*” where there are “*significant environmental considerations*”.

Paragraph 92 - lower limits would be appropriate on ‘lower tier’ roads “*where there are significant environmental considerations such as in National Parks or Areas of Outstanding National Beauty, or where there is a high density of bends, junctions or accesses, or the road is hilly*”.

[PPG13: Transport \(2001\) –](#)

sets out objectives for the integration of planning and transport at a national, regional, strategic and local level, seeking to: -

- Promote more sustainable transport choices for people and freight.
- Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling.
- Reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

local authorities should: -

“ensure that development comprising jobs, shopping, leisure and services offers a realistic choice of access by public transport, walking and cycling, recognising that this may be less achievable in some rural areas”.

“in rural areas, locate most development for housing, jobs, shopping, leisure and services in local service centres which are designated in the [development plan] to act as focal points for housing, transport, and other services, and encourage better transport provision in the countryside”.

“use parking policies, alongside other planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys”.

“protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choices for both passenger and freight movements”.

[PPS 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas \(2004\)](#) –

- Accessibility should be key consideration in all development decisions
- Most developments that generate large numbers of trips should be located in/ next to towns/ service centres accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.
- Other developments should, where possible give people the greatest opportunity to access them by public transport, walking and cycling.
- Proposals for large scale tourism and leisure development should try and increase access to the site by sustainable transport modes; and use of traffic management and appropriate parking policies near the site. (PPG13)

Regional

[East Midlands Regional Plan \(RSS8\)](#):

[Regional Transport Strategy \(RTS\)](#) (September 2006) Aims:-

- Reducing the need to travel, especially by car, and reducing traffic growth and congestion.
- Promoting a step change in the level of public transport.
- Making better use of existing networks through better management.
- Developing additional highway capacity only when all other measures have been exhausted.

The RSS for the East Midlands Policy 9

- Requires routes for long distance traffic to be developed to avoid the National Park

Draft RTS objectives (include):-

- promoting accessibility and overcoming “*peripherality in the regions rural areas*”.

Policy 41 – Objectives for the Peak Sub-area include: -

- P1 Implementing key proposals of the South Pennines Integrated Transport Strategy (SPITS).
- P2 Developing opportunities for modal shift away from road based transport including for the quarrying and aggregates sector.
- P3 Overcoming the problems of rural isolation for those without access to a car.
- P4 Improving transport linkages to the North West region and the rest of the East Midlands.

Policy 42 - outlines a regional approach to traffic growth reduction,

Policy 43 - aimed at influencing behavioural change within the region

Policy 44 -- outlines regional priorities for parking levies and Road User Charging, including within environmentally sensitive areas

Policies 45 and 46 - Regional car parking standards and improving public transport accessibility respectively.

Policy 51 – Requires the Highways Agency to work to progress trunk road investment priorities subject to full and detailed appraisal. The A628 Mottram – Tintwistle bypass including the Glossop Spur is included as a Regional Transport Investment Priority, for implementation 2011-16.

[Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West of England: Regional Transport Strategy \(January 2006\) –](#)

- Transport Investment Priorities, included within the Regional/Sub-Regional section are the A57T/A628T Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass and the Glossop Spur (A57). Both of these affect the National Park.

Local

[Derbyshire Local Transport Strategy 2006-2021](#)

- Acknowledges the threat of traffic upon the protected environment of the National Park and the policies for the Peak sub-region within RSS8.

[Derbyshire's Accessibility Strategy 2006-2011](#)

- Acknowledges that the county's tourism and leisure industry is largely centered in the Peak District and restates RSS8 that "*access to and across*" the National Park "*by public transport and other non-car modes should be improved*".

Derbyshire Accessibility Partnership

- Oversees the delivery of accessibility improvements throughout the County and ensures that schemes/projects/initiatives are consistent with the aims & objectives of: - the Local Area Agreement; Derbyshire Community Strategy, Regional Economic Strategy and Derbyshire's Accessibility Strategy. It has led to the formation of :-

Countywide Strategic Accessibility Partnerships: -

- Access to Healthcare
- Access to Education and Training
- Access to Employment and Food
- Access to Leisure and Culture
- Planning and Land Use

These partnerships will consider strategic issues affecting accessibility, with detailed solutions and action plans to be developed through sub-groups or Local Access Forum – the details for this are yet to be finalised.

