Local Plan Review Workshop Summary

Workshop Topic: Economy, Shops and Community Facilities
Date: 29th June 2021
Time: 10.00am
Workshop led by: Adele Metcalfe, Sarah Welsh, Clare Wilkins

Summary of Attendees:

Number of external attendees:	17
Organisations Represented.	- PDNPA Members - Staffordshire Moorlands Council - Bradwell CLT - High Peak Borough Council - Chatsworth - Ashbourne Town Team - Tissington Estate - Derbyshire Dales District Council - Peak Park Parishes Forum - Charlesworth Parish Council - Over Haddon Parish Council - CLA - Tideswell Parish Council - Litton Properties

Link to topic paper:

Supporting-Economic-Development.pdf (peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Shops-and-Community-Facilities.pdf (peakdistrict.gov.uk)

Link to presentation:

Economy and Shops, Services & Community Facilities: Peak District National Park

Questions asked for workshops:

1. The economic life of the Peak District is being affected by huge changes (e.g. leaving the EU, Covid) and there is more to come (e.g. ELMS). We know we have more work to do to understand this. What do you see as the new opportunities for business?

2. Thinking specifically about farm diversification, our policies already support small scale business development, preferably by re-use of existing buildings of vernacular merit. The new business must support the existing agricultural business and the 'primary business' must retain ownership and control.

   a. Does this give farmers and land managers sufficient scope to make the most of new opportunities?

   b. What are the risks to the National Park's special qualities of 'relaxing' this approach? (We know this isn't the right audience and we will be asking this again!) Shops and Community Facilities

3. Planning policy can't on its own provide and retain community facilities. What can we do to support thriving and sustainable communities?

Summary of responses given:

Group 1:

Q.1
- Opportunities for carbon credits, re-afforestation, bio-diversity enhancements to reflect its increased importance.
- The pandemic has increased domestic holidaying and the increased demand is good and hope this will continue. Continued opportunity to convert underused buildings to viable new uses like holiday use and other uses. Farmers need a supportive policy environ to convert to viable new uses.
- There should be co-operation between the National Park and District Councils so that land outside the NP can take the pressure off the NP.
- Support barns for flexible uses, not just office space required, need light industrial, start-ups, storage etc. link it to market towns initiative.

Q.2
- Concerned about ownership and control because a farmer may want to let out part of their building to non/semi related business eg dairy let out a building to an ice cream producer. Focus should be on the environment improvements not the main use/ancillary relationship. Agriculture will take up most of the land but the value would be in the buildings = no risk because DM controls are very strong. There will be a need for new buildings and flexibility.

Q.3
- Need to understand what the population data issues are so that policies can respond to it.
- Issues of ageing population.
- Cross boundary working on boundary sites.

- Acknowledge and support larger Estates provide low cost market homes for rent.
-

Group 2:

The National Park needs a more flexible and balanced view with regards to the economy. Diversity of jobs, employment opportunities for different people to counteract changes in the population. We need affordable housing for locals. Need more internet changes to home working. Would like to see within NP policy is more flexibility in the approach. General view of group, without flexibility it has a limiting effect on the economy and NP sustainability. Graphs show a declining and ageing population. We need to grow the population to get to a position where the level of people to supply and help the economy – econ active – are able to gainfully employed and support the economy. Maintaining the level of population won't help this. Flexibility – in conversions and nature of employment. If flex introduced – good for green agenda working locally and not commuting out of the NP.

Group 3:

Q1.
- We need to tailor requirements accordingly. Farmers may not take up the new ELMS system. It could lead to intensification of farming and increase in productivity. Identify what is perceived to be required and tailor requirements accordingly. Who then decides this and what is to be achieved?
- Staycation opportunities have led to an extension to the tourism period.
- Need to respond to net zero targets.
- Threats are to current farming practices – ELMS complicated and not attractive – see above comment.
- Homeworking could be a threat as it supports people with wealth who may move to the PD and price out local or young people wanting to stay. But if there is better broadband there could be young people staying – it's a balancing act.
Q2.
- A no, B very little if the right design is imposed – depending on your opinion.
- We definitely need to enable businesses but at the same time an awareness of the landscape impact e.g. increasing size of agricultural buildings and those not located within the core of buildings.
Q3.
- We need to achieve a critical mass of population for communities to be viable but reflecting on the ageing and more wealthy population pricing out local people who can't pick up local jobs – often lower paid too though. The profile of the popn is important. The current settlement hierarchy is right.
- Community development might support adjacent communities with their needs. Either through a partnership approach or accidental which draws people in. Always need an emphasis on the evidence base to support conclusions.
- Working from home with good broadband will enable people to support local facilities.
- What is a viable community? It came across in the presentation that you need all the aspects presented. A viable community is one that has sense of belonging. You don't need to tick every box – need to note this.
- There needs to be a critical mass to sustain community facilities. The evidence prepared for the Core Strategy – it's good that you are looking at what facilities communities have but need to go further and make an assessment of whether facilities are in decline or viability is threatened. What pop critical mass is required to make these facilities survive? E.g. a local shop provides a service to wider community than just the village in which it is in.
- Need a socioeconomic wellbeing report to provide the evidence.

- Could provide additional housing to help support the critical mass required to support community facilities.

Comments from the chat box during the presentation:

o Re aging population, this will be exacerbated post-covid as more housing is changing to second home / holiday cottages....whilst very little new housing (esp affordable housing) is being built.

o How will an aging population be supported going forward. There is acceptance it will happening but the focus seems to be on expanding existing jobs and change of farming?