

Statement of Representations



Introduction

Summary of main issues raised

- The main objection is from the Peak Park Parishes Forum*, which considers that references to use of section 106 agreements in the Introduction paves the way for an unreasonable and unjustified use of Section 106 agreements to, in their words, tax development. The Forum also considers that the policies do not complement one another and cannot therefore be considered to be sound.
- DM1 is seen as a repetition of Core Strategy GSP1 and it is questioned whether it will lead to sustainable development. (Peak Park Parishes Forum*)
- The commitment to sustainable development in both the policy and the text is questioned. (Peak Park Parishes Forum*, Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)
- The terms special qualities and valued characteristics needs to be more clearly set out and explained (Friends of the Peak District)
- The policy does not reflect the NPMP, particularly in regard to thriving & vibrant communities (Peter O’Brien)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
Contents	Stella McGuire	10	10.1	Y	Y	N	N
1.29 -1.30	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.1	N	N	Y M1.7	N

1.29 -1.30	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.2	N	Y	N	Y
1.26	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.4	Y	N	Y	Y
Appendices list	PDNPA	-	INT1.1	Y	Y	N	N
Contents list	PDNPA	-	INT2.1	Y	Y	N	N
1.25	PDNPA	-	INT2.2	Y	Y	N	N
DM1	PDNPA	-	INT1.3	Y	N	N	N
DM1	PDNPA	-	INT1.4	Y	N	N	N
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.3	Y	N	N	Y
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.4	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.5	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.6	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.7	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.8	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.9	N	N	N	Y

DM1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.1	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.2	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.3	N	N	N	Y
DM1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.4	Y	N	N	Y
DM1	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.1	Y	N	N	N
DM1	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.14	Y	N	N	N
DM1	Peter O'Brien	64	64.10	N	N	N	Y

Chapter 2: Development Management Practice

Summary of main issues raised

- The role of pre-application advice and the importance of accurate policy led information on policy and local issues (to encourage a positive three way dialogue between communities developers and planners leading up to a planning application) is not spelt out in this section and this is seen as an omission. (Friends of the Peak District)
- The omission of reference to NPPF paragraph 116 means the protections for the National Park are not spelt out in their entirety. (National Trust)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor	Representation	Considered	Minor	Main	Request for
--------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------------

		ID	ID	sound by respondent	Modification proposed by NPA	modification proposed by NPA	hearing
2.1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.5	N	N	N	Y
2.1	National Trust	50	50.1	N	N	N	N

Chapter 3: Conserving and enhancing the National Park (Conservation)

Strategic Context

Summary of main issues raised

- No issues of soundness raised

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
General	East Midlands Chamber (Nick Chischniak)	3	3.3	Y	N	N	Y
3.1	PDNPA	-	INT1.5	Y	Y M3.1	N	N
3.3	PDNPA	-	INT1.13	Y	N	N	N
3.3	PDNPA	-	INT1.14	Y	N	N	N
3.3	PDNPA	-	INT1.15	Y	N	N	N
3.3	Stella McGuire	10	10.2	Y	YM3.2	N	N
3.5	PDNPA	-	INT1.6	Y	YM3.3	N	N

3.6	Stella McGuire	10	10.15	Y	N	N	N
3.8	PDNPA	-	INT1.7	Y	N	N	N
3.8	Stella McGuire	10	10.5	Y	N	N	N

Policy DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes

Summary of issues raised

- DMC1 requirement for developers to undertake a landscape assessment is considered unnecessarily onerous on developers (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- DMC1 requirement for assessment is not in line with national planning guidance and the policy should require Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment rather than landscape assessment, with supporting text referencing the Guidelines for LVIA (National Trust)
- Part C of policy DMC1 is considered unenforceable and contrary to national planning guidance (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- We support the landscape first approach and the consideration of cumulative impact but this is only practically possible if the evidence base upon which this is founded is up to date. The current Landscape Strategy needs review because development since its adoption has changed some of the landscapes already. (The ability of the policy as written to deliver the objective is therefore questioned and could be seen, in spite of the overall support, to represent an 'effectiveness' issue in terms of the soundness of the plan (Friends of Peak District)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.10-3.13	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.6	N	N	N	Y
3.9	PDNPA	-	INT1.66	Y	N	N	N
3.9	PDNPA	-	INT2.4	Y	N	N	N
3.10	Stella McGuire	10	10.2	Y	N	N	N
3.15	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.11	N	N	N	Y

DMC1, DMC2	Jean Howarth	1	1.1	Y	N	N	Y
DMC1	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC1	Natural England	22	22.1	Y	N	N	N
DMC1	Stanton in peak PC	33	33.1	Y	N	N	Y
DMC1	National Trust	50	50.2	N	N	N	N
DMC1	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.1	N	N	N	Y
DMC1	Rowsley PC	69	69.1	Y	N	N	Y
DMC1 3.92	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.1	N	N	N	Y

Policy DMC2 Protecting and managing the Natural Zone

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested part C (iv) is likely to lead to failure to meet the six tests set out in PPG. Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 21a-015-20140306. (Allen Newby PME Planning Services)
- It is suggested Part C (iv) is inconsistent with paragraph 3.21 and that it needs to be clarified whether a personal and time limited consent is a mandatory or discretionary requirement of permission. (Peak Park Parishes Forum) *
- It is suggested that Part C (iv), if requiring a legal agreement rather than a condition, is contrary to para 204 of the NPPF (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- It is suggested that an Article 4 direction should be made for the Natural Zone to avoid the need for personal and time limited consents (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.17/3.22	Stella McGuire	10	10.3	Y	Y M3.4	N	N
3.17	PDNPA	-	INT4.1	Y	Y M3.5	N	N
3.17	Stella McGuire	10	10.4	Y	Y M3.6	N	N
3.17	Stella McGuire	10	10.5	Y	N	N	N
3.22	Stella McGuire	10	10.3	Y	Y M3.7	N	N
DMC2	Allen Newby PME Planning Services	9	9.1	N	N	N	Y
DMC2	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.7	Y	N	N	Y
DMC2	NFU (Paul Tame)	2	2.2	Y	N	N	Y
DMC2	Stanton in Peak PC	33	33.2	Y	N	N	Y
DMC2	National Trust	50	50.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC2	Rowsley PC	69	69.2	Y	N	N	Y
DMC2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.12	N	N	N	Y
DMC2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.13	N	N	N	Y
DMC2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.14	N	Y	N	Y
DMC2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.15	N	N	N	Y
DMC2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.16	N	N	N	Y

Policy DMC3: Siting, design, layout and landscaping

Summary of issues raised

- No representations were made on soundness of this policy
- Some concern that light pollution should be more of a consideration (Rowsley PC and Stanton in Peak PC)
- Suggestion to highlight the importance of understanding the implications that the design of new development can have on flood risk, water conservation and sustainable drainage (United Utilities)

- Objection to policy DMC3 because a common set of design criteria does not allow for consideration of the individual characteristics of each village. (Great Hucklow PC)
- The last sentence of Part A is poorly drafted: “Siting.....will be essential.....”. and , it also seems to be duplicated by Part B(i).

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.23	PDNPA	-	INT1.8	Y	Y M3.8	N	N
3.24	PDNPA	-	INT1.9	Y	Y M3.9	N	N
3.25	PDNPA	-	INT1.10	Y	N	N	N
3.25	PDNPA	-	INT1.11	Y	N	N	N
3.26	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M3.10	N	N
3.26	PDNPA	-	INT1.12	Y	Y M3.11	N	N
3.30	PDNPA	-	INT1.13	Y	N	N	N
3.31	PDNPA	-	INT1.16	Y	N	N	N
3.33	PDNPA	-	INT1.17	Y	N	N	N
DMC3	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.17	Y	N	N	Y
DMC3	Peter Abbott	24	24.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC3	Stanton in Peak PC	33	33.3	Y	N	N	Y
DMC3	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.2	N	N	N	Y
DMC3	United Utilities	44	44.2	Y	Y	N	N
DMC3	National Trust	50	50.4	Y	N	N	Y
DMC3	Rowsley PC	69	69.3	Y	N	N	Y

DMC4: Settlement Limits

Summary of issues raised

- DMC4 is framed by paras 3.38 and 3.41 but it is not clear whether DMC4B is intended to apply to all open spaces identified by conservation area plans, i.e. all those identified on the inset maps. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)
- It is suggested that the kind of protection proposed by DMC4B is akin to the protection given to “Local Green Space” referred to in paras 76 and 77 of the NPPF, but it is questioned whether there is evidence that the considerations set out in those paragraphs has been addressed. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.37	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.2	Y	Y M12	N	N
3.38	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.3	Y	Y M13	N	N
3.39	PDNPA	-	INT1.18	Y	Y	N	N
3.40	PDNPA	-	INT1.19	Y	Y M3.14	N	N
3.41	PDNPA	-	INT1.20	Y	Y M3.15	N	N
3.41	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M3.16	N	N
3.41	PDNPA	-	INT2	Y	Y M3.16	N	N
DMC4	PDNPA	-	-	Y	N	Y M3.17	N
DMC4	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.8	N	N	N	Y
DMC4	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.3	Y	N	N	Y
DMC4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.18	Y	N	N	Y
DMC4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.19	N	N	N	Y
DMC4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.20	N	N	N	Y
DMC4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.22	N	Y	N	Y
DMC4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.23	N	N	N	Y

DMC4	PDNPA	-	INT2.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.21	N	N	N	Y

DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that part 12 of the NPPF, particularly paras 133 and 134 requires a planning authority to weigh public benefits against any harm to the heritage asset and that DMC5 doesn't interpret "exceptional circumstances" (expressed in Core Strategy policy L3B) in this context because there is no provision to balance public benefit against impact on heritage assets. It is therefore suggested that the policy is incompatible with the NPPF (Peak Park Parishes Forum) *
- It is suggested that the supporting text to DMC5 doesn't explain how non designated heritage assets are considered to be such by the Authority so there is no indication of the criteria to be applied in arriving at that judgement. It is suggested that criteria for arriving at that judgement should include the value of a building to the local community (Peak Park Parishes Forum) *
- It is suggested that DMC5 A (ii) is contrary to NPPF paras 128 and 131 – 134 in requiring an applicant to demonstrate why the proposed development is desirable or necessary (Emery Planning Partnership)
- It is suggested that DMC5 F(i), (ii) and (iii) are unsound because they are not consistent with NPPF paragraphs 133-134, which requires decision makers to weigh harm/loss against public benefits. DMC5 Part F by comparison appears to allow no harm or loss (however minor) to any heritage assets. The policy therefore fails to recognise that alterations and additions to heritage assets are sometimes required in order to keep them in good repair, fit for purpose and viable for the future. The policy is also negatively couched because it does not recognise the scope for enhancements to be secured, for example by removing inappropriate modern elements. (National Trust)
- The NPPF requirement to weigh public benefits (positive benefits) against less than significant impact is not reflected in this policy (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification	Request for hearing
-------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

				respondent Y/N	Y/N	proposed by NPA Y/N	
3.43	PDNPA	-	INT1.21	Y	Y	N	N
3.46	Stella McGuire	10	10.6	Y	Y M3.18	N	N
3.46	PDNPA	-	INT1.22	Y	Y M3.18	N	N
3.47	PDNPA	-	INT1.23	Y	Y M3.19	N	N
3.49	PDNPA	-	INT1.24	Y	Y M3.20	N	N
3.51	PDNPA	-	INT1.25	Y	Y M3.21	N	N
3.51	PDNPA	-	INT1.26	Y	Y M3.22	N	N
3.51	Stella McGuire	10	10.7	Y	Y M3.23	N	N
3.51	Stella McGuire	10	10.9	Y	Y M3.23	N	N
3.52	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M3.24	N	N
3.52	PDNPA	-	INT1.27	Y	N	N	N
3.52	Stella McGuire	10	10.12	Y	N	N	N
3.53	PDNPA	-	INT1.28	Y	N	N	N
3.55	PDNPA	-	INT1.31	Y	Y M3.25	N	N
3.54	PDNPA	-	INT1.30	Y	Y M3.26	N	N
3.55	PDNPA	-	INT1.29	Y	Y M3.27	N	N
3.56	PDNPA	-	INT1.32	Y	Y M3.28	N	N
3.58	PDNPA	-	INT1.33	Y	Y M3.29	N	N
3.58	PDNPA	-	INT1.34	Y	Y M3.30	N	N
3.53	Stella McGuire	10	10.13	Y	N	N	N
3.58	Stella McGuire	10	10.14	Y	Y M3.30	N	N
3.60	Stella McGuire	10	10.16	Y	Y M3.31	N	N
3.60	PDNPA	-	INT1.35	Y	Y M3.31	N	N
3.61	PDNPA	-	INT1.36	Y	N	N	N
3.61	PDNPA	-	INT1.37	Y	Y M3.32	N	N
Page 26	Stella McGuire	10	10.10	Y	N	N	N
Page 26	Stella McGuire	10	10.11	Y	N	N	N
Page 26	Stella McGuire	10	10.8	Y	N	N	N
3.63	PDNPA	-	INT1.38	Y	Y M3.33	N	N

3.64	PDNPA	-	INT1.39	Y	N	N	N
3.64	PDNPA	-	INT1.40	Y	N	N	N
3.64	PDNPA	-	INT1.41	Y	N	N	N
3.64	Stella McGuire	10	10.17	Y	Y M3.34	N	N
3.66	PDNPA	-	INT1.42	Y	Y M3.35	N	N
DMC5	Allen Newby PME Planning Services	9	9.2	N	N	Y M3.36	Y
DMC5	Stella McGuire	10	10.18	Y	N	N	N
DMC5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.29	N	N	N	Y
DMC5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.30	N	N	N	Y
DMC5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.31	N	N	N	Y
DMC5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.32	N	N	N	Y
DMC5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.33	N	N	N	Y
DMC5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.34	N	N	N	Y
DMC5	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.13	Y	N	Y	Y
DMC5 3.71	Emery Planning	48	48.2	N	N	Y	Y
DMC5	National Trust	50	50.5	N	N	Y	Y
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.43	Y	Y M3.37	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.44	Y	Y M3.38	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.45	Y	Y M3.39	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.46	Y	N	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.47	Y	Y M3.40	N	N
DMC5	Peter Abbott	24	24.5	Y	Y M3.41	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.48	Y	N	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.49	Y	N	N	N
DMC5	PDNPA	-	INT1.50	Y	N	N	N

