

ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION MAY – JUNE 2007

Summary of responses

In total 39 responses with 496 individual comments logged.

Sheet 1: Vision & Objectives	66 comments
Sheet 2: Valued characteristics	12
Sheet 3: Landscape policy	25
Sheet 4: Natural resources & Utilities	45
Sheet 5: Minerals	60
Sheet 6: Transport	73
Sheet 7: Recreation & tourism	54
Sheet 8: Housing	60
Sheet 9: Settlements	17
Sheet 10: Economy	39
Sheet 11: Waste management	17
Sheet 12: Planning gain	8
Comments in support of particular Options	222

1. Vision & Objectives

General support; need to align timescales of NPMP, RSS & CS. Individual comments include:

- *Climate change: need to link with transport.*
- *Natural beauty: need to recognise mans' influence.*
- *Recreation & tourism: should include staying visitors & quality issues, and recognise importance of visitor spending.*
- *Sustainable communities: refer to affordable housing.*
- *Rural economy: refer to wider economy not just links to character/environment, and encourage business to expand or set up.*

2. Valued characteristics

Suggest evidence base needs broadening.

1 in support of **2.1**; 4 for **2.2**

– preference for a stronger approach informed by LCA/BAP/CHS.

3. Landscape policy

6 for **3.1**; 5 for **3.2**; 5 for **3.3**; 2 support mix of 3.1 & 3.2

– views divided between maintaining current policies or a taking a more flexible approach.

4. Natural resources & utilities

Calls for more flexible policy towards renewables and for clarity in telecoms policies.

1 for **4.1.1**; 5 for **4.1.2**

- preference for considering applications in context of landscape & design policies with no areas specified for either search or protection.

5 for **4.2.1**; 2 for **4.2.2**

- preference for retaining current approach encouraging on-site renewables but focussing principally on conservation.

3 for **4.3.1**; 4 for **4.3.2**

- slight preference for taking a stronger line seeking energy-efficient or non-development solutions to utilities development.

Suggested new Option: Seek green infrastructure or climate adaptation provision from all developments, either directly or as a contribution to a central fund.

5. Minerals

Comments on value of employment, transport impacts and need to refer to role of recycled materials in reducing aggregate demand.

3 for **5.1.1**; 2 for **5.1.2**; 4 for **5.1.3**

- divided opinion about whether to weaken or strengthen policy approach to minerals activity.

3 for **5.2.1**; 4 for **5.2.2**

- divided opinion about whether to continue to permit fluorspar working.

1 for **5.3.1**; 3 for **5.3.2**

- preference for debate on long term future of cement production in Hope Valley.

4 for **5.4.1**; 2 for **5.4.2**

- preference for continuing current policy on 'conservation grade' building stone.

6 for **5.5.1**; 1 for **5.5.2**

- preference for continuing site by site review of old mineral permissions.

4 for **5.6.1**; 3 for **5.6.2**

- slight preference for seeking best end use of mineral sites on site by site basis.

6. Transport

Options need to address spatial planning matters and contribute to achieving aims, objectives and policies of RTS & LTPs.

2 for **6.1.1**; 7 for **6.1.2**

- preference for introducing measures to reduce vehicle numbers & speeds, rather than accepting current and future traffic levels and seeking to reduce their impact.

4 for **6.2.1**; 6 for **6.2.2**

- preference for measures including road user charging to mitigate and manage environmental impact of traffic and parking.

4 for **6.3.1**; 4 for **6.3.2**

- slight preference for policies seeking improved public transport, but without introduction of fiscal charges for driving in the NP or Green Travel Plan.

3 for **6.4.1**; 5 for **6.4.2**

- divided opinion about approach to access to services.

4 for **6.5.1**; 5 for **6.5.2**

- slight preference for seeking a stronger approach to achieve appropriate road and transport infrastructure in keeping with NP setting.

7. Recreation & tourism

Several stress importance of tourism to the economy.

4 for **7.1.1**; 2 for **7.1.2**; 5 for **7.1.3**

- slight preference for a more flexible approach to satisfy demand for attractions and accommodation, informed by LCA.

0 for **7.2.1**; 7 for **7.2.2**

- clear preference for identification of sites for new tourist facilities linked to sustainable hubs or gateways.

1 for **7.3.1**; 1 for **7.3.2**

- limited response to issue on provision of serviced holiday accommodation.

8. Housing

Policy preventing open market may lead to unsustainable patterns in towns and villages outside Park; need to consider design.

0 for **8.1.1**; 2 for **8.1.2**; 8 for **8.1.3**

- clear preference for encouraging more housing permissions, by giving priority for local need in conversions, identifying affordable housing sites, and scope for planning gain.

4 for **8.2.1**; 1 for **8.2.2**

- support for a separate policy on housing for key workers.

4 for **8.3.1**; 3 for **8.3.2**

- slight preference for introducing a separate policy on nursing homes & sheltered housing for the elderly.

2 for **8.4.1**; 5 for **8.4.2**

- preference for not introducing a separate policy to address gypsy and traveller sites.

0 for **8.5.1**; 1 for **8.5.2**; 2 for **8.5.3**; 2 for **8.5.4**

- mixed opinion on how to extend the local eligibility definition for affordable housing.

Suggested new Option: build open market housing to cross-subsidise affordable housing.

9. Settlements

3 for **9.1**; 0 for **9.2**; 7 for **9.3**

- preference for review of designated settlements and new classification as Market Town, Rural Service Centre and Small Rural Centre with different levels of growth.

10. Economy

Suggest link between employment and shortage of affordable housing; looks at employment too narrowly as B1/B2, doesn't bring out service employment or tourism.

2 for **10.1.1**; 2 for **10.1.2**; 1 for **10.1.3**

- mixed opinion on the need for allocation of more employment sites, and whether to safeguard existing sites or allow changes of use.

7 for **10.2.1**; 0 for **10.2.2**

- strong preference for retaining the possibility of employment development across all settlements (NB this support may be affected by choice of settlement policy).

0 for **10.3.1**; 8 for **10.3.2**

- strong preference for allowing more diversified economic uses in new and traditional buildings where they deliver conservation & enhancement and have essential need to be on site.

Comments stress importance of farming to maintaining landscape quality in the National Park, and difficulties faced by farmers.

11. Waste management

Support for small/appropriate waste and recycling facilities in National Park, in accordance with proximity principle.

3 for **11.1.1**; 0 for **11.1.2**

- preference for accepting waste management sites in the NP if no sites exist nearby.

3 for **11.2.1**; 0 for **11.2.2**

- preference for accepting waste management sites to combat unauthorised sorting/treatment operations.

3 for **11.3.1**; 0 for **11.3.2**

- preference for accepting local recycling sites within villages.

1 for **11.4.1**; 3 for **11.4.2**

- slight preference for seeking to reduce construction waste by requiring recycling or disposal on site.

12. Planning gain

Should only be applied to housing schemes and large developments or would stall development; both conservation and affordable housing should benefit dependent on each case.

0 for **12.1.1**; 1 for **12.1.2**

- slight preference for channelling planning gain towards social & economic issues rather than conservation & enhancement.

3 for **12.2.1**; 0 for **12.2.2**

- preference for planning gain priorities to reflect NPA priorities as defined in NPMP and associated strategies.