



Peak District National Park Authority Local Plan Part 2 **Development Management Policies**

Submission Consultation Statement

February 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. Introduction	3
2. Statement of Community Involvement	4
3. Consultation Process Overview - including timeline for Regulation 18 (Preparation of a local plan)	6
4. Issues and Preferred Approaches Reg. 18 (September 2012)	11
5. Publication Stage Reg.19 (November 2016)	30
6. Modifications Consultation	34
7. Appendices	
i. Evolution of policy taking account of responses to Issues and Preferred approaches	
ii. Contacts at Regulation 18 Issues and Preferred Approaches Stage	
iii. Contacts at Regulation 19 Publication Stage	
iv. Statement of Representations from Publication Stage	
v. Press releases	

1. Introduction

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared as a supporting document to the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies Document (DMP). It has also been produced to help comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (hereafter referred to as 'the Regulations'). It details how the National Park Authority has dealt with consultations, how comments (representations) have been sought, and how the representations that have been received have been addressed in the preparation and evolution of the DMP.

1.2 The DMP sets out the detailed policy framework that will be used for the determination of planning applications in the National Park alongside core policies already laid out in the adopted Core Strategy (2011).

1.3 In particular, and in line with the requirements of Regulation 22 of the Regulations, this statement sets out:

- Which bodies and persons the Authority invited to make representations under Regulations 18 and 19;
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under Regulations 18 and 19;
- A summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to Regulations 18 and 19; and
- How many representations made pursuant to Regulations 18 and 19 have been taken into account.

1.4 This Consultation Statement also refers to additional consultation undertaken on proposed modifications to the Publication version which will be submitted as an addendum to the plan.

2. Statement of Community Involvement

- 2.1 The Peak District National Park Authority has an adopted Statement of Community involvement (SCI), which sets out how the Authority will involve the local community and other interested parties in the planning process.
- 2.2 The current SCI was adopted in May 2012 following public consultation. A number of amendments to the local planning regulations were made during April 2012, under the ***Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012***.
- 2.3 The adopted SCI therefore needs to be read alongside the regulations in order to understand the sound basis for consultation on plan making.
- 2.4 In terms of timeframes for consultation the SCI sets higher standards than the effective minimum standard laid down in regulation, e.g. 12 weeks at regulation 18 stage and 8 weeks for the regulation 19 (Publication stage) consultation. This was in recognition of the strong representation and relevance of the parish councils within the National Park. The 6 week regulatory minimum for consultation often does not provide sufficient time for parishes to meet and agree representations; hence longer consultation periods have been established.

Extract from SCI - Opportunities for involvement in the preparation of planning policy documents

Consultation on the Issues and Preferred Options document

This document will set out the issues and the reasons for selection of preferred options, and a summary of the alternatives that were considered. There will be a 12-week consultation period which will be advertised on the website and in a press notice.

Statutory consultees, local communities and other relevant stakeholders from the list at Appendix 1 will be consulted by email or letter. Public meetings/exhibitions and workshops will be arranged where appropriate. Documents will be placed on the website, and copies will be available to read at the Authority's office, and in a number of constituent authority offices and libraries within and adjoining the National Park (see Appendix 2). Representations can be made by post, fax or email; on-line response systems will be available.

All representations will be acknowledged. All the comments made will be considered in finalising documents for publication, and will be discussed with respondents if necessary to clarify or consider in more detail. A summary of representations and the Authority's responses will be prepared and made available on the website.

Publication of the draft plan

The draft plan and supporting documents will be offered for an 8-week consultation period, which will be advertised on the website and in a press notice. A Statement of Consultation will be prepared, describing how the requirements of the SCI have been met, and summarising all previous representations and the Authority's responses.

At this stage comments can only be made on the 'soundness' of the plan. Statutory consultees and other relevant stakeholders, and everybody who responded at the Preferred Options stage, will be consulted by letter or email. The documents will be placed on the website, and copies will be available to read at locations as before. Representations can be made by post or email; on-line response systems will be available. All representations will be acknowledged.