DMC6: Schedule Monuments

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the Core Strategy pre-dates the NPPF and as such pre-dates up to date government guidance on heritage assets and the requirement to weigh public benefits (positive benefits) against impact. (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.67	PDNPA	-	INT1.51	Y	Y M3.42	N	N
3.68	PDNPA	-	INT1.52	Y	Y M3.43	N	N
3.69	PDNPA	-	INT1.53	Y	N	N	N
3.72	PDNPA	-	INT1.57	Y	N	N	N
3.73	PDNPA	-	INT1.58	Y	N	N	N
3.73	Stella McGuire	10	10.18	Y	Y M3.45	N	N
3.77	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M3.47		N
DMC6	Peter Abbott	24	24.6	Y	Y M3.57	N	N
DMC6	Stanton in Peak PC	33	33.4	Y	N	N	Y
DMC6	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.12	N	N	N	Y
DMC6	National Trust	50	50.8	Y	N	N	Y
DMC6	Rowsley PC	69	69.4	Y	N	N	N
DMC6	PDNPA	-	INT1.54	Y	N	N	N
DMC6	PDNPA	-	INT1.55	Y	N	N	N
DMC6	PDNPA	-	INT1.56	Y	N	Y	N

DMC7: Listed Buildings

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that DMC7 A (ii) is unsound as it is not consistent with NPPF paragraphs 131-134, and 140 of the NPPF in requiring an applicant to demonstrate why the proposed development is desirable and necessary.(Emery Planning Partnership , Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- It is suggested that DMC7 A (ii) is unsound as it is not consistent with NPPF paragraphs 131-134, and 140 of the NPPF in requiring an applicant to demonstrate why the proposed development is desirable and necessary (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- It is suggested that DMC7 Parts D and E are unduly restrictive in light of the NPPF paragraphs 133 and 134 (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd) and that the criteria of part D are unnecessary in the light of Listed Building legislation.
- It is suggested that if criterion in Part D is retained, the policy should acknowledge the need to consider public benefit of the development proposed. (Peak Park Parishes Forum) *

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
DMC7	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.11	Y	N	N	Y
DMC7	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.8	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Emery Planning	48	48.3	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Fisher German pp Tissington Estate	52	52.1	Y	N	N	N
DMC7	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.2	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.3	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.4	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Roger Yarwood Planning	60	60.5	N	N	N	Y

	Consultants Ltd						
DMC7	PDNPA	-	INT1.59	Y	Y M3.46	N	N
DMC7	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.25	Y	N	N	Y
DMC7	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.26	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.37	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	National Trust	50	50.9	Y	N	N	Y

DMC8: Conservation Areas

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the Authority's policy and evidence on open spaces is not compatible with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 126 (Peak Park Parishes Forum) and that the mapping for these spaces leads to confusion (Peak Park Parishes Forum* and Taddington Parish Council)
- It is suggested that DMC8C is not justified because anyone has the right to submit an outline planning application (and this needn't be problematic because the planning authority has the right to ask for further information) (Peak Park Parishes Forum) *
- It is suggested that DMC8D and DMC10 A are contrary to NPPF paragraph 12 (Peak Park Parishes Forum) *
- It is suggested that DMC8F is dubious in terms of the legality of the requirement. (Peak Park Parishes Forum* and Great Hucklow Parish Council)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.76	Stella McGuire	10	10.20	Y	N	N	N
3.76	PDNPA	-	INT1.60	Y	N	N	N

3.79	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.27	Y	Y M3.48	N	Y
3.79	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.28	Y	Y M3.48	N	Y
3.81	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.25	Y	Y M3.49		Y
3.81	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.26	Y	Y M3.49		Y
3.81	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.27	Y	Y M3.49		Y
3.82	PDNPA	-	INT1.61	Y	N	N	N
3.82	National Trust	50	50.10	Y	Y M3.50	N	N
3.83	PDNPA	-	INT1.62	Y	N	N	N
3.84	PDNPA	-	INT1.63	Y	N	N	N
DMC8	National Trust	50	50.11	Y	Y M3.51		N
DMC8	Taddington PC	19	19.2	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.26	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.27	N	Y M3.47	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.28	N	Y M3.47	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.38	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.39	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.40	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.41	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.9	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.1	Y	N	N	Y
DMC8	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.1	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	Fisher German pp Tissington Estate	52	52.2	Y	N	N	N
DMC8	Anita Dale	66	66.4	Y	N	N	N
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.24	Y	N	N	Y
DMC8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.25	N	N	N	Y
DMC8	PDNPA	1	1.64	Y	N	N	N
DMC8	National Trust	50	50.11	Y	Y M3.50	N	N
DMC8	PDNPA	-	INT1.66	Y	Y M3.51	N	N
DMC8	Taddington PC	19	19.3	N	N	N	Y
DMC8F	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.9	N	N	N	Y

DMC9: Registered parks and gardens

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the Core Strategy pre-dates the NPPF and as such pre-dates up to date government guidance on heritage assets and the requirement to weigh public benefits (positive benefits) against impact. (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.86	PDNPA	-	INT1.65	Y	N	N	N
3.87	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M3.52	N	N
DMC9	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.9	N	N	N	N
DMC9	National Trust	50	50.12	Y	N	N	N

DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that Paragraphs 3.107 and 3.108 conflict with draft policies DME2 (Farm Diversification), and DMH5, which would often involve the conversion of buildings that are not heritage assets. The NPPF para. 28 states that local plans should “support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and ‘well designed’ new buildings” (para 28). Para. 55 indicates that housing development which would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting is capable of being a very special circumstance. It is suggested that neither of these paragraphs is restricted to heritage assets and consequently, the draft paragraphs 3.107 and 3.108 are in direct conflict with the NPPF. (Emery Planning)

- It is suggested that elements of DMC10 are inconsistent with the Core Strategy. For example, "DCM10.A.iii. It is unlikely that a "higher intensity use" (e.g. a dwelling house) in a smaller hamlets, farmsteads or groups of buildings will be in "sustainable locations" but such changes of use may nevertheless be acceptable under Core Strategy Policy. (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd).
- It is suggested that "Part B and Part.C.i and ii are not consistent with Core Strategy HC1.C. (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- It is suggested that Part A. Criterion A (iii) restricts the locations in which the conversion of heritage assets will be permitted whereas Paragraph 28 of the NPPF states that Local Plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, including through the conversion of existing buildings. NPPF also requires Local Plans to "support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside." (para. 28). NPPF does not restrict such development to that occurring within settlements, smaller hamlets, and farmsteads and in groups of buildings. Similarly, paragraph 55 of the NPPF indicates that residential conversions in isolated locations may be acceptable where, "development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting". It is suggested that proposed criterion A (iii) would thwart Core Strategy HC1 compliant proposals that accorded with paragraph 55 of the NPPF and that DMC10 is therefore not consistent with existing local or national policy. (Emery Planning)
- It is suggested that Part A(iv) ought to reflect the NPPF 133-134 required balancing exercise. (National Trust)
- It is suggested that Part B and the draft paragraphs in the main text, are in conflict with Core Strategy Policy HC1 (New Housing) which states that "exceptionally, new housing (whether newly built or from re-use of an existing building) can be accepted" subject to specified criteria, none of which restrict conversions to heritage assets alone. (Emery Planning)
- It is suggested that Part B, by preventing possible re-use, to high intensity uses, of buildings that are not heritage assets, could be considered contrary to NPPF paragraph 55 which, in the context of housing delivery by re-use of buildings in isolate locations, allows for possible re-use of redundant or disused buildings where that leads to an enhancement of the immediate setting. It is suggested that it is also inconsistent with Core Strategy HC1Ci) which enables re-use of 'valued vernacular' buildings to residential use (i.e. a higher intensity use) but does not limit that to heritage assets. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)
- It is suggested that Part B and supporting paragraphs 3.107-3.108 prevent the conversion of buildings that are not heritage assets, to higher intensity uses. Paragraph 3.108 states that these buildings will rarely be worthy of conversion to higher intensity uses and as such, their conversion "will not be permitted". The statement that these will "rarely be worthy of conversion" suggests there will be instances where such buildings are worthy of conversion. It is suggested there are situations where the conversion of a disused building could lead to enhancements to the immediate/wider setting in accordance with paragraph 55 of the NPPF and that the application of a blanket ban on conversion is therefore not justified under the tests in paragraph 182 of the NPPF. (Emery Planning)

- It is suggested that DMC10 Part C essentially repeats Core Strategy HC1 part C and is therefore unnecessary. (Emery Planning)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.90	PDNPA	-	INT1.66	Y	Y M3.53	N	N
3.91	PDNPA	-	INT1.67	Y	N	N	N
3.92	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M3.54	N	N
3.93	PDNPA	-	INT1.68	Y	Y M3.55	N	N
3.94	PDNPA	-	INT1.69	Y	Y M3.56	N	N
3.97	PDNPA	-	INT1.70	Y	Y M3.57	N	N
3.98	PDNPA	-	INT1.71	Y	Y M3.56	N	N
3.98	PDNPA	-	INT1.72	Y	N	N	N
3.99	PDNPA	-	INT1.73	Y	N	N	N
3.106	PDNPA	-	INT1.74	Y	Y	N	N
3.106	PDNPA	-	INT1.75	Y	Y M3.58	N	N
3.107	PDNPA	-	INT1.76	Y	N	N	N
3.107 -	Emery Planning	48	48.6	N	N	N	Y
3.107/3.109	Stella McGuire	10	10.21	Y	N	N	N
3.108	Stella McGuire	10	10.22	Y	N	N	N
3.109	Stella McGuire	10	10.23	Y	Y	N	N
3.109	Stella McGuire	10	10.24	Y	Y	N	N
DMC10	Peter Abbott	24	24.6	Y	Y M3.59	N	N
DMC10	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.6	N	N	Y M3.60	Y
DMC10 3.92	Holme Valley PC	7	7.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC10	PDNPA	-	INT1.78	Y	N	N	N
DMC10	Allen Newby	9	9.3	Y	N	Y M3.61	Y
DMC10	Roger Yarwood Planning	60	60.7	N	N	N	Y

	Consultants Ltd						
DMC10	Stella McGuire	10	10.25	Y	N	N	N
DMC10	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.42	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.43	Y	N	N	Y
DMC10	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.44	Y	N	N	Y
DMC10	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.45	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.46	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.47	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	Peter Abbott	24	24.7	Y	N	N	N
DMC10	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.1	N	N	N	Y
DMC10 3.89 -3.109	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.8	N	N	N	N
DMC10 3.107 -3.109	Emery Planning	48	48.4	N	N	N	Y
DMC10 3.107 – 3.108	Emery Planning	48	48.5	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	Emery Planning	48	48.7	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	National Trust	50	50.13	N	N	N	Y
DMC10	PDNPA	-	INT1.77	Y	N	N	N
DMC10	PDNPA	-	INT1.78	Y	N	N	N

DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing conservation interests

Summary of issues raised

- Suggestion that aiming for no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity will not be effective in promoting an improvement, over time, in the biodiversity of the National Park, and thereby to its resilience to climate change and its ability to provide ecosystem services, both to the communities within the Park and to its beneficiaries in adjacent urban areas. (Friends of the Peak District)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.111	Stella McGuire	10	10.26	Y	N	N	N
3.112	PDNPA	-	INT1.79	Y	Y M3.62	N	N
3.113	PDNPA	-	INT1.80	Y	N	N	N
3.114	Stella McGuire	10	10.27	Y	N	N	N
3.115	Stella McGuire	10	10.28	Y	Y M3.63	N	N
3.120	Stella McGuire	10	10.29	Y	Y M3.64	N	N
DMC11	Stella McGuire	10	10.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC11	Natural England	22	22.2	Y	N	N	N
DMC11	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.11	N	N	Y M3.65	Y
DMC11	National Trust	50	50.14	Y	N	N	N

DMC12: Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological, or geomorphological importance

Summary of issues raised

- No responders objected to this policy on soundness grounds but three responders requested a hearing on the two points below

- It is suggested that in part B ‘Exceptional circumstances’ should probably be followed by ‘where development may be permitted’ (as per Part A). It is suggested that it should also be made clear that the term ‘management’ in DMC12 Bi refers to management for the nature conservation interests for which the site is important. Otherwise, the word can be misinterpreted to refer to all types of management that do or could take place on that site, some of which might be regarded as ‘essential’ in terms of another aspect of the management of the site but which would be damaging to the nature conservation interest. (National Trust)
- It is suggested that Part C of the policy does not make clear whether ‘loss’/‘harm’ relates only to impacts on the special interest of the site, or to all impacts of the development on wildlife/geology, or to the impacts of the development taken as a whole.(National Trust)
- It is suggested that a maintained and regularly updated list of locations of sites, features or species, wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance would be helpful otherwise developers may be unaware of them. It isn’t clear that such a list exists or is intended. (Rowsley PC)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
DMC12	Natural England	22	22.3	Y	N	N	N
DMC12	Stanton in Peak PC	33	33.5	Y	N	N	Y
DMC12	National Trust	50	50.15	Y	N	N	Y
DMC12	Rowsley PC	69	69.5	Y	N	N	Y
DMC12	PDNPA	-	INT2.15	Y	N	N	N
DMC12	PDNPA	-	INT1.81	Y	Y M3.66	N	N

DMC13: Protecting trees, woodland or other landscape features put at risk by development

Summary of issues raised

- No responders objected to this policy on soundness grounds.
- Policy is sound because it complies with NPPF paragraph 118. (Natural England, National Trust and Woodland Trust)

- Parts B and C of the policy should include a commitment to ensuring that layouts avoid future threats to trees in the future, e.g. because of root damage, boundary issues, proximity to buildings etc. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
3.121	PDNPA	-	INT1.82	Y	Y M3.67	N	N
3.122	PDNPA	-	INT1.83	Y	Y M3.68	N	N
3.125	PDNPA	-	INT1.84	Y	Y M3.69	N	N
DMC13	Natural England	22	22.4	Y	N	N	Y
DMC13	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.48	Y	N	N	Y
DMC13	National Trust	50	50.16	Y	N	N	N
DMC13	The Woodland Trust	55	55.1	Y	Y M3.70	N	N

DMC14: Pollution and disturbance

Summary of issues raised

- Policy is not sound because there is no reference to roads or vehicle movements which they consider are a primary cause of air, light and noise pollution. (Friends of the Peak District)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by	Main modification proposed by	Request for hearing
-------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------

					NPA	NPA	
3.128	United Utilities	44	44.3	Y	Y M3.71	N	N
DMC14	Peter Abbott	24	24.8	Y	N	N	N
DMC14	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.13	N	N	N	Y
DMC14	National Trust	50	50.17	Y	N	N	N

DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land

Summary of issues raised

- Invasive species should be considered ‘contaminated land’ and afforded that status in policy (Rowsley and Stanton in Peak PCs)
- It would be useful to add in advice on applying part B (United Utilities).