[Derbyshire's Bus Strategy](#)

- Acknowledges the visitor pressures upon the National Park

- Recognizes the growing problem of rural congestion, with the majority of the Park's visitors arriving by private car.
- States that increased bus use could ease this problem and offer access for those without a car.

[Derbyshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan](#)

[South Pennines Transport \(SPITS\) Project: Business Plan 2005-2015](#)

- The strategic goal is to *“reduce the overall impact of traffic upon the Peak District National Park and mitigate its effects”*.
- The aim is to *“restrain traffic on non trunk routes across the Park and to minimise traffic growth on the A628/616(T) in order to create an environment which is safer and healthier.*
- *The intention is to achieve a balance between the economic needs and regeneration aspirations of the surrounding conurbations: and accommodate these as far as possible”*.

The project has eight strategy elements for the SPITS area –

1. Traffic restraint;
2. Managing and influencing the implementation of fiscal demand measures;
3. Creating *“safe roads”*;
4. Influencing travel behavior;
5. Improving /reinstating rail routes and services;
6. Improving long distance bus and coach services;
7. Improving integration, ticketing, marketing and technology of public transport services; Improvements to the A57/A628/A616 key trunk road across the National Park.

Derbyshire Partnership Forum – Derbyshire Community Strategy 2003-2006

- Environment, Transport and Housing combine to make one of its six key areas for improvement, by *“increasing recycling rates and use of public transport and ensuring access to affordable housing”*.

Strategy has a number of priorities: -

- Improving the condition and quality of roads, pavements and transport infrastructure
- Improving access to and expanding and improving the availability of public and community transport
- Increasing the number of journeys undertaken by bus, cycling and walking
- Improving access to and maintenance of footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes and ensuring that these are safe
- Improving road safety and reducing the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents

[Shaping the Future of Staffordshire 2005-2020: The sustainable strategy for the County](#) –

- has a key priority for integrating and sustaining transport, and a theme vision of *“Transport in Staffordshire is developed that supports sustainable economic growth while providing social and environmental benefits”*.

[Kirklees Partnership – Community Strategy 2006-08](#)

- aims to increase car sharing and use of public transport.

[Oldham's Community Strategy 2005-2020](#) – has a vision for the environment: -

- *“A Borough where people live in cleaner, greener and safer neighbourhoods and have access to a rich natural heritage of greenspace, woodlands and wider countryside that support a wealth of plant and animal life. A transportation system that reduces congestion and pollution and supports walking, cycling and use of public transport. An improved quality of life for all which meets the needs and aspirations of local people, whilst working to honour our national and international environmental obligations to conserve our precious natural resources”.*

[Derbyshire Dales and High Peak Local Strategic Partnership: Community Strategy 2006-09](#)

Theme 5 Access to Services and Rural Transport,

- Aims to - *“Reduce inequalities in access to services for people living in rural areas”.*

[Survey 2004 results](#)

Total number of responses = 388

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.

Would an entry fee into the National Park be acceptable if you could park for free once here?

- 33.8% felt 'Yes' it would be acceptable
- 59% felt 'No' it would not be acceptable
- 5.7% had 'No opinion'
- 1.8% did not reply

Should public transport spending be on resident services or visitor management?

- 74.7% 'Residents'
- 32% 'Visitors'
- 8% had 'No opinion'
- 4.1% did not reply

Should cross park traffic be reduced?

- 47.4% 'Yes'
- 29.9% 'No'
- 18% had 'No opinion'
- 4.6% did not reply

How would you like to see traffic managed?