3. Consultation Process Overview

3.1 The Peak District National Park DMP has been subject to a combination of a variety of consultation methods which have played an important role in shaping the policies in this document. A range of methods have been employed including:

3.2 *September to December 2012 – an Issues and Preferred Approaches consultation document. This was the principle event satisfying the terms of Regulation 18 (Preparation of a local plan).*

3.3 The table below sets out a more complete timeline of engagement.

Date	Nature of Consultation	Who consulted
May 2012	Land Managers Forum Awareness of upcoming consultation	NFU CLA Land Owners Farmers Large Estates Utilities bodies
May 2012	Agents Forum – Awareness of upcoming consultation	Local planning Agents
May 2012	Discussion re policy issues	Derbyshire Fire and rescue
June 2012	Cross Authority meet up to learn about practical landscape delivery issues and impact on policy	Moors for the Future partnership
July 2012	Liaison meeting in advance of formal consultation	Peak Park Parishes Forum (PPPF)
Sep 2012	Annual Parishes Day launch of consultation and policy debates regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village capacity • Re-use of traditional buildings • Local needs and local connection for housing • Replacement dwellings • Employment sites (safeguarding and release) • Parking 	PPPF and wide range of parish councils
Sep 2012	High Peak radio interview	Listeners in High Peak area of Derbyshire
Sep 2012	Duty to Co-operate meeting	Tameside Borough Council
	Housing Forum on preferred approaches	Peak District Rural Housing Association Other Housing Associations Derbyshire Dales District

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

		Council
	Scoping of SA	Statutory Environmental bodies
	Scoping of HRA	Statutory Environmental bodies
24 th Sep – 17 December 2012 12 week period	Issues and preferred approaches	All specific and general consultation bodies
Oct 2012	Mid-point consultation discussion on DM policies	PPPF
25 th July 2013	Duty to Co-operate meeting	Derbyshire Dales District Council
8 th March 2013	Duty to Cooperate meeting	High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
July 2013	Report back on representations from consultation and planning ahead to parishes day	PPPF
	Authority workshop on DM policies	PDNPA Members
	Meeting/workshop on emerging evidence relating to historic farmsteads of the Peak District	Historic England
Oct 2013	Parishes Day – policy debates focussed on housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing • Barn conversions • Replacement dwellings 	PPPF and a wide range of parish councils
3 rd October 2013	Meeting/workshop on emerging evidence relating to historic farmsteads of the Peak District	Historic England
4 th September 2014	Duty to Co-operate Meeting with Barnsley	Barnsley Council
Sep 2014	Parishes Day – Debates under the theme Thriving and Vibrant communities	PPPF and a wide range of parish councils
17 th March 2015	National Trust Liaison meeting	National Trust
26 th March 2015	Duty to Co-operate meeting with Cheshire East	Cheshire East Council
Sep 2015	Parishes Day – Debates under the theme Tourism and Visitor Management	PPPF and a wide range of parish councils
24 th September 2015	Duty to Co-operate meeting	Derbyshire Dales District Council
Oct 2015	Authority meeting – approval of draft Development	PDNPA Members

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Management Policies document	
4 th December 2015	Derbyshire Dales – Housing Market Area workshop	DDDC and surrounding local planning authorities
Jan – May 2016	PDNPA member steering group to finalise draft plan for publication	Lead member representatives
15 th Feb 2016	Duty to Cooperate 2016	Kirklees Council
March 2016	Habitats Regulations Assessment undertaken	By DTA Ecology consultants
April 2016	Updated SA Scoping report	Statutory Environmental bodies
Sep 2016	Sign off under delegation by Chair of PC	PDNPA members
Sep 2016	Parishes consultation event pre-consultation	Parish Councils
8 th Sep 2016	Transport Design Guide Stakeholder event	Highways and Rail Authorities
24 th Sep 2016	Annual Parishes Day – debates on thriving communities	Parish Councils
6 th October 2016	DtC meeting with DCC Minerals Policy Team	Derbyshire County Council
7 th October 2017	Revised Local Development Scheme taken to full Authority	Authority members
28 th Oct 2016 – 27 th Jan 13 weeks (SCI says 8 weeks with extra provision given owing to Xmas period)	Publication State Consultation (Reg 19)	All specific and general consultation bodies
9 th November 2016	Bradfield Parish Council – discussion re DMP consultation	Parish Council
10 th November 2016	Meeting with DDDC Housing manager re policy development and delivery issues	DDDC Housing
6 th Jan 2017	Local Conservative MP's to discuss National Park issues including DM Policy development	MP's
12 th Jan 2017	Duty to Cooperate meeting with Sheffield	Sheffield City Council
17 th Jan 2017	Meeting with Natural England re strategic transport issues	Natural England
19 th Jan 2017	Waterhouses Parish council re DM Policies consultation	Parish Council
25 th Jan 2017	Stanton in Peak Parish	Parish Council