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
DMC15	Stanton in Peak PC	33	33.6	Y	N	N	Y
DMC15	United Utilities	44	44.4	Y	N	N	N
DMC15	Rowsley PC	69	69.6	Y	N	N	Y
DMC15	PDNPA	-	INT2.6	Y	N	N	N

Chapter 4: Farming and Economy

Strategic context

Summary of main issues raised

- The scope for new businesses in the open countryside is seen as too limited by constituent councils (High Peak Borough and Staffordshire Moorlands)
- The need for high value low impact jobs requires a much more permissive housing policy to attract those who would provide such jobs (Great Hucklow Parish Council)
- The evidence of strategic need for employment sites is questioned with the inference that the figures given as the basis for the safeguarding policy are too low (Staffordshire Moorlands District Council)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for hearing
4.2	PDNPA	-	INT1.85	Y	Y M4.1	N	N
4.3	PDNPA	-	INT1.86	Y	Y M4.2	N	N
4.4	PDNPA	-	INT1.87	Y	Y M4.3	N	N
4.6	PDNPA	-	INT1.88	Y	N	N	N
4.9	PDNPA	-	INT2.9	Y	Y M4.4	N	N
4.9	Stella McGuire	10	10.31	Y	N	N	N
4.9	PDNPA	-	INT2.7	Y	N	N	N
4.10	PDNPA	-	INT1.89	Y	Y M4.5	N	N

DME1: Agricultural or forestry operational development

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested there is conflict between DME1 (D&E) and paras 4.13-4.15 because the implication is that ‘modern’ agricultural buildings are effectively temporary, while ‘traditional’ agricultural buildings are intrinsic to the character of the place. This implies that ‘traditional’ agriculture is more appropriate to the National Park than contemporary agricultural practice. This is suggested as being at odds with supporting the continuing role of agriculture with such wording as ‘critical to the ongoing conservation and enhancement of the National Park landscape.’ (para 4.13) (Friends of Peak District)
- It is suggested that the wording of Policy DME1 is not clear so the policy is likely to lead to misunderstandings, and thus be ineffective. (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)
- It is suggested that policy could make it difficult for farmers and other land management organisations to implement higher environmental and welfare standards so would be unsound by virtue of failing to be positively prepared and consistent with NPPF paragraph 28 (National Trust)
- It is suggested that the word “proven” in part A sets the bar too high and should be replaced with “shown.” (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- It is suggested that parts A(v) and A(vi) will place an additional unnecessary burden on the farmer and that part A(x) is meaningless, wholly unreasonable and unnecessary. (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by	Main modification proposed by	Hearing request
--------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------

					NPA	NPA	
4.11	PDNPA	-	INT1.90	Y	Y M4.6	N	N
4.11	Stella McGuire	10	10.32	Y	Y M4.7	N	N
4.11	PDNPA	-	INT1.91	Y	N	N	N
DME1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.14	N	N	N	Y
DME1	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.6	N	Y M4.8	N	N
DME1	National Trust	50	50.18	N	N	N	Y
DME1	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.8	N	N	N	Y
DME1	PDNPA	-	INT1.92	Y	N	N	N

DME2: Farm diversification

Summary of issues raised

- Some concern was expressed that diversification is a green light for loss of farms to holiday accommodation and uses that ‘prettify’ the working landscape (Stanton in Peak and Rowsley Parish Councils)
- Some concern was expressed that policy has to do more than simply support land management business and that the diversifying use and activity must be appropriate in its own right in the landscape before consideration of the benefits it might bring to the primary land management business. (PPPF)
- It is suggested that certain elements of draft Policy DME2 are not sound when considered against paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework because no justification is provided for the restrictions that would be imposed by Part A and paragraph 206 of the NPPF makes it clear that such restrictive planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. There is no evidence that the above could be demonstrated in the case of every application for farm diversification and the issues should therefore be addressed through the imposition of conditions on a case by case basis, where the relevant tests are met. Accordingly, it is suggested that part A is both unjustified, unnecessary, in conflict with the NPPF and does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives and proportionate evidence. (Emery Planning)
- It is suggested that Part A does not provide flexibility to the rural and farming economy because when a business unit becomes vacant there needs to be flexibility to market that building to a wide variety of businesses and secure continued support and growth to the local rural economy in line with the NPPF and Government Policy in the Rural Productivity Plan. (Fisher German pp Tissington Estate)

- It is suggested that Part B is contrary to Government policy because it would restrict the growth and development of rural businesses and prevent suitable rural businesses becoming a greater part of any traditional farm business. (Fisher German pp Tissington Estate)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
4.13	PDNPA	-	INT1.93	Y	N	N	N
4.14	PDNPA	-	INT1.94	Y	N	N	N
4.16	PDNPA	-	INT1.95	Y	Y M4.9	N	N
4.17	Stella McGuire	10	10.33	Y	Y M4.10	N	N
4.19	Stella McGuire	10	10.34	Y	Y M4.11	N	N
4.19	PDNPA	-	INT2.8	Y	Y M4.11	N	N
DME2	Chapel-en-le-Frith PC	12	12.6	Y	N	N	N
DME2	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.15	Y	N	N	Y
DME2	Stanton in Peak PC (+Sue Fogg)	33	33.7	Y	N	N	N
DME2	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.4	Y	N	N	N
DME2	Emery Planning	48	48.8	Y	N	N	Y
DME2	National Trust	50	50.19	Y	N	N	N
DME2	Fisher German (Kay Davies)	52	52.3	Y	N	N	N
DME2	Rowsley PC	69	69.7	Y	N	N	N
DME2	PDNPA	-	INT2.9	Y	N	N	N
DME2	PDNPA	-	INT1.96	Y	Y M4.12	N	N
DME2	PDNPA	-	INT2.9	Y	Y M4.12	N	N
DME2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.49	Y	N	N	Y

DME2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.52	Y	N	N	Y
------	---------------------------	----	-------	---	---	---	---

DME3: Safeguarding employment sites

Summary of issues raised

- There is a need to guard against loss of employment space and it is noticed that some sites are becoming dominated by other uses (Friends of Peak District and Derbyshire Dales District Council)
- Long term protection of sites is contrary to the NPPF and should be avoided (IBA Planning pp Don Clapham)
- It is suggested that using evidence derived through a neighbourhood plan for decision-making purposes, in conjunction with the additional policy requirements is inappropriate because paragraphs 160 and 161 of the NPPF state that it is for the local authority to collate an appropriate evidence base and have a clear understanding of business needs and economic markets within its area. Furthermore, it is suggested that the reference to “any adopted neighbourhood plan evidence or policy” within the presently proposed draft policy conflicts with paragraph 184 of the NPPF which clearly provides that it is for the Local Plan to take a clear planning policy lead on key sites. (NLP pp Litton Properties)
- It is suggested that the burden of policy requirements is a particularly important consideration where sites are subject to constraints, and that the effective double layering of policy requirements fails to fully recognise the wider economic and employment impacts. In doing so it is suggested that this could prevent viable and achievable development proposals from coming forward. Consequently it is suggested that the DME3 is contrary to the objectives of paragraph 21 of the NPPF, which provides that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations. (NLP pp Litton Properties)
- It is suggested that Riverside Business Park has a range of complex physical and environmental constraints including historical assets, flood risk, and ecology, each of which imposes significant limitations on development. It is suggested that proposals to bring the site forward for development have sought to maximise its economic contribution, both to Bakewell and the wider National Park area. It is suggested that in accordance with Paragraph 21 of the Framework regard should be given to the difficulties these barriers present to investment and that the policy should not result in additional burdens which would be likely to prevent future development activity. For example, it is accepted that the existing accessibility issues would be improved through the construction of a new bridge over the River Wye but it is suggested that there are significant viability constraints to its construction. Having the scope to accommodate high value uses within the site would contribute significantly to the viability of the scheme, facilitating the sustainable redevelopment of the site in accordance with the core planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. It perhaps needs its own policy (NLP pp Litton Properties)

- The safeguarding approach has not been effective in preventing change of use from class B1 business uses and undermining the amount of B1 accommodation available going forward. The policy needs to be clearer about how it will prevent loss of business space in reality (Friends of the Peak District)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
4.21	Stella McGuire	10	10.35	Y	Y M4.13	N	N
4.21	PDNPA	-	INT1.97	Y	Y M4.13	N	N
4.22	Stella McGuire	10	10.36	Y	Y M4.13	N	N
4.21	PDNPA	-	INT4.9	Y	Y M4.13	N	N
4.22	Stella McGuire	10	10.37	Y	Y M4.14	N	N
4.22	Stella McGuire	10	10.38	Y	Y M4.14	N	N
4.23	PDNPA	-	INT2.10	Y	N	N	N
DME3	Stella McGuire	10	10.39	Y	Y M4.15	N	N
DME3	Stella McGuire	10	10.40	Y	Y M4.15	N	N
DME3	Stella McGuire	10	10.41	Y	Y M4.15	N	N
DME3	PDNPA	-	INT4.23	Y	Y M4.15	N	N
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.7	N	Y M4.15	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.8	N	Y M4.15	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.10	N	Y M4.15	N	Y
DME3	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.16	Y	N	N	Y
DME3	Stanton in Peak PC (Sue Fogg)	33	33.8	Y	N	N	N
DME3	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.5	Y	N	N	N
DME3	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.10	Y	N	N	N
DME3	IBA Planning on behalf of D Clapham	46	46.1	N	N	N	N

DME3	IBA Planning on behalf of D Clapham	46	46.2	N	N	N	N
DME3	IBA Planning on behalf of D Clapham	46	46.3	N	N	N	N
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.11	Y	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.12	Y	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.13	Y	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.14	N	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.15	N	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.16	N	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.6	N	N	N	Y
DME3	NLP pp Litton Properties	57	57.9	N	N	N	Y
DME3	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.5	N	N	N	N
DME3	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.5	Y	N	N	N
DME3	Rowsley PC	69	69.8	Y	N	N	N
DME3-5	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.6	N	N	N	N
DME3-5	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.6	N	N	N	N

DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under occupied employment sites in DS1 settlements

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the 12 months marketing requirement is unreasonable because in some cases the change of use will be desirable from a planning point of view and in other cases, keeping a building unused for 12 months is an unreasonable burden on the owner. (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- It is suggested that the section following part A is confusingly drafted and completely unnecessary. (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd)
- The policy should refer to sites inside or on the edge of settlements to be compatible with other policies. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
4.26 new sub heading	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M4.16	N	N
4.26	Stella McGuire	10	10.42	Y	Y M4.17	N	N
4.27	PDNPA	-	INT1.98	Y	N	N	N
4.29	Stella McGuire	10	10.43	Y	N	N	N
4.31	Stella McGuire	10	10.44	Y	Y M4.18	N	N
4.32	Stella McGuire	10	10.45	Y	N	N	N
4.32	PDNPA	-	INT1.99	Y	N	N	N
4.34	Stella McGuire	10	10.46	Y	Y M4.19	N	N
4.36	PDNPA	-	INT1.100	Y	N	N	N
4.37	PDNPA	-	INT2.11	Y	N	N	N
4.37	Stella McGuire	10	10.47	Y	Y M4.20	N	N
4.37	Stella McGuire	10	10.48	Y	Y M4.20	N	N
4.37	Stella McGuire	10	10.49	Y	N	N	N
4.37	PDNPA	-	INT1.101	Y	Y M4.20	N	N
4.41	PDNPA	-	INT1.102	Y	N	N	N
4.41	Stella McGuire	10	10.51	Y	Y M4.21	N	N
4.42	Stella McGuire	10	10.52	Y	N	N	N
4.42	Stella McGuire	10	10.53	Y	Y M4.22	N	N
DME4	Stella McGuire	10	10.54	Y	Y M4.23	N	N
DME4	Peak Park Parishes Forum	23	23.56	N	Y M4.23	N	Y
DME4	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.9	N	N	Y M4.23	Y
DME4	PDNPA	-	INT2.12	Y	Y M4.23	N	N
DME4	PDNPA	-	INT1.103	Y	N	N	N

DME5: Class B1 Employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 settlements