- 14.8% 'Road tolls'
- 29.4% 'Speed cameras'
- 37.7% 'Traffic calming'
- 20.3% 'Other'
- 9.4% did not reply

The Help Shape the Future responses

- General support for the broad aims of an environmental levy to help reduce the impact of traffic and raise more funds for public transport but:
- Need to consider impact on wider accessibility, commercial users and local people, and shouldn't prevent people from getting to and enjoying the National Park.
- General support to reduce the impact of quarrying (traffic, noise, dust, etc) by seeking green travel plans.
- Strong support for reduction in traffic speeds to preserve tranquillity, reduce road kill, increase safety for cyclists, pedestrians and horses and reduce the potential for road traffic collisions.
- Some support for raising the design standards or essential new transport infrastructure, but recognition that will be costly and could result in fewer schemes being delivered.
- "Overall environmental benefit" needs to be clarified.
- Suggestion that this could be expanded to address creeping urbanisation of all types of development, indeed making a case for an overall signing/street furniture policy.
- Support for establishing a National Park car parking strategy to guide the management of all parking although there would require agreement with the various district/borough councils.

NPA Meeting 7/4/06

- Authority endorsed objections to the A57/A628 Mottram-Tintwistle bypass; the A616/A628 Restraint Measures and the Glossop Spur (A57) road schemes.

NPA Meeting 26/05/06

- Authority objects to the Glossop Spur as it currently stands.

NPA Meeting 30/3/07

- Authority members object unanimously to the Highways Agency 2007 draft orders for A57/A628 Mottram – Tintwistle Bypass and A628/A616 Route Restraint measures.

Option 6.1.1	<p>Issue 1 - Reconciling transport demands with NP objectives by restraining the volume of traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconcile transport demands with NP objectives and manage traffic within the Park's strategic road network. This approach mainly accepts current and future levels of traffic and tries to reduce adverse impacts. It includes safeguarding land for new road schemes where appropriate within DOE Circulars 4/76 and 125/77.
Option 6.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use fiscal demand management aimed at reducing the number of private motorised vehicles (particularly cars) entering and crossing the Park. Use the money to fund alternative means of access. (with other local authorities and through SPITS) Lower speed limits could deter cross park traffic. Vehicles that continue to use the Park will still directed by the Strategic Road Network.
Option 6.2.1	<p>Issue 2 - The need to mitigate and manage the environmental impact of traffic and parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep policies that direct traffic to the appropriate roads through use of the Strategic Road Network. Use traffic management schemes to reduce impacts in particularly sensitive and popular areas. Support off-street parking where it is appropriate as long as there is an equivalent reduction in on-street parking.
Option 6.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep policies that direct traffic to the appropriate roads through use of the Strategic Road Network, traffic management schemes and parking. Seek lower speed limits within the National Park where safe and appropriate, through SPITS and under DfT Circular 01/2006. Pursue road user charging to reduce the environmental impacts of the car and preferably to provide funds for alternative forms of transport.
Option 6.3.1	<p>Issue 3 - Pressures on the existing public transport system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep policies that retain and improve public transport infrastructure, Encourage other authorities and agencies with this statutory responsibility to do likewise. Continue to safeguard former railway routes within the National Park against their possible reinstatement.
Option 6.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep policies as per Option 1. Seek fiscal charges for driving within the National Park,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the proceeds on Public Transport. • Produce a Green Travel Plan policy (linked to planning gain) • Seek some form of re-regulation of bus services to provide a more stable bus network.
Option 6.4.1	<p>Issue 4 - The need to encourage greater access to homes, jobs, services and leisure opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep policies that retain and improve Public Transport Infrastructure. • Encourage other authorities and agencies with this statutory responsibility to do likewise. • Continue to safeguard former railway routes against possible rail re-use. • Retain policies related to cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians and access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty.
Option 6.4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep policies related to Public Transport infrastructure as for Option 1. • Work with accessibility partnerships to improve access to services through a wide range of means of transport and non-transport solutions. This may include changes to IT infrastructure or change of use of farm buildings etc. <p>(Policy related to access to sites for those with a mobility difficulty have been superseded by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, and are probably no longer relevant.</p> <p>Accessibility could be improved if businesses were required to produce green travel plans as a condition of receiving planning permission (planning gain))</p>
Option 6.5.1	<p>Issue 5 - The need to ensure that roads & transport infrastructure are in keeping with the National Park setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep policies to ensure that the design of transport infrastructure is in keeping with its National Park setting.
Option 6.5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek conformity across all highway authorities and agencies responsible for road works and signage within this and other National Parks. • Seek different and appropriate levels of signage for National Parks.

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