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Council re DM Policies consultation	
14 th Feb 2017	Transport for the North – Wider Connectivity project Board	Transport for the North, Highways England, DfT, Highways Authorities
21 st March 2017	Duty to Cooperate meeting with Barnsley	Barnsley MBC
31 st March 2017	Annual Planning Liaison meeting with National Trust	The National Trust
4 th April 2017	Wider Connectivity Project Board	Transport for the North, Highways England, DfT, Highways Authorities
6 th April 2017	Duty to Cooperate meeting with Derbyshire County Council Policy team	Derbyshire County Council
27 th April 2017	National Parks Heads of Planning	The National Parks family
9-10 th May 2017	DDDC Local Plan examination hearings	Derbyshire Dales DC
11 th May 2017	Peak District Affordable Housing Working Group	Derbyshire Dales DC and High Peak BC housing and regeneration officers
24 th May 2017	Trans-Pennine Upgrade programme meeting Highways England and Statutory Environmental bodies	Highways England Natural England Historic England Environment Agency
13 th July 2017	Derbyshire Planning Policy Officers Group	All Derbyshire local planning authorities
29 th August 2017	Sheffield City Council Head of Planning	Sheffield City Council
25 th Sep 2017	Trans-Pennine Upgrade Programme – Statutory Environmental Bodies	Natural England Historic England Environment Agency
30 th September 2017	Annual Parishes Day – theme of National Park special qualities and managing impacts on them	Parish Councils
3 rd October 2017	National Park Management Plan consultation event	Wide range of partners
6 th October 2017	National Park Authority approval of proposed modifications to DM policies and Statement of Representations from Publication stage.	National Park Authority members
6 th Nov 2017	Meeting with Peak Park Parishes Forum	Parish Councils
13 th November 2017 – 12 th Jan 2018 8 weeks consultation	Consultation into proposed modifications for DM policies	All specific and general consultation bodies
15 th November	Duty to Cooperate meeting	Stockport MBC

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

2017	with Stockport MBC	
15 th November 2017	Inception meeting for joint SHELAA process with High Peak BC	High Peak BC
22 nd November 2017	Presentation and discussion re development consent order for Trans-Pennine Upgrade Programme (Road Investment Strategy 1)	Arcadis (consultants) working with Highways England
30 th November 2017	Affordable housing working group	Derbyshire Dales DC and High Peak BC Housing and Regeneration officers.
11 th December 2017	Peak Park Parishes Forum discussion re DM Policies proposed modifications	Parish Councils
13 th December 2017	Meeting with Chatsworth Estate re DM Policies proposed modifications	Chatsworth Estate
23 rd Jan 2018	Trans-Pennine Tunnel Stakeholder Reference Group – presentation on strategic case	Transport for the North Highways England Range of other LPA's Highways Authorities and interest groups also in attendance.
6 th Feb 2018	Duty to Cooperate meeting with Derbyshire County Council	Derbyshire County Council

4. Regulation 18 Issues and Preferred Approaches Consultation (September to December 2012)

4.1 This consultation satisfying regulation 18 stage of the regulations followed a range of other meetings and conversations with:

- parishes
- housing bodies
- farmers
- land owners
- other strategic partnerships affecting the national park

4.2 At this stage all parish councils and parish meetings were consulted, along with all constituent and adjoining councils and other statutory consultation bodies as required by regulations (See Appendix 2).

4.3 The consultation took place between Monday 24th September 2012 to Mon 17th December 2012 (12 weeks) in accordance with adopted Statement of Community Involvement. 59 people and organisations commented at this time generating several hundred separate comments. Some of these were duplicate points made by parish councils owing to support expressed for a collective response made by the Peak Park Parishes Forum. A document splitting out all of the comments and giving an early view of the Authority regarding the impact on emerging policy is available on the Authority website. Appendix 1 explains how the Reg 18 consultation shaped the preparation of the DM policies moving forward to the Reg 19 publication stage in 2016.

4.4 The Reg 18 consultation was extremely helpful in understanding the overall level of support for areas of policy and where further resources would be best directed as issues were debated and as the document began to be drafted.

4.5 A document containing the full original set of responses from the 2012 consultation may also be viewed on the Authority consultation website.