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that personal consents are rarely acceptable and are likely to fail the six tests set out in PPG. Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 21a-015-20140306. (though it is noted that they will only be used in exceptional circumstances) National Planning Policy Guidance states that “Unless the permission otherwise provides, planning permission runs with the land and it is rarely appropriate to provide otherwise” (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 21a-015-20140306). It is accepted that there may be circumstances where the withdrawal of permitted development rights or the grant of a personal or temporary permission does meet the tests for a valid planning condition, but this would only be the case where it were necessary to ensure compliance with other local and national policy requirements. It is claimed that an assessment of proposals in the normal manner would identify whether such restrictive conditions were required and that there is therefore no justification to include a policy relating to what can, under national guidance, be an exceptional use of such conditions. (Allen Newby PME Planning Services Ltd)
- It is suggested that whilst Core Strategy policy E2A envisages new build by way of replacement, DME5 is silent on this issue and that this therefore limits the scope of the Core Strategy policy E2. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- It is claimed that Part B to policy DME5 is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. (Emery Planning)
- The policy should give provision for the NPA to agreed discontinued use in order to free up land/buildings to other uses without restriction to temporary uses. A Chatsworth specific policy would help (Chatsworth Settlement Trust)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
4.46	PDNPA	-	INT2.13	Y	Y M4.24	N	N
4.46	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.50	Y	Y M4.24	N	Y
4.46	PDNPA	-	INT4.22	Y	Y M4.25	N	N
4.47	PDNPA	-	INT1.104	Y	N	N	N

4.47	PDNPA	-	INT1.105	Y	Y M4.25	N	N
4.47	PDNPA	-	INT4.22	Y	Y M4.25	N	N
DME5	Allen Newby PME Planning Services Ltd	9	9.4	N	N	N	N
DME5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.50	Y	N	N	Y
DME5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.51	N	N	N	Y
DME5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.53	Y	N	N	Y
DME5	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.5	N	N	N	N
DME5	Emery Planning	48	48.9	N	N	N	Y
DME5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.55	N	N	N	Y

DME6: Home working

Summary of issues raised

- There were no representations on soundness issues

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Page 52 footnote	PDNPA	-	INT1.106	Y	Y M4.26	N	N
4.48	PDNPA	-	INT2.14	Y	Y M4.27	N	N
4.48	Great Hucklow Parish Council	43	43.4	Y	Y M4.27	N	Y

4.48	PDNPA	-	INT1.107	Y	N	N	N
------	-------	---	----------	---	---	---	---

DME7: Expansion of existing industrial and business development where it is not ancillary to agricultural business

Summary of issues raised

- There were no representations on soundness issues

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
4.49	Great Hucklow Parish Council	43	43.4	Y	Y M4.28	N	Y
4.49	Martin Beer	56	56.2	Y	Y M4.28	N	N
4.50	PDNPA	-	INT4.24	Y	Y M4.29	N	N
4.51	PDNPA	-	INT4.14	Y	Y M4.30	N	N
4.55	PDNPA	-	INT2.15	Y	Y M4.31	N	N
4.55	PDNPA	-	INT4.14	Y	N M4.32	N	N
DME7	Stella McGuire	10	10.55	Y	Y M4.33	N	N
DME7	PDNPA	-	INT1.107	Y	Y M4.33	N	N

DME8: Design layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots

Summary of issues raised

- There were no representations on soundness issues.

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Respondent considers it sound	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
4.60	PDNPA	-	INT4.16	Y	Y M4.34	N	N
4.64	Stella McGuire	10	10.56	Y	Y M4.35	N	N
4.65	Stella McGuire	10	10.57	Y	Y M4.36	N	N
4.65	PDNPA	-	INT1.109	Y	Y M4.36	N	N

Chapter 5 Recreation and Tourism

Summary of main issues raised within Strategic Context and wider text:

- There is no reference to the Recreation Hubs SPD that the Authority is working on. (National Trust)

List of responses

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main Modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request?
Para 5.1 to Para 5.4	National Trust	50	50.20	N	N	Y M5.2/M5.3/M 5.4	No

Policy DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites

Summary of main issues raised:-

- DMR1C only allows for the provision of one shepherds hut, is questionable. (Allen Newby)
- Why are pods and shepherds huts referred to specifically in DMR1, there are other options including gypsy caravans or converted horse boxes. (Allen Newby)
- DMR1A should refer to “*neighbouring residents and uses*”. (Great Hucklow Parish Council)
- How can the policy reflect and address the impact of new or expanded sites on the surrounding road network as the PDNPA is not the highway authority? (Stanton in Peak Parish Council (+ Sue Fogg), Rowsley Parish Council)
- A question as to the reasonableness of the restriction on static caravans, chalets and lodges within the National Park. (Greg Potter)
- Tourism policies must be sufficiently flexible to allow businesses to adapt to changing economic trends and changes in demands from tourists. This includes allowing existing sites to develop and enhance their facilities. (The Caravan Club)

Listing of responses

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main Modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request?
DMR1	Allen Newby	9	9.5	Y	N	N	No
DMR1A	Great Hucklow Parish Council	23	23.57	N	N	N	No
DMR1	Stanton in Peak Parish Council (+ Sue Fogg)	33	33.9	Y	N	N	Yes
DMR1	The Caravan Club	37	37.1	Y	N	N	No
DMR1	Greg Potter	65	65.1	N	N	N	No
DMR1	Rowsley Parish Council	69	69.9	Y	N	N	Yes

Policy DMR2: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites

Summary of main issues raised: -

- Tourism policies must be sufficiently flexible to allow businesses to adapt to changing economic trends and changes in demands from tourists. This includes allowing existing sites to develop and enhance their facilities. (The Caravan Club)

Listing of responses

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main Modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request?
DMR2	The Caravan Club	37	37.1	Y	N	N	No

Policy DMR3: Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation

Summary of main issues raised: -

- It is unclear why if residential use is not suitable because of its relationship with adjoining house, that holiday occupancy is. (Stella McGuire)
- In relation to DMR3B(iii) the question is whether the property would fulfil a reasonable need as an affordable house, not its size. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- It is inappropriate to allow new build for holiday accommodation compared to for housing stock to allow for sustainable communities. Holiday lets should only be achieved through conversion. (Chelmorton Parish Council)

Listing of responses

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main Modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request?
DMR3	Stella McGuire	10	10.60	Y	N	N	No
DMR3C	Stella McGuire	10	10.61	Y	N	N	No
DMR3B(iii)	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.58	N	N	N	Yes
DMR3	Chelmorton Parish Council	26	26.3	N	N	N	No
DMR3	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.8	Y	N	N	No
DMR3B	PDNPA	-	INT6.1	N	N	Y M5.10	No

Policy DMR4: Facilities for keeping and riding horses

Summary of main issues raised: -

- Policy DMR4B should stipulate the use of those materials for building, most in keeping with the National Park, for example a building resembling like a traditional stone barn. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- The policy is too prescriptive and discourages more sustainable options that are more in tune with the landscape. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- The policy is prejudicial to those wishing to keep horses compared with other uses including farm buildings, employment or tourist sites. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- The consideration of cumulative impact of equestrian facilities would strengthen the policy. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*
- It may be difficult to locate equestrian facilities close to existing buildings in all cases; therefore some measure of flexibility is required / the requirement should be removed. (Emery Planning, Roger Yarwood Planning)
- The phrase within DMR4B “or a building that would lend itself to future conversion for such” should be removed, as the Authority already has existing powers to prevent change of use. (Roger Yarwood Planning)

List of responses

Para / policy	Respondent / agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main Modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request?
DMR4B	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.59	N	N	N	Yes
DMR4B	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.60	N	N	Y M5.12	Yes
DMR4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.61	N	N	N	Yes
DMR4C	Emery Planning	48	48.13	N	N	N	No
DMR4	Roger Yarwood Planning	60	60.10	N	N	N	No

Chapter 6: Housing

General

Summary of issues raised

- It is noted that the National Parks Circular 2010 absolves the National Park Authority from setting housing targets, but it suggested that this does not remove the other obligations required by the NPPF paragraph 50, and the need for policies that contribute to choice in the housing market, including starter homes and self-build. (PPPF*, Peter O Brien, Karen Bradley MP, High Peak Borough Council leader Cllr Tony Ashton)
- It is suggested that the National Park Authority should have assessed needs, as required by the NPPF, and either responded to them or demonstrated why they should not be met. (Derbyshire Dales District Council,)
- The NPA should have a housing target (High Peak Borough Council leader Cllr Tony Ashton)

- It is suggested that there is no incentive within policy whereby land can be released for affordable housing, and that therefore Paragraph 54 of the NPPF has not been addressed. (PPPF)
- It is suggested that the Core Strategy policy HC1 is not sound and that therefore housing policies in this part 2 plan cannot be considered sound. (Peter O'Brien)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
General	Osmaston and Yeldersley Parish Council	63	63.1	Y	N	N	N
General	Peter Abbott	24	24.2	Y	N	N	N
General	Peter O'Brien	64	64.1	N	N	N	Y
General	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.5	Y	N	N	Y
General	Great Hucklow PC	43	43.6	Y	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.62	N	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.63	N	N	N	Y
General	Karen Bradley MP	70	70.7	Y	N	N	N
General	Chelmorton PC	26	26.2	N	N	N	N
General	IBA Planning pp D Clapham	46	46.4	N	N	N	N
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.64	N	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.65	N	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.66	N	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.67	N	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.68	N	N	N	Y
General	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.69	N	N	N	Y
General	Karen Bradley MP	70	70.4	Y	N	N	Y
General	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.11	Y	N	N	N

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
General	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.12	Y	N	N	N
General	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.13	Y	N	N	N
General	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.14	Y	N	N	N
General	John Youatt	54	54.1	Y	N	N	Y
General	Anita Dale	66	66.5	Y	N	N	N
General	Stanton in peak PC (+Sue Fogg)	33	33.11	Y	N	N	N
General	Rowsley PC	69	69.12	Y	N	N	N
HC1	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.2	N	N	N	N
HC1	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.5	N	N	N	N
HC1	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.1	N	N	N	N
HC1	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.1	N	N	N	N

Strategic Context (up to paragraph 6.37)

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the real level of housing need across the Districts that make up the National Park area is not outlined and that this means that the strategic context for the policies that follow is unsound. (Staffordshire Moorlands MP Karen Bradley and High Peak Borough Council leader Tony Ashton)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.1	Stella McGuire	10	10.62	Y	Y M6.1	N	N
6.1	Peter Abbott	24	24.9	Y	Y M6.1	N	N
6.1	Peter O'Brien	64	64.7	N	N	N	Y
6.2	Peter O'Brien	64	64.9	N	N	N	Y
6.2	Peter O'Brien	64	64.11	N	N	N	Y
6.2	Bakewell and District Civic Society)	8	8.4	Y	N	N	N
6.2	Stella McGuire	10	10.63	Y	Y M6.2	N	N
6.2	Stella McGuire	10	10.64	Y	Y M6.2	N	N
6.2	Peter Abbott	24	24.4	Y	Y M6.2	N	N
6.2	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.17	Y	Y M6.2	N	Y
6.3	Peter O'Brien	64	64.6	N	N	N	Y
6.4	Peak Park Parishes Forum	23	23.64	Y	N	Y M6.3	Y
6.4	Gt Hucklow PC	43	43.5	N	N	Y M6.3	N
6.4	Stella McGuire	10	10.65	Y	Y M6.4	N	N
6.5	Peter O'Brien	64	64.12	N	N	N	Y
6.5	Peter O'Brien	64	64.13	N	N	N	Y
6.5	Peter O'Brien	64	64.14	N	N	N	Y
6.8	Peter O'Brien	64	64.8	N	N	N	Y
6.9	Stella McGuire	10	10.66	Y	Y M6.5	N	N
6.9	Stella McGuire	10	10.8	Y	N	N	N
6.10	Stella McGuire	10	10.67	Y	Y M6.6	N	N
6.10	Stella McGuire	10	10.67	Y	N	N	N
6.13	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT2.18	Y	Y M6.7	N	N
6.13	Anita Dale	66	66.6	Y	Y M6.7	N	N
6.14	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.4	Y	Y M6.8	N	N

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.13	Peak District Rural Housing Association	25	25.1	Y	Y M6.9	N	N
6.13	Peak District Rural Housing Association	25	25.2	Y	Y M6.9	N	N
6.14	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.86	N	Y M6.10	N	Y
Between 6.14 and 6.15	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.87	N	Y M6.11	N	Y
6.16	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M6.12	N	N
Between 6.18 and 6.19	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.87	N	Y M6.13	N	Y
6.17	Peter O'Brien	64	64.4	N	N	N	Y
	Peter O'Brien	64	64.5	N	N	N	Y
6.20 – 6.21	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.87	N	N	Y M6.14	N
6.29	Peak District Rural Housing Association	25	25.3	Y	N	N	N
6.28	Anita Dale	66	66.7	Y	N	N	N
	Emma Humphreys	71	71.1	Y	N	N	N
6.31	Peter O'Brien	64	64.3	N	N	N	Y
6.37	PDNPA	PDNPA	PDNPA	Y	Y M6.15	N	N
6.37	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.54	N	Y M6.15	N	Y
6.37	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.75	N	Y M6.15	N	Y
6.37	Friends of The Peak district	28	28.18	N	Y M6.15	N	Y
6.37	Allen Newby PME Planning Services	9	9.6	Y	Y M6.15	N	N
6.38	Peak District Rural Housing Association	25	25.4	Y	Y M6.16	N	N
6.38	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.73	N	Y M6.16	N	Y

DMH1: New Affordable housing

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the lack of housing target puts unreasonable pressure on communities around the National Park to accommodate more housing. (High Peak Borough Council leader, Tony Ashton and Staffordshire Moorlands MP, Karen Bradley)
- It is suggested that the housing need of parishes that border the National Park include starter and market homes, and that these ought to be provided in the National Park as well as outside. (High Peak Borough Council and Chapel en le Frith Town Council)
- It is noted that the 'in principle' position established in the Core strategy DS1 allows some types of development outside of DS1 settlement so it is suggested that it is unjustified to restrict new build affordable housing to DS1 settlements on the grounds of sustainable development. (PPPF)*
- It is suggested that the policy is unsound because it unnecessarily restricts demand and closes off options for other affordable housing products. (High Peak Borough Council Chapel Parish Council, Peter O Brien)
- The size thresholds are too low (PPPF*, Anita Dale, Friends of the Peak District, Peter O Brien)
- There is lack of reasoned justification for the policy (Peak Park Parishes Forum)*

