



Local Plan Review Workshop Summary

Workshop Topic:	Recreation, Tourism and Sustainable Transport
Date:	14 th July 2021
Time:	10am
Workshop led by:	Adele Metcalfe/Tim Nicholson

Summary of Attendees:

Number of external attendees:	34
Organisations Represented.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tissington Estate 2. Hucklow PC/PPPF 3. Greater Manchester & High Peak Area Ramblers 4. Edale PC/PPPF 5. National Trust 6. Ramblers DD FP & Access Sec/PDLAF member 7. CPRE 8. PDNP members 9. P&D Group (working for Chatsworth) 10. NFU 11. PDNP (Engagement) 12. Litton Properties 13. Over Haddon PC 14. Staffordshire Ramblers 15. Midlands Connect Rail 16. Transport for the North 17. HPBC 18. SMDC 19. DDDC 20. Campaign for National Parks 21. High Peak & Hope Valley Community Rail Partnership 22. Chatsworth Estate 23. Friends of Loxley Valley 24. Stockport MBC 25. Hope Valley Climate Action Group 26. Tameside MBC 27. Local Access Forum 28. Oldham Council

	29. CLA 30. Staffs CC 31. Charlesworth PC/PPPF 32. Fisher German 33. British Horse Society
--	--

Link to topic paper:

https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0036/387198/Recreation-and-Tourism.pdf

https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/387202/Sustainable-Transport-and-Infrastructure.pdf

Link to presentation: [PowerPoint Presentation \(peakdistrict.gov.uk\)](#)

Questions asked for workshops:

1. Our objective for recreation is for a network of high quality sustainable sites and facilities that have promoted understanding and enjoyment by everyone, including residents. Have we achieved this?
2. How do we achieve the right balance for visitor parking? Our current approach is restrictive – we won't permit new or enlarged facilities unless there is a demonstrable need and consideration of environmental capacity. Is this still the right approach? If it's going wrong, where and how is it going wrong?
3. The routes of the Monsal and Trans Pennine trails are currently safeguarded against development for future rail use. Given their popularity as multi-user trails, should they be safeguarded for this use instead?
4. How useful have our policies been in delivering our aspirations for sustainable travel? If they have not been useful – what can we do differently?

Summary of responses given:

General

There was some overlap in the discussion points provided across different questions, particularly questions 1 and 4.

Question 1 – Network of high quality and sustainable facilities

The workshop presentation referred to the development of the Peak District National Park Recreation Hubs Supplementary Planning Document and a series of three definitions; Gateways, Recreation Hubs and Recreational Attractions.

- It was thought that some progress had been made and that the policies are flexible.
- In relation to Gateways, clarification was sought on locations and the following feedback received; '*gateway development hub*' is an aspirational term, do the towns know they are gateways?
- Concern was expressed about really busy sites where demand exceeds capacity. At these sites inappropriate parking is impacting on buses and safety, and in most cases these sites don't have good public transport links to offer alternative means of access. In other cases, the use of social media has encouraged large numbers of visits to small and less accessible sites with similar issues. Widespread issues across the whole area means that local control can be limited.
- It was suggested that strategic planning for promoting enjoyment and understanding was needed. The refusal of some planning applications for facilities was referenced. It was felt that Cultural Heritage is not always given priority in providing facilities.
- Concern was expressed about the plight of communities, they are not thriving. It was suggested that the local economy needs to be improved. There appears to have been some debate about the value of tourism to the local economy.

Question 2 – Visitor parking

There were a range of common themes arising from the break-out group discussions on this question: -

- It was felt that Increasing car parking will not solve the problem, and that there is a need to provide alternatives and in particular to improve public transport access to recreation sites for visitors, including cycle carriage. It was suggested that car park expansion should be the last resort. It was also recognised that car parks can act as attractions in their own right. Better management of parking was advocated.
- It was suggested that recreational visitors like to park for free, and that this adds to the problem. Other comments re: charging for parking included that where charges are perceived to be too high, the car parks are not used. It was also felt that where charges are being made, car park users should be better informed about what the money will be used for.
- The issue of the limited availability of residential parking in villages was raised, it was suggested that both residential and visitor parking should be considered together. It was suggested that local planning authorities should work with communities to draw up community car park plans.
- Concern was expressed about the current policy approach of requiring the removal of on-street parking in exchange for the provision of off-street visitor parking.

- It was stated that all public car parks should provide electric vehicle charging points.
- It was suggested that the combination of Park & Ride and constraints on car usage should be trialled on busy days / Bank Holidays. Options include congestion charging, increased parking charges, traffic regulation orders to restrict parking or the temporary / permanent closure of roads.
- One group raised concerns about the use of temporary / pop-up car parks to provide additional parking capacity.
- One group advocated a more positive approach to new car parks in certain circumstances, e.g. small brownfield site, not environmentally sensitive, well located in relation to visitor facilities and active travel routes.
- It was felt that Policy should be clear on the reasons for resisting parking. If climate change is a major consideration then this could be ameliorated in future by the increase in use of electric and hybrid cars (although pollution from breaks and tyres remains). Is landscape impact a more important issue to address? Or traffic and on-street parking? Clarity is needed around key issues.

Question 3 – Safeguarding of the Monsal Trail route

There was no real consensus either between or within the four of the break-out groups that discussed this question: -

- For three groups, the feedback was that *'there were different views within the group'*; *'the group was conflicted or neutral'* and *'mixed thoughts'*.
- Two groups felt that the options should be kept open for rail, with one stating that the corridor should be protected regardless of any future use.
- One group stated that if purpose of reopening the railway was for freight then this would not benefit tourism and recreation.
- It was suggested that the National Park Authority could advocate existing railway stations as gateways to the National Park, including along the Hope Valley Line.
- Biodiversity issues were identified, with the potential for rail reinstatement or trail extension to have negative impacts.

Question 4 – Sustainable travel

There was some consensus between the break-out groups on this question:

- It was felt that whilst improvements could / should be made for sustainable transport in the National Park, that this largely fell outside of the National Park Authority's powers or remit. The responsibility lies with transport authorities and government. There was a suggestion that a clearer definition of *'sustainable transport'* was needed.
- It was suggested that the majority of people feel that they have to come by car, not all visitors live within easy access of a bus or train route. However, more could be done to encourage alternative forms of transport, including active travel

as part of the visit. It was also suggested that substituting some day visits for staying visits would remove a number of car journeys to and from the National Park.

- Some thought needs to be given to the location of hubs and their links to walking, cycling and other sustainable transport options; *'the right tree in the right place for the right reason'* approach, also applies to tourism facilities.
- There was a discussion about the possible need to restrict access, with the Snowdonia approach being cited. Other examples used included the Yorkshire Dales, where mobile phone app's can be used to request buses for larger groups.
- The potentials for a policy on whole estate plans to find long term solutions to pre-existing problems with traffic and parking was put forward.
- Free public transport was suggested as a possible option.
- It was suggested that the focus of the discussion was on visitors and that resident's travel should also be considered.