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMH1	Allen Newby PME Planning Services	9	9.6	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Stella McGuire	10	10.69	Y	Y M6.17	N	N
DMH1	Chapel-en-le-Frith PC	12	12.3	N	N	N	N

DMH1	Chapel-en-le-Frith PC	12	12.5	N	N	N	N
DMH1	Waterhouses PC	17	17.1	Y	N	N	N
DMH1	Taddington PC	19	19.5	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.4	Y	N	N	N
DMH1, 6.9 - 6.29	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.5	Y	N	N	N
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.70	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.71	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.72	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.73	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.74	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.75	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.76	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1, 6.52	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.77	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.78	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1, 8.24	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.79	N	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.80	N	N	N	Y
DMH1	Peak District Rural Housing Association	25	25.5	Y	N	N	Y
DMH1	Anita Dale	66	66.8	Y	N	N	N
DMH1	Peter O'Brien	64	c	Y	Y	N	Y
DMH1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.18	N	N	N	Y
DMH1 & DMH2	Martin Beer	56	56.5	Y	N	N	N
DMH1, DMH2	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.6	N	N	N	N

DMH2: First occupation of affordable housing

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that the plan's definition of housing need is inadequate, and that the restrictions on occupancy based on this definition fail to recognise the requirements of NPPF paragraph 50, and, in addition, do not represent a positive response to the English National Parks and the Broads Vision and Circular, or the Authority's own National Park Management Plan with regard to the objective of maintaining vibrant and thriving villages. (PPPF, Peter O'Brien, Karen Bradley MP and High Peak Borough Council leader Cllr Tony Ashton)
- It is noted that notwithstanding policy DMH4: essential worker dwellings, policy DMH2 does not provide for those with an essential need to live near to their work to be allocated affordable housing as a first occupant. (PDRHA, Martin Beer)
- It is suggested that the ten year connection (allied to housing need) is an unjustified policy requirement. (Peter O'Brien, Derbyshire Dales District Council)
- It is suggested that this policy unnecessarily restricts demand and does not contribute to choice in the housing market. (High Peak Borough Council, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Martin Beer)
- It is not clear how other needs are to be addressed e.g. for elderly persons to downsize. (PPPF*, Staffordshire Moorlands MP Karen Bradley, High Peak Borough Council)
- The approach will not achieve thriving vibrant villages when measured against the NPMP but also paras 50 and 55 of the NPPF (Peak Park Parishes Forum*)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.52	Peter Abbott	24	24.10	Y	Y M6.18	N	N
6.52	PDNPA	4	4.8	Y	Y M6.18	N	N
DMH1 & DMH2	Martin Beer	56	56.5	Y	N	N	N
DMH1, DMH2	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.6	N	N	N	N
DMH2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.81	N	Y M6.10	N	Y

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMH2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.82	N	N	N	Y
DMH2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.83	N	N	N	Y
DMH2, 6.22	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.84	N	N	N	Y
DMH2	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.85	N	N	N	Y
DMH2	Peak District Rural Housing Association	25	25.6	N	N	N	Y
DMH2	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.15	Y	N	N	N
DMH2	Peter O'Brien	64	64.2	N	N	N	Y
DMH2 & DMH3	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.3	N	N	N	N
DMH2 & DMH3	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.3	N	N	N	N

DMH3: Second and subsequent occupation of affordable housing (the occupancy cascade)

Summary of issues raised

- No representation on soundness that don't repeat those made on DMH2, but clarifications suggested to part B to clarify that it is owners and managers of such houses that need to follow the policy requirements (Peter Abbott)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMH2 & DMH3	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.3	N	N	N	N

DMH2 & DMH3	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.3	N	N	N	N
DMH3	Peter Abbott	24	24.11	Y	Y M6.19	N	N
DMH3	Peter Abbott	24	24.12	Y	Y M6.19	N	N
DMH3	Peak District Rural Housing Assoc.n	25	25.7	Y	N	N	Y

DMH4: Essential worker dwellings

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that there is no need to restrict the size of the houses or restrict conversions to traditional buildings (PPPF*)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.57	Stella McGuire	10	10.71	Y	Y M6.20	N	N
6.62	Stella McGuire	10	10.72	Y	N	N	N
DMH4	PDNPA	PDNPA	PDNPA	Y	Y M6.21	N	N
DMH4	Stella McGuire	10	10.73	Y	Y M6.21	N	N
DMH4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.89	N	N	Y M6.21	Y
DMH4	Stella McGuire	10	10.73	Y	Y M6.22	N	N
DMH4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.88	N	N	N	Y

DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilages of existing dwellings by conversion or new build

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that where permission is required for either conversion (where the building is not currently in ancillary residential use or not within the curtilage or where the alterations exceed permitted development), or building of a new build ancillary dwelling, it should always be possible to secure its ancillary status through use of a planning condition. It is noted that National Planning Practice Guidance states that “It may be possible to overcome a planning objection to a development proposal equally well by imposing a condition on the planning permission or by entering into a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990”. (Emery Planning)
- It is claimed that the policy provision to use Section 106 legal agreements to tie the ancillary dwelling to the main dwelling in order to ensure its continued status as ancillary is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 203 and 204. (PPPF*)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.69	NFU (Paul Tame)	2	2.1	Y	Y M6.23	N	N
DMH5	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.91	N	N	N	Y
DMH5	Emery Planning	48	48.10	N	N	N	Y

DMH6: Re-development of previously developed land to dwelling use

Summary of issues raised

- It is questioned, from the preamble, or from the policy itself, why this policy is needed. Taking each bullet point in turn: All development must conserve and enhance (Core Strategy Policy GSP2 and GSP3) and DMC3; DMC3B(i), DMC4 and DMC8A(i) all deal with open areas (see above); Repetition of Core Strategy Policy HC1; Insofar as this is understood, it is dealt with as follows. It is not clear whether this policy is intended to enlarge upon Core Strategy Policy HC1 (CII) or has another purpose. However, the test in Core Strategy Policy HC1 for the redevelopment of sites (which could include buildings) is clear: conservation or enhancement within a DS1 settlement. It is therefore not understood why the list of sites in Para 6.77 (see also definition of previously developed land in Appendix 11) has been included - why, for example, exclude a site of a dilapidated prefabricated barn, simply because it was agricultural, and why limit it to sites that have had a permanent structure rather than despoiled sites

generally? If it is in a DS1 settlement and conservation/enhancement occurs, the question is asked why its redevelopment for much needed housing would not in principle be sustainable and be to the benefit of the National Park and of the community (PPPF*)

- It is suggested that paragraphs 6.78 and 6.79 require clarification to make the plan sound (PPPF*)
- It is suggested that the relationship of this policy to DME4 isn't clear and needs to be explained (PPPF*)
- It is suggested that the policy appears to relate to building conversions as well as brown field sites, in which case it is contended that it is contradicted by DMC10B (PPPF*)
- It is suggested that the fourth bullet point of DMH6, taken with paras. 6.84 to 6.86, is confusing and the objectives unclear. It is suggested that if a site comes forward capable of accommodating two or more dwellings, whether previously developed or not, under CS Policy HC1C(IV), policies are needed:
 1. To ensure that the site is put to the optimum use, having regard to National Park purposes and the need to maximise housing provision, e.g. a policy to ensure a site capable of taking, say, four houses does not just have one large one;
 2. To prevent partial development;
 3. To ensure that any lawful financial contribution is payable, i.e. to prevent in the above example four separate applications of one house each to avoid the financial contribution.

It is suggested that neither objective is met by the policy as written. (PPPF*)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Page 74 first sub heading	PDNPA	PDNPA	1.116	Y	N	N	N
6.76	PDNPA	PDNPA	1.116	Y	N	N	N
DMH6 and 6.77	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.91	N	N	Y M6.24	Y
6.80	Stella McGuire	10	10.75	Y	Y M6.25	N	N
6.84	Stella McGuire	10	10.75	Y	N	N	N

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.84	Peter O'Brien	64	64.15	N	Y M6.26	N	Y
6.84	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.64	N	Y M6.26	N	Y
6.84	Karen Bradley	70	70.4	N	Y M6.26	N	N
6.84	PDNPA	-	-	Y	Y M6.26	N	N
6.85	Stella McGuire	10	10.76	Y	Y M6.27	N	N
6.86	Stella McGuire	10	10.77	Y	Y M6.28	N	N
6.87	Stella McGuire	10	10.78	Y	Y M6.29	N	N
6.87	PDNPA	PDNPA	PDNPA	Y	N	N	N
6.87	PDNPA	PDNPA	PDNPA	Y	N	N	N
DMH6, 6.78,6.79	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.92	N	N	N	Y
DMH6	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.93	N	N	N	Y
DMH6	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.94	N	N	N	Y
DMH6, 6.84 -6.86	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.95	N	N	N	Y
DMH6	NHS Property Services	38	38.8	Y	N	Y M6.30	N
DMH6	National Trust	50	50.21	Y	N	N	Y
DMH6	PDNPA	PDNPA	-	Y	N	N	N

DMH7: Extensions and Alterations

- No representations go to the soundness of the policy and no issues were raised that cannot be dealt with by minor modifications

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.88	Stella McGuire	10	10.79	Y	Y M6.31	N	N
DMH7	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT2.21	Y	Y M6.32	N	N
DMH7	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.96	Y	Y M6.32	N	Y
DMH7	PDNPA	PDNPA	-	Y	N	N	N
DMH7	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.18	Y	Y M6.32	N	N

DMH8: New outbuildings for domestic garaging and storage uses in the curtilage of dwelling houses

Summary of issues raised

- It is noted that the policy is 'permissive' meaning that the principle of development has already been considered to conserve and enhance in the context of National Park objectives. However, it is suggested that in situations where it is possible to conserve the desirable features of the National Park, but not further enhance it would be illogical to imply that conservation was not desirable. It is noted that Policy DMH8 as it is currently worded does not support applications for new outbuildings that conserve the immediate dwelling and curtilage (and the other features/characteristics referred to in the draft policy), but may not be considered to enhance. It is suggested that such proposals (provided they complied with other local and national planning policies) would not undermine the purposes of the National Park and that the otherwise permissive policy is therefore unduly restrictive. (Emery Planning)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Page 76 Sub heading	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.20	Y	Y M6.33	N	N

6.91	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.97	N	Y M6.34	N	Y
DMH8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.97	Y	Y M6.35	N	Y
DMH8	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.19	Y	Y M6.35	N	N
DMH8	Stanton in Peak PC (+Sue Fogg)	33	33.1	Y	N	N	Y
DMH8	Emery Planning	48	48.11	N	N	N	N
DMH8	Rowsley PC	69	69.1	Y	N	N	Y

DMH9: Replacement dwellings

Summary of issues raised

- It is suggested that there is no incentive for low carbon or innovative designs which means that successful implementation of policies in the core strategy that encourage such designs will be a less likely outcome. (Allan Newby PME Planning Services)
- It is suggested that the wording unnecessarily restricts the requirement for significant enhancement to much larger replacements, when there may be clear opportunities to achieve this on more modest schemes. (PDNPA)
- It is suggested that the removal of the requirement to replace a house with one of similar size means there will be a loss of smaller houses and bungalows, both of which, it is suggested, serve a purpose for people needing more affordable and/ or more accessible property. (Rowsley PC)
- The policy needs to include an option to restrict permitted development rights to 'lock in' any enhancement gained (PDNPA)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.92	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.24	Y	Y M6.36	N	N
6.94	Stella McGuire	10	10.92	Y	Y M6.37	N	N
6.94	Bakewell and District Civic Society)	8	8.5	Y	Y M6.37	N	N
6.95	Stella McGuire	10	10.94	Y	Y M6.38	N	N

6.95	Bakewell and District Civic Society)	8	8.6	Y	Y M6.38	N	N
6.97	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.100	Y	Y M6.39	N	Y
6.98	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT2.21	Y	Y M6.40	N	N
6.98	Stella McGuire	10	10.96	Y	Y M6.40	N	N
6.100	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.100	Y	N	N	Y
DMH9	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT4.21	Y	N	YM6.41	N
DMH9	Allen Newby PME Planning Services	9	9.7	Y	N	YM6.41	Y
DMH9	PDNPA	PDNPA	-	Y	N	YM6.41	N
DMH9	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.98	Y	N	N	Y
DMH9	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.99	Y	N	N	Y
DMH9	Rowsley PC	69	69.11	Y	N	N	N

DMH10: Sub-division of dwellings to create multiple dwelling units

Summary of issues raised

- One clarification was suggested for supporting text but no other issues were raised.

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.103	PDNPA	PDNPA	INT2.22	Y	Y M6.42	N	N

DMH11: Section 106 agreements

Summary of issues raised

- It is claimed that the motive behind the use of legal agreements is to avoid spending resource on monitoring and enforcing planning conditions. And that this is wrong in principle and in law, and not justified by paragraphs 1.24 to 1.30 or paragraph 6.107 (PPPF*)
- It is noted that paragraph 6.107 suggests that s106 agreements have been successful in preventing breaches of condition and that for this reason the Authority will continue to use them. However, it is suggested that there is no evidence to support this assertion and that this approach is inconsistent with national planning policy. (Emery Planning)
- It is claimed that the powers in s106 allow a local planning authority to regulate the use of land or specified operations on land, but not to “tie” the land together as the policy attempts to do. The contention is that it is unnecessary to tie essential worker homes to the land, and that standard conditions, e.g. as for agricultural workers are adequate. (PPPF*)
- It is accepted that a s106 agreement may be justified in exceptional circumstances in the context of part B to H of the policy, but it is claimed that those parts of the policy go beyond what is reasonably required, and beyond Paras 203 and 204 of the NPPF, and the legal scope of s106. (PPPF*)
- It is suggested that the question of whether these matters are to be dealt with via Section 106 Agreement, or planning conditions, can be ably addressed through the tests that are applied in the National Planning Policy Framework section ‘Decision taking’, paragraphs 203 to 206 concerning planning conditions and obligations (and that the core strategy already covers this sufficiently for planning purposes) (Chatsworth Settlement Trustees)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.107	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.103	N	N	N	Y
6.107	Emery Planning	48	48.12	N	N	N	Y
DMH11	Stella McGuire	10	10.97	Y	Y M6.43	N	N
DMH11	Stella McGuire	10	10.98	Y	Y M6.44	N	N
DMH11	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.101	Y	N	N	Y
DMH11	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.102	Y	N	N	Y
DMH11	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.104	N	N	N	Y
DMH11	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.105	N	N	N	Y
DMH11	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.106	N	N	N	Y

DMH11	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.19	N	N	N	Y
DMH11	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.4	N	N	N	N

Chapter 7: Shops, Services and Community Facilities

Summary of main issues raised on Strategic Context:

- Include reference to Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan (PDNPA)
- For the future sustainability of communities the document recognises the importance of resisting the loss of community facilities but does not really present any realistic ways of averting this. In contradiction, many of the policies outlined are likely to have the opposite effect, in further eroding community facilities (Karen Bradley MP)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
7.3 M11.28	PDNPA	-	INT5.6	Y	Y M7.12	N	N
7.4	PDNPA	-	INT5.7	Y	Y M7.13	N	N
DMS	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.16	Y	N	N	N

DMS	Karen Bradley MP	70	70.6	N	N	N	N
-----	------------------	----	------	---	---	---	---

DMS1: Shops, professional services and related activity in Core Strategy named settlements

- Part C of policy unclear and only appears justified by supporting text that comes after the policy instead of before. (Stella McGuire)
- Proposed retail developments within defined town centres are considered for their accordance with the NPPF's town centre first approach (which considers town centres as a whole). Importantly, there is no retail test in the NPPF which requires an assessment of retail impact for proposed retail developments within town centres on existing town centre retail destinations. Proposed retail developments within a town centre will, in all likelihood, increase the turnover of the town centre and will have an overall positive impact. Competition between retail destinations in defined town centres is not discouraged in the NPPF. (Litton Properties)
- Policy DMS1 refers to a requirement for evidence that local convenience shopping will not be 'adversely affected or undermined'. Paragraph 26 of the NPPF states that the impact test only applies to proposals exceeding 2,500 sq. m floorspace unless a different proportional locally set threshold is adopted by the local planning authority. Paragraph 27 of the NPPF states that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on [one or more of the factors listed in paragraph 26] it should be refused. Any development may have an impact but the NPPF is only concerned with 'significant adverse impacts'. It follows that any development below the floorspace threshold will not have a 'significant' adverse impact. It is noted that the Peak District National Park Authority has not adopted a locally set retail impact threshold for retail developments. There is no justification for Policy DMS1 limiting the requirement for a retail impact assessment to convenience retailing only. The policy should comply with paragraph 26 of the NPPF.
- There is no justification for Policy DMS1 limiting the requirement for a retail impact assessment to convenience retailing only. The policy should comply with paragraph 26 of the NPPF. (Litton Properties)
- Policy DMS1 makes no reference to the sequential test as set out in Paragraph 24 of the NPPF. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to applications for main town centre uses that are not located in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. It requires applications for main town centre uses to be located first in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out-of-centre sites be considered. The fact that the sequential test is not referenced in Part 2 of the Local Plan is a key omission. On the basis of the above, Policy DMS1 is unsound as it is not in accordance with the guidance on vitality of town centres set out within the NPPF. (Litton Properties)
- It is recommended that Policy DMS1 is amended to accord with the NPPF so that proposals for retail and other 'main town centre uses' outside Bakewell Town Centre and the named settlements listed in Policy DS1 of the Core Strategy will only be permitted if they: a) comply with the sequential test as set out in Paragraphs 24 and 25 of the NPPF; and b) avoid having a 'significant adverse impact' upon existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of a proposal as assessed by the requirements set out in paragraph 26 of the NPPF. The policy should be redrafted accordingly. (Litton Properties)
- The overall policy approach to shops, services and community facilities is fully supported, particularly Policy DMS1 which is broadly consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), that seeks to direct new shops and services to town, district or local centres so that their vitality and viability is maintained and enhanced; and particularly paragraph 28 which requires local planning authorities to promote the

retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. (Derbyshire County Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
7.5	Stella McGuire	10	10.99	Y	Y M7.11	Y	N
DMS1	Litton Properties	57	57.1	N	N	N	Y
DMS1	Litton Properties	57	57.2	N	N	N	Y
DMS1	Litton Properties	57	57.3	N	N	N	Y
DMS1	Litton Properties	57	57.4	N	N	N	Y
DMS1	Litton Properties	57	57.5	N	N	N	Y
DMS1	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.6	Y	N	N	N

DMS2: Change of use of shops, community services and facilities

- It is noted that Paragraph 7.12 excludes health facilities from the types of 'community facilities' that would be expected to require viability and marketing tests. Whilst supporting the exclusion of health services from this list, NHSPS seeks formal clarification that health facilities would be explicitly excluded from the requirements of this policy (for the reasons below). NHSPS would strongly object to any inclusion or interpretation that health facilities would be considered under this policy. (NHS Property Services)
- NHSPS strongly objects to the wording and requirements of Policy DMS2 in considering the change of use of vacant and surplus 'community facilities'. An essential element of supporting the wider transformation of NHS services and the health estate is to ensure that surplus and vacant NHS sites are not strategically constrained by local planning policies, particularly for providing alternative uses (principally housing). Faced with financial pressures, the NHS requires flexibility in its estate. In particular, the capital receipts and revenue savings generated from the disposal of unneeded or unsuitable sites and properties for best value is an important component in helping to provide funding for new or improved services and facilities. (NHS Property Services)
- Policy is contrary to advice received from Planning Advisory Service in 2015 on soundness of Policy DMS2 that the steps required to safeguard a community use could potentially be overly onerous. There are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by NHS commissioners to identify unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities. These must be satisfied prior to any property being declared surplus and put up for disposal. Restrictive policies, especially those which require substantial periods of marketing, could prevent or delay required investment in new/improved services and facilities. (NHS Property Services)
- "NHSPS would only support Policy DMS2 if it is clear that evidence of the wider NHS estate reorganisation programme would be accepted as justification for the loss of a community facility, and would therefore be excluded from the requirements of this policy. NHSPS would support the inclusion of the following: "The loss or change of use of existing health facilities will be acceptable if it is shown that this forms part of a wider estate reorganisation programme to ensure the continued delivery of services. Evidence of such a programme will be accepted as a clear demonstration that the facility under consideration is neither needed nor viable and that adequate facilities are or will be made available to meet the ongoing needs of the local population. In such cases Part A of Policy DMS2 would not apply, and no viability or marketing information will be required." This would be in accordance with the requirements of NPPF Paras 28 and 70, and adopted Core Strategy Policy HC4." (NHS Property Services)
- This approach is also in conflict with the requirements of adopted Core Strategy Policy HC4. (NHS Property Services)
- The policy also provides no flexibility for alternative forms of development, for example to accommodate continuing community use on part of a site in new fit for purpose facilities, with redevelopment of the wider site for an alternative use. (NHS Property Services)
- In cases where a business is failing, it is considered that paragraph A (i) of this policy is overly restrictive and would result in unnecessary financial hardship for business owners, which could be alleviated by a shorter marketing period or the provision of reasonable alternative evidence that would still achieve the objectives of the policy. In view of this, the policy does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. Furthermore, the policy is more restrictive than the DCLG Advice Note entitled "Community Right to Bid" (2012). This advice note is aimed at helping local authorities to implement Part 5 Chapter 3 of the Localism Act 2011 and the Assets of Community Regulations

2012. This advice note suggests a 6 week period; from the point the owner notifies the local authority of their intention sell a property to allow community interest groups to make a written request to be treated as a potential bidder. If none do so, the owner is free to sell their asset at the end of the 6 weeks. If a community interest group does make a request during this interim period, then it is advised that a 6 month moratorium (again from the point the owner notifies the local authority) should operate. Given that the national policy position suggests that the absolute maximum marketing period should be 6 months, it is considered a policy which requires marketing for a minimum of 12 months is entirely unjustified and is not consistent with Government guidance. It is suggested that the marketing period should be amended to no more than 6 months. (Emery Planning)

- The requirements in section A(ii) and A(iii) are unreasonable and places an additional unnecessary burden on the developer, contrary to government advice. The need to show either lack of need or non-viability is adequately addressed by the requirement in A(i). (Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
7.12	NHS Property Services	38	38.2	N	N	Y M7.7	would welcome any further discussion
7.12	Stella McGuire	10	10.100	Y	N	N	N
7.13	PDNPA	-	INT2.23	Y	Y M7.8	N	N
7.16	Stella McGuire	10	10.101	Y	Y M7.1	N	N
7.19	Stella McGuire	10	10.102	Y	Y M7.2	N	N
DMS2	Stella McGuire	10	10.103	Y	Y M7.3	N	N

DMS2 (C)	Stella McGuire	10	10.104	Y	Y M7.4	N	N
DMS2	NHS Property Services	38	38.1	N	N	N	would welcome any further discussion
DMS2	NHS Property Services	38	38.3	N	N	Y M7.7	would welcome any further discussion
DMS2	NHS Property Services	38	38.4	N	N	Y M7.7	would welcome any further discussion
DMS2	NHS Property Services	38	38.5	N	N	Y M7.7	would welcome any further discussion
DMS2	NHS Property Services	38	38.6	N	N	N	would welcome any further discussion
DMS2	Holme Valley PC	7	7.4	Y	N	N	N
DMS2	Cheshire East Council	27	27.4	Y	N	N	N
DMS2	Emery Planning	48	48.1	N	N	N	N
DMS2	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants	60	60.11	N	N	N	N

DMS3: Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements

- Description of goods at garden centres cannot be described as being produced 'on the premises'. (Stella McGuire)
- Clarification of Part D of DMS3 so that policy requires retail development outside of Core Strategy named settlements 'does not adversely affect', rather than that an applicant be asked to 'assess the impact'. This will also align with Policy DME5 on expansion of B1 employment uses outside DS1 ('named') settlements. (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
7.26	Stella McGuire	10	10.105	Y	N	N	N
DMS3 (D)	Stella McGuire	10	10.106	Y	N	Y M7.9	N

DMS5: Outdoor Advertising

- Part C of policy lacks clarity (Stella McGuire)
- Minor clarifications.

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMS5	Stella McGuire	10	10.107 INT7.1	Y	Y M7.10	N	N
DMS5	National Trust	50	50.22	Y	N	N	N
7.7	PDNPA	-	INT7.3	Y	Y M15	N	N
7.10	PDNPA	-	INT7.5	Y	Y M.16	N	N
7.30	PDNPA	-	INT7.8	Y	Y M.17	N	N
7.31	PDNPA	-	INT7.9	Y	Y M18	N	N
DMS7	PDNPA	-	INT7.10	Y	Y M19	N	N

DMS6: Safeguarding sites for community facilities

- NHSPS objects to Policy DMS6, where evidence from a wider NHS estate reorganisation programme should be accepted as justification for the loss of a community facility, and should therefore be excluded from the requirements of this policy. This policy provides no flexibility for sites where existing services are to be re-provided either on or off site, to continue to serve the local population. Without prejudice to the above, the policy wording should recognise that the sites allocation as a 'community facility' needs to form part of an adopted development plan document. (NHS Property Services)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
7.36	Stella McGuire	10	10.108	Y	Y M7.6	N	N
7.39	PDNPA	-	INT2.24	Y	N	N	N
7.39	Stella McGuire	10	10.109	Y	N	N	N
DMS6	NHS Property Services	38	38.7	N	N	N	would welcome any further discussion

Chapter 8: Bakewell

Summary of main issues raised on Strategic Context

- Whilst the paragraphs may add to the Core Strategy, on their own they appear to be disjointed. It is suggested that the information is either expanded to provide a fuller picture or, (as this is available elsewhere) the introduction signposts the other sources. (Bakewell Town Council)
- Use of word substantial in relation to safeguarded employment sites, needs changing to 'predominant' to align with DME policy. (PDNPA)
- “This plan does not include policies that are specific to Bakewell...” then lists policy DMB1 “Bakewell’s Settlement Boundary”. Suggest this be reworded. (Bakewell Town Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
8.1-8.4	Bakewell Town Council	49	49.1	Y	N	N	N
8.2	Bakewell and District Civic Society	8	8.3	Y	Y M8.11	N	?
8.4	PDNPA	-	INT5.5	Y	Y M8.15	N	N
8.5	Bakewell Town Council	49	49.2	Y	Y M8.6	N	N

DMB 1: Bakewell Settlement Boundary

Summary of issues raised

- Clarify relationship between DMP and neighbourhood plan regarding development boundary (PDNPA)
- Policy DMB1 provides very little in the way of specific policy advice . . . it is considered that (it) could be expanded to set out some key development management principles for Bakewell that are reflective of the Core Strategy but provide more detail to give the policy approach more weight and substance (Derbyshire County Council)
- Bakewell is the largest settlement within the Peak District National Park, and given the range of services and facilities it provides for those living in the surrounding catchment area it is considered that support should be given to the policies within the document that seek to maintain and enhance the future prospects of the town. However given the role and function that Bakewell plays within the Peak District National Park, it is considered that there should be more support and flexibility shown within the plan to the delivery of housing and employment development that maintains its future sustainably. Whilst this may result in Bakewell taking slightly more development, it is considered that having additional development on the edge of the town would be less harmful on the landscape character than development elsewhere in the plan area. (Derbyshire Dales District Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
8.7	Stella McGuire	10	10.110	Y	N	N	N
8.7	PDNPA	-	INT5.2	Y	N	Y M8.9	N
8.7	PDNPA	-	INT2.25	Y	Y M8.9	N	N
DMB1	PDNPA	-	INT2.26	Y	Y M8.10	N	N
DMB1	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.7	N	Y	N	Y

					M8.16		
DMB1	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.17	N	N	N	N

Central Shopping Area

Summary of issues raised

- “Bakewell is the only settlement boasting a wide range of shops...” contrasts poorly to the “modest settlement” and “modest size” in paragraph 8.9. (Bakewell Town Council)
- Amend to “The boundary of the Central Shopping Area’ to make clearer what ‘this area’ means? (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
8.8/8.9	Bakewell Town Council	49	49.3	Y	N	N	N
8.9	Stella McGuire	10	10.112	Y	Y M8.2	N	N
8.9	Stella McGuire	10	10.111	Y	Y M8.2	N	N
8.10	Stella McGuire/ Bakewell Town Council/PDNPA	10/49/INT1	10.113/49.4/INT1.1 21	Y	Y M8.1	N	N
8.10	Stella McGuire	10	10.114	Y	Y M8.3	N	N

Principles for land use across the town

Summary of main issues raised

- Policies seem less strict than proposed in the draft Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan and wonder whether the BNP policies would take precedence. (Bakewell and District Civic Society)
- Lines 5 to 7 confused. Maybe a minor rewrite on lines of: “Given the strategic need for employment sites, the policy safeguards existing employment sites, and ensures that their redevelopment etc. etc. (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
8.11	Bakewell and District Civic Society	8	8.1	Y	Y M8.14	N	Y
8.11	Bakewell Town Council	49	49.5	Y	Y M8.7	N	N
8.11	Stella McGuire	10	10.116	Y	N	N	N
8.11	Stella McGuire	10	10.115	Y	Y M8.4	N	N
8.13	PDNPA	-	INT5.3	Y	Y M8.12	N	N

Principles for land use in the central shopping area

Summary of main issues raised

- Would the meaning be clearer if sentence ran something like “The Central Shopping Area covers? / comprises? a small area of the town” – rather than ‘includes’? (Stella McGuire)
- Policies seem less strict than proposed in the draft Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan and wonder whether the BNP policies would take precedence: The DMP has ‘rarely justification to use planning to influence offer or prevent change of use’ but the BNP has ‘further changes of use from A will not be permitted’. . (Bakewell and District Civic Society)
- Paragraph should be reviewed and reworded to make its intent clearer to the reader. (Bakewell Town Council)
- Align with draft neighbourhood plan policy. (PDNPA)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
8.14	Stella McGuire	10	10.117	Y	Y M8.5	N	N
8.15	Bakewell and District Civic Society	8	8.2	Y	N	N	N
8.15	Bakewell Town Council	49	49.6	Y	Y M8.13	N	N
8.15	PDNPA	-	INT1.122	Y	Y M8.8	N	N
8.15	PDNPA	-	INT5.4	Y	Y M8.13	N	N
8.15	Stella McGuire	10	10.118	Y	Y M8.13	N	N

Chapter 9 Travel and Transport

Summary of main issues raised within Strategic Context and wider text:

- Whether all the tests for all of the development criteria within DMT1 should apply.
- DMT1 Cross-park infrastructure reads as if criteria A to E must all be met. If that is so, it seems to rule out almost any scheme. Although it may be necessary for a major cross park scheme to meet all these tests, there may be schemes which impinge upon the park but result in an overall reduction of traffic in the park. For example a scheme which effected only a small corner of the park may bring substantial benefits. Suggest that after "E." the policy could continue" or F. A substantial overall benefit to the park can be demonstrated." (Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
9.2	Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport	62	62.1	N	N	N	No

Policy DMT1: Cross-park infrastructure

Summary of main issues raised:-

- The policy does not take into account the need for local schemes to address traffic management and congestion, particularly in relation to Chatsworth Estate land. (Chatsworth Estate Trustees).
- The policy does not take into account the environmental benefits for local communities of the Mottram – Hollingworth – Tintwistle bypass or the economic benefit of easier movement to and from Manchester. It also does not take into account impacts on the communities of Buxton and the Hope Valley. (HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton), High Peak Borough Council)

- The policy does not refer to the proposed climbing lanes on the A628 within the Park [Trans-Pennine Upgrade Programme RIS 1]. An acknowledgement that this is acceptable should the design be appropriate would be welcomed. (Derbyshire County Council, Peak Park Parishes Forum)
- In reference to the Core Strategy Policy T2C, it has been suggested that the policy be positively framed to offer support to schemes meeting the criteria of DMT1. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)
- The policy should also reference the terms under which the National Park Authority will object to development and transport development proposals in adjacent authority areas that compromise the special qualities of the National Park; and require such authorities to actively consult and cooperate with the National Park Authority to enable the effective implementation of this policy. (Friends of the Peak District)
- The policy does not take into account developments outside the Park and their impact on roads within the Park, a more coordinated approach that considers development within, and outside the Park; and its effect on local traffic is required. (Great Hucklow Parish Council)
- Cross-Park roads such as the A623 should be improved due to the impact of tourists visiting the area, safety for cyclists and economic benefit to businesses and strategic importance. (Gordon Rooke, Martin Beer)
- Whether all the tests for all of the development criteria within DMT1 should apply, or if an addition of “F a substantial overall benefit to the Park” could apply for smaller schemes. (Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport)
- The policy does not account for the economic, environmental or sustainable travel benefits of reopening the Matlock to Buxton railway. (Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council)
- The policy is too restrictive and does not take account of congestion on the edge of the Park and may restrict rail development enabling the movement of quarry traffic onto rail. (Staffordshire Moorlands District Council)
- The policy is too restrictive and makes a presumption against cross-Park travel. It is too National Park centred, without considering the impacts on neighbouring settlements. (HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton), Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMT1	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.4	N	N	N	No
DMT1	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.12	N	N	N	No

DMT1	Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council	12	12.7	N	N	N	No
DMT1	Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council	12	12.8	N	N	N	No
DMT1	Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council	12	12.9	N	N	N	No
DMT1	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.1	Y	N	N	No
DMT1	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.111	Y	N	N	No
DMT1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.20	N	N	N	Yes
DMT1	Highways England	31	31.1	Y	N	N	No
Para 9.16-9.20	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.2	N	N	N	No
DMT1	Great Hucklow Parish Council	43	43.11	N	N	N	Yes
DMT1	Gordon Rooke	53	53.1	Y	N	N	No
DMT1	Martin Beer	56	56.3	N	N	N	No
DMT1	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.7	N	N	N	No
DMT1	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.7	N	N	N	No
DMT1	Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport	62	62.1	N	N	N	No

Policy DMT2: Access and design criteria

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The Transport Infrastructure SPD should acknowledge the Strategic Road Network. (Highways England)
- A request to be kept informed of the development of the Transport Infrastructure Design Guide SPD. (Highways England)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 9.22	Highways England	31	31.2	Y	N	N	No
Response to DMT1, but applicable to DMT2	Highways England	31	31.1	Y	N	N	No

Policy DMT3: Railway construction

Summary of main issues raised: -

- Paragraph 9.32 does not provide adequate justification for the policy approach in DMT3D of the refusal or lack of support for tourist or heritage railways. (Peak Park Parishes Forum, Bakewell Town Council)
- Request for reference to “*railways acting as tourist attractions*” (paragraph 9.32) to be removed. (Peak Rail plc)
- A question over the legality of policy DMT3D in relation to the National Park Authority’s ability to refuse permission for new tourist or heritage railways. (Peak Rail plc, Rowsley Parish Council)
- Request for additional criteria under policy DMT3E regarding improved access to the national rail network for residents and visitors through new stations or termini within the National Park. (Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport)
- The policy does not account for the economic, environmental or sustainable travel benefits of reopening the Matlock to Buxton railway. (Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council)
- The policy is too restrictive and does not take account of congestion on the edge of the Park and may restrict rail development enabling the movement of quarry traffic onto rail. (Staffordshire Moorlands District Council)

- The policy is too restrictive and makes a presumption against cross-Park travel. It is too National Park centred, without considering the impacts on neighbouring settlements. (HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton), Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council)
- The Parish Council would welcome further opportunities for rail travel along the route of the Hope Valley and between Buxton and Matlock, whether national or heritage, so objects to DMT3D. (Great Hucklow Parish Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMT3	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.4	N	N	N	No
DMT3	HPBC (Cllr Tony Ashton)	4	4.12	N	N	N	No
DMT3	Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council	12	12.9	N	N	N	No
Para 9.32 / DMT3D	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.112	Y	N	Y M9.5	No
DMT3D	Great Hucklow Parish Council	43	43.12	N	N	N	Yes
DMT3D	Bakewell Town Council	49	49.9	N	N	Y M9.5	Yes
DMT3	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	58	58.7	N	N	N	No
DMT3	High Peak Borough Council	59	59.7	N	N	N	No
Para 9.32 / DMT3	Peak Rail plc	61	61.1	N	N	Y M9.5	No
Para 9.32 / DMT3	Peak Rail plc	61	61.2	N	N	Y M9.5	No

Para 9.33 / DMT3	Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport	62	62.2	N	N	N	No
DMT3D	Rowsley Parish Council	69	69.14	N	N	Y M9.5	No

Policy DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way

Summary of main issues raised: -

- There should be an additional criterion to ensure that the enjoyment of an existing public footpath by walkers will not be detrimentally affected by the introduction of new users, particularly cyclists. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)
- Policy DMT4D is over restrictive in relation to small improvements to the rights of way network, as small scale improvements such as permissive paths are unlikely to meet all of the criteria. (National Trust)
- The policy does not account for the economic, environmental or sustainable travel benefits of reopening the Matlock to Buxton railway. (Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council)
- The continuation of the Monsal Trail into Buxton to link with a cycle hub at the station would be welcomed. (David Carlisle)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMT4	Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council	12	12.9	N	N	N	No
DMT4	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.113	N	Y M9.8	N	No

DMT4D	National Trust	50	50.26	Y	Y M9.8	Y M9.9	No
Para 9.42	David Carlisle	68	68.1	Y	N	N	No

Parking – general

Summary of main issues raised: -

- It is not clear that the residential parking standards provided in Policy DMT7A are the minimum standards. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 9.47 to Para 9.48 / DMT7	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.116	No	N	Y M9.10	No

Policy DMT5: Business parking

Summary of main issues raised: -

None

Policy DMT6: Visitor parking

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The policy fails to address the massive increase in visitor numbers affecting on-street parking in villages and towns. Having extended the cycle facilities, no additional parking has been provided. (Stanton in Peak Parish Council (+ Sue Fogg))
- The restrictive nature of the policy and a lack of clarity as to how this will tie in to the planned Recreation Hubs SPD referred to in paragraph 9.64. (National Trust)
- There needs to be a positive view (from the Authority) to providing new or enlarged visitor car parks. (Rowsley Parish Council, Stanton in Peak Parish Council (+ Sue Fogg))
- The policy DMT6A should substitute the words “demonstrable need” for “demonstrable benefit” in relation to visitor car park provision. (Peak Park Parishes Forum*)
- The benefits of additional parking facilities should not be lost if there is no mechanism to remove on-street parking as referred to in DMT7B. (Peak Park Parishes Forum*)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 9.63	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.114	Yes	N	Y Modification M9.17 Y Modification M9.18	No
DMT6A	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.114	Yes	N	Y M9.19	No
DMT6B	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.115	Yes	N	Y M9.20	No

DMT6	Stanton in Peak Parish Council (+ Sue Fogg)	33	33.13	N	Y M9.16	N	Yes
Para 9.64 / DMT6	National Trust	50	50.27	N	Y M9.16	N	No
DMT6	Rowsley Parish Council	69	69.15	N	Y M9.16	N	No

Policy DMT7: Residential off street parking

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The provision of minimum parking facilities is not likely to meet future need. Lower parking provision than the 6Cs Parking Standards is not acceptable. (Bradwell Parish Council)
- It is not clear that the residential parking standards provided in Policy DMT7A are the minimum standards. (Peak Park Parishes Forum*)
- It should be made clear that conditions will be imposed in settlements to reserve garaging and off-street parking for those purposes only. (Peak Park Parishes Forum)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMT7	Bradwell Parish Council	11	11.6	No	N	Y M9.21	No

DMT7A	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.116	No	N	Y M9.10 Y M9.21	No
DMT7B	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.118	No	N	Y M9.21	No

Policy DMT8: Air transport

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The policy should refer to aircraft take-off and landing sites, rather than just landing sites. (PDNPA)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMT8A	PDNPA	PDNPA	PDNPA1.126	Y	N	Y M9.28	No

Chapter 10 Utilities

Summary of main issues raised within Strategic Context and wider text:

- The policy needs to show a degree of flexibility or pragmatism to ensure that infrastructure is provided for the benefit of communities. (Derbyshire Dales District Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMU	Derbyshire Dales District Council	34	34.19	N	N	N	No

Policy DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure

Summary of main issues raised:-

- Reference to the inclusion of telecommunications cables within paragraph 10.1 in regard to the sharing of infrastructure by developers. (Friends of the Peak District)
- Paragraph 10.6 needs to reference the need to possibly phase delivery of development to enable to ensure connection into infrastructure facilities. (United Utilities)
- Concern that the policies do not reflect the need for additional infrastructure for broadband and mobile services. (Martin Beer, Great Hucklow Parish Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 10.1	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.21	Y	Y M10.1	N	Yes
Para 1.24 to Para 1.29 DMU1	Great Hucklow Parish Council	43	43.3	N	N	N	Yes
Para 10.6	United Utilities	44	44.5	N	Y M10.3	N	No
Para 1.24 to Para 1.29 DMU1	Martin Beer	56	56.1	N	N	N	Yes

Policy DMU2: New and upgraded utilities services

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The importance of increasing access to broadband should be acknowledged in relation to the 'landscape first' approach of policies including (DMC1). (Cheshire East Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMU2	Cheshire East Council	27	27.2	Y	N	N	Yes

Policy DMU3: Development close to utility installations

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The table between paragraphs 10.12 and 10.13 is unclear, further clarification of the abbreviations would be helpful. (Friends of the Peak District)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 10.12 to Para 10.13 DMU3	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.22	N	N	Y M10.6/M10.7	No

Policy DMU4: Telecommunications Infrastructure

Summary of main issues raised: -

- There is a sub-header missing before paragraph 10.14. (Stella McGuire)
- Concern that the policies do not reflect the need for additional infrastructure for broadband and mobile services. (Martin Beer, Great Hucklow Parish Council)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 10.14 / DMT4	Stella McGuire	10	10.121	Y	N	Y M10.8	No
Para 1.24 to Para 1.29 DMU4	Great Hucklow Parish Council	43	43.3	N	N	N	Yes
Para 1.24 to Para 1.29 DMU1	Martin Beer	56	56.1	N	N	N	Yes

Policy DMU5: Restoration of utility and telecommunications infrastructure sites

Summary of main issues raised: -

- The introductory text providing context to the policy along with the subheading is missing (PDNPA)

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
New Paragraphs 10.22 to 10.25	PDNPA	-	INT3.17 to INT3.21	Y	N	Y M10.11	No

Chapter 11 Minerals and Waste

Summary of main issues raised within Strategic Context and wider text:

- Definition of ‘minerals development’ and what it should or should not include (Hollister/AECOM).
- Query regarding the statement that the DMP policies only become relevant if an application is acceptable in principle when assessed against the Core Strategy – reference to s.38(6) of PCP Act 2004 refers to whole plan (Hollister/AECOM)
- The requirement that applicants should undertake consultation with Statutory Consultees and the local community before submitting an application goes further than national guidance and policy which states that pre-application engagement is ‘encouraged’ (Mineral Products Association; Cemex).

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
11.1	John Hollister/AECOM (Stancliffe)	6	6.1	N	Y M11.1	N	Yes
11.1	John Hollister/AECOM (Stancliffe)	6	6.2	N	Y M11.3	N	Yes

11.13	Mineral Products Association	14	14.4	N	Y M11.4	N	No
11.13	CEMEX	39	39.3	N	Y M11.4	N	No

Policy DMMW1: The Justification for mineral and waste development

Summary of main issues raised:

- The policy does not take into account national considerations of need, impact of permitting or refusing on local economy or costs of developing elsewhere, and is therefore inconsistent with paragraph 116 of the NPPF and the exceptional circumstances test (Hollister/AECOM; Mineral Products Association).
- Uncertainty as to whether the policy solely relates to MIN1 type proposals or whether it should also include proposals falling under MIN2 and MIN3 of the CS (Hollister/AECOM)
- Consideration of proximity to market may or may not be relevant to considerations of public interest, dependent upon argument around national need (Mineral Products Association).
- Call for the policy text to make clear that proposals for minor extensions or deepening at existing building and roofing stone quarries will fall to be assessed under MIN3 in all cases rather than classifying such proposals as ‘major development’. Request for evidence not proportionate for smaller mineral operations (Hollister/AECOM; Chatsworth Settlement Trustees).
- There should be specific stand-alone policy in relation to unconventional hydrocarbon development proposals, in particular an explicit approach to the impact of surface infrastructure arising from projects both within and on the boundary of the National Park (Friends of the Peak District).

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
Para 11.5	John Hollister/AECOM (Stancliffe)	6	6.3	N	Y M11.5	N	Yes
Para 11.5	John Hollister/AECOM (Stancliffe)	6	6.4	N	Y M11.5	N	Yes
DMMW1	Mineral Products Association	14	14.1	N	Y M11.5	N	No
DMMW1	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.x	Y	Y M11.1	N	No
11.4	Friends of the Peak District	28	28.23	Y	N	N	No
11.1	Stanton in Peak PC (+ Sue Fogg)	33	33.2	N	N	N	No
11.2	Stanton in Peak PC (+ Sue Fogg)	33	33.3	N	N	N	No
11.5	Stanton in Peak PC (+ Sue Fogg)	33	33.4	N	N	N	No
DMMW1	Stanton in Peak PC (+ Sue Fogg)	33	33.5	N	N	N	No
DMMW1	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees	35	35.3	N	M11.4	N	No
11.1 – 11.5	The Coal Authority	36	36.1	Y	N	N	No
DMMW1	CEMEX	39	39.1	N	N	N	No
11.1	Rowsley PC	69	69.2	N	N	N	No
11.2	Rowsley PC	69	69.3	N	N	N	No
11.5	Rowsley PC	69	69.4	N	N	N	No
DMMW1	Rowsley PC	69	69.5	N	N	N	No

Policy DMMW7: Safeguarding local building and roofing stone resources and safeguarding existing permitted minerals operations from non-mineral development

Summary of main issues raised:

- When read together, policy DMMW7 and Core Strategy MIN4 fail to explicitly state that local building and roofing mineral resources will be safeguarded; there is also an issue with the fact that they only fall to be invoked in case of potential sterilisation from major non-minerals development (Hollister/AECOM; Mineral Products Association; Derbyshire County Council).
- Inconsistent reference on the Policies Map to policy DMMW1, believe it should be DMMW7. Approach on safeguarding and link to the Core Strategy needs clarification (Mineral Products Association).
- There does not appear to be a specific policy that relates to the safeguarded railheads (Derbyshire County Council)
- Some areas of building stone delineated by reference to national and intermediate use – consider this is contrary to the stated aims of the overall policy which is stone for a local need. If policy is aimed at safeguarding the remaining mineral against potential adverse development then it clearly needs to state that fact (Rowsley PC; Stanton in Peak PC).
- Consistent approach needed on all demarcations – a number of anomalies in the Stanton Moor area have been identified (Rowsley PC; Stanton in Peak PC).
- Safeguarding of limestone resources that facilitate building and roofing stone resources should be included (Mineral Products Association; Tarmac).

List of responses

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMMW7	John Hollister (AECOM/Stancliffe)	6	6.6	N	N	Y M11.25	Yes
DMMW7/Policies Map	Mineral Products Association	14	14.7	N	Y MPM.64	N	No
DMMW7	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.10	Y	Y MPM.69	Y M11.25	No

DMMW7	Heaton (Tarmac)	45	45.3	Y	Y MPM.70	Y M11.25	No
11.21 – 11.24	Stanton in Peak PC (& Sue Fogg)	33	33.25 + 33.28	N	Y MPM.70	Y M11.25	No
11.21 – 11.24	Rowsley PC	69	69.27	N	Y MPM.67	Y M11.25	No

Policy DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development

Summary of main issues raised:

- The relationship between ancillary development and the location which it can take place needed to be clearer (Hollister/AECOM; Rowsley PC; Stanton in Peak PC).*

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main Modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
DMMW8	Mineral Products Association	14	14.8	Y	Y M11.26 M11.27	Y M11.28	No
DMMW8	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.110		Y M11.26 M11.27	Y M11.28	No
DMMW8	Rowsley PC	69	69.28		Y M11.26 M11.27	Y M11.28	No
DMMW8	Stanton in Peak PC (+Sue Fogg)	33	33.26		Y M11.26 M11.27	Y M11.28	No

DMMW8	John Hollister/ AECOM (Stancliffe)	6	6.7	N	Y M11.26 M11.27	Y M11.28 M11.28	Yes
DMMW8	Tarmac (Heaton)	45	45.4	N	Y M11.26 M11.27	Y M11.28	No

Appendices

- 3 responders (including one internal responders) making 43 individual points. The majority of these were typographical errors and none of the points raised soundness issues.
- General points that it would improve presentation to have all appendices in the same font style and size, had page numbers and a common lay-out (Stella McGuire).

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? (as suggested by responder) Y/N	Minor Modification proposed by PDNPA? Y/N	Main modification proposed by PDNPA? Y/N	Hearing request
General	Stella McGuire	10	10.82	Y	Y MA.1	N	N
General	Stella McGuire	10	10.83	Y	Y MA.2	N	N

Appendix 1 – Historic Environment Records

Summary of issues raised

- Whether it would be useful to combine Appendix 1 and 4 (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 1	Stella McGuire	10	10.84	Y	Y MA.4	N	N
Appx 1	PDNPA	-	INT1.141	Y	N	N	N

Appendix 2 – Natural Zone Definition

Summary of issues raised

- General tidying up

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 2	Stella McGuire	10	10.85	Y	Y MA.6	N	N
Appx 2	PDNPA	-	INT1.142	Y	Y MA.6	N	N

Appendix 3 – List of DS1 Settlements

Summary of issues raised

- General tidying up

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor	Representation	Sound?	Minor	Main	Hearing
-------------	------------------	-------------	----------------	--------	-------	------	---------

		ID	ID	Y/N	Modification proposed? Y/N	modification proposed? Y/N	request
Appx 3	Stella McGuire	10	10.86	Y	Y MA.26	N	N
Appx 3	PDNPA	-	INT1.143	Y	Y MA.26	N	N
Appx 3	PDNPA	-	INT1.144	Y	Y MA.8	N	N

Appendix 4 – Source list for Historic Environment

Summary of issues raised

- Merge Appendix 1 and 4 (Stella McGuire), general tidying up/references (NT)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 4	Stella McGuire	10	10.84	Y	Y MA.4	N	N
Appx 4	National Trust	50	50.6	Y	Y MA.37	N	Y
Appx 4	PDNPA	-	INT1.145	Y	Y MA.27	N	N
Appx 4	PDNPA	-	INT1.146	Y	Y MA.28	N	N
Appx 4	PDNPA	-	INT1.147	Y	Y MA.32	N	N
Appx 4	PDNPA	-	INT1.148	Y	Y MA.36	N	N
Appx 4	PDNPA	-	INT1.149	Y	Y MA.35	N	N

Appendix 5 – Guidance for preparing a heritage statement

Summary of issues raised

- Amend reference to further information (NT)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
50	National Trust	50	50.7	Y	Y MA.38	N	Y

Appendix 6 – List of Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Summary of issues raised

- It was suggested that this list was out of date and not required (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 6	Stella McGuire	10	10.87	Y	Y MA.39	N	N
Appx 6	PDNPA	-	INT1.150	Y	N	N	N
Appx 6	PDNPA	-	INT1.151	Y	N	N	N

Appendix 7 – List of Conservation Areas

Summary of issues raised

- Reference to PDNPA website

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 7	Stella McGuire	10	10.88	Y	Y MA.40	N	N

Appendix 8 – Proving a housing need

Summary of issues raised

- Confusion between the two forms and where they come from (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 8	Stella McGuire	10	10.89	Y	Y MA.41/42	N	N
Appx 8	Stella McGuire	10	10.132	Y	Y MA.41/42	N	N

Appendix 9 – no issues raised

Appendix 10 – Parking Standards

Summary of issues raised

- Whose info is this? (Stella McGuire)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 10	Stella McGuire	10	10.90	Y	Y MA.43	N	N

Appendix 11 – Glossary of terms

Summary of issues raised

- General clarification and typographical errors (Stella McGuire and Ken Smith)

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.91	Y	Y MA.44/62/63	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.134	Y	Y MA.45	N	N
Appx 11	PDNPA	-	INT1.152	Y	Y MA.46	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.135	Y	Y MA.47	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.136	Y	Y MA.48	N	N
Appx 11	PDNPA	-	INT1.153	Y	Y MA.49	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.137	Y	Y MA.49	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.138	Y	Y MA.50	N	N
Appx 11	PDNPA	-	INT1.154	Y	Y MA.51	N	N
Appx 11	PDNPA	-	INT1.155	Y	Y MA.52	N	N
Appx 11	PDNPA	-	INT1.156	Y	Y MA.53	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.139	Y	Y MA.54	N	Y
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.140	Y	Y MA.55	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.141	Y	N	N	N

Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.142	Y	Y MA.56	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.143	Y	Y MA.57/58	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.144	Y	Y MA.59	N	N
Appx 11	Stella McGuire	10	10.145	Y	Y MA.60	N	Y
Appx 11	PDNPA	-	INT1.157	Y	Y MA.61	N	N

Policies Map

- Main amendment with regards to removing church yards as Community Recreation Areas

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? (as suggested by responder) Y/N	Minor Modification proposed by PDNPA? Y/N	Main modification proposed by PDNPA? Y/N	Hearing request
Policies Map	PDNPA	-	INT1.120	Y	N	Y MPM.4-61	N
Policies Map	Peak Park Parishes Forum*	23	23.21	Y	N	Y MPM.4-61	Y
Policies Map	Taddington PC	19	19.3	Y	N	Y MPM.52	Y
Policies Map	Taddington PC	19	19.4	Y	N	Y MPM.53	Y
Policies Map	PDNPA	-	INT5.1	Y	N	Y MPM.63	N

Minerals Map

Summary of issues raised

- General tidying up of maps

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Minerals Map	Minerals Products Association	14	14.7	Y	Y MPM.64	N	Y
Minerals Map	Minerals Products Association	14	14.9	Y	Y MPM.65	N	Y
Minerals Map	Rowsley PC	69	69.27	N	Y MPM.66/67	N	N
Minerals Map	Derbyshire County Council	21	21.10	N	Y MPM.69	N	Y

Interactive Map

Summary of issues raised

- Add in some missing layers – building/roofing stone, neighbourhood plan layer
- Amend some of the pop-up info

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representor ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing request
Interactive Map	Minerals Products Association	14	14.7	Y	Y MPM.70	N	Y
Interactive Map	Minerals Products Association	14	14.9	Y	Y MPM.70	N	Y
Interactive Map	Stanton in Peak	33	33.28	Y	Y MPM.70	N	N

* The response from the Peak Park Parishes Forum was supported by 13 other Parish Councils: Youlgrave PC, Abney PC, Bamford PC, Bradwell PC, Castleton PC, Chapel-en-le-Frith PC, Chelmorton PC, Edale PC, Great Hucklow PC, Hope with Aston PC, Over Haddon PC, Taddington PC, Winster PC.