Issues and Preferred Approaches Consultation Methods

Method	Action Taken
Direct Consultation	Letters were sent out to all contacts on the Policy Planning database informing them of the consultation document, how to access it and how to make representations.
Hard Copies for Inspection	Hard copies of the consultation document were placed

	<p>at the following locations for the duration of the consultation period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak District National Park Authority office in Bakewell; • A range of other local authority offices across the area (see statement of representations procedure); and • A range of other libraries across the area (see statement of representations procedure)
Online	A full copy of the Issues and Preferred Approaches document and method of submitting representations was published on the Authority's website for the duration of the consultation.
Publicity	<p>The following additional publicity was undertaken to help promote the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public notice was placed in the local press (Peak Advertiser) • A press release (see Appendix 5) was issued to the local newspapers and radio (subsequent interview undertaken with High Peak radio)

Respondents to Issues and Preferred Approaches

<p><u>Responder number: 001</u> <u>Date received: 25/09/2012</u> <u>Responder: National Grid (Jemima Mathews)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 030</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Oldham Council (Clare Moran)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 002</u> <u>Date received: 01/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: Coverland UK (John Church)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 031</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Renewable UK (Yana Bosseva)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 003</u> <u>Date received: 09/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: NFU (Paul Tame)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 032</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Chatsworth Estate (Will Kemp)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 004</u> <u>Date received: 01/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: Meltham Town Council (Sarah Armitage)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 033</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Rainow Parish Council (Sarah Giller)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 005</u> <u>Date received: 27/10/2012</u> <u>Responder: Peak Park Parishes Forum (Phillip Thompson)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 034</u> <u>Date received: 16/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: National Trust (Alan Hubbard)</u></p>

<p><u>Responder number: 006</u> <u>Date received: 07/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Environment Agency</u> <u>(Andrew Pitts)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 035</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Chelmorton Parish Council</u> <u>(Mathew Lovell)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 007</u> <u>Date received: 09/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Mobile Operators</u> <u>Association (Mono Consultants)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 036</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Youlgrave Parish Council</u> <u>(Mathew Lovell)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 008</u> <u>Date received: 14/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Western Power</u> <u>Distribution (Turley Associates)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 037</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Natural England (John King)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 009</u> <u>Date received: 15/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Kirklees Council</u> <u>(Planning Policy Group)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 038</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Pauline Beswick</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 010</u> <u>Date received: 20/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: English Heritage</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 039</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: CEMEX UK (Shaun Denny)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 011</u> <u>Date received: 23/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell Town Council</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 040</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Minerals Products</u> <u>Association (Malcolm Ratcliff)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 012</u> <u>Date received: 25/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Mr Peter Simon</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 041</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: United Utilities (Dave</u> <u>Sherratt)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 013</u> <u>Date received: 26/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Wardlow Parish Council</u> <u>(Andy Middleton)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 042</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Friends of the Peak District</u> <u>(Andy Tickle)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 014</u> <u>Date received: 26/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Edale Parish Council</u> <u>(Nick Faulks)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 043</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: John Youatt (1) note SY =</u> <u>Sustainable Youlgrave</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 015</u> <u>Date received: 30/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: The Coal Authority</u> <u>(Rachael Bust)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 044</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Stoney Middleton Parish</u> <u>Council (Dulcie Jones)</u></p>

<p><u>Responder number: 016</u> <u>Date received: 04/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bamford and Thornhill Parish Council (Anne Celnick)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 045</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Emery Planning Partnership ('Various clients')</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 017</u> <u>Date received: 04/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Winster Parish Council (Rob Greatorex)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 046</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Derbyshire County Council (Environmental Services)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 018</u> <u>Date received: 05/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Ramblers Association (greater Manchester and High Peak area)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 047</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Woodland Trust (Nick Sandford)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 019</u> <u>Date received: 06/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell and District Civic Society (George Challenger)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 048</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Litton Properties (Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 020</u> <u>Date received: 06/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Highways Agency Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire (Graham Broome)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 049</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Severn Trent Water (James Glynn)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 021</u> <u>Date received: 07/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Highways Agency Spatial Planning (Kamaljit Kokhar)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 050</u> <u>Date received: 17/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: John Youatt (2)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 022</u> <u>Date received: 07/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Sport England (Maggie Taylor)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 051</u> <u>Date received: 10/08/2012</u> <u>Responder: The Ramblers Association: Derby area (John Riddall)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 023</u> <u>Date received: 11/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Rowsley Parish Council (Roger Brown)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 052</u> <u>Date received: 29/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Defence Infrastructure Organisation</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 024</u> <u>Date received: 12/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Tissington Estate (Tom Redfern)</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 053</u> <u>Date received: 29/11/2012</u> <u>Responder: Peak Park Watch (Adrian Russell Associates)</u></p>
<p><u>Responder number: 025</u> <u>Date received: 12/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Country Land and</u></p>	<p><u>Responder number: 054</u> <u>Date received: 03/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: British Mountaineering</u></p>

<u>Business Association (Caroline Bedell)</u>	<u>Council (Henry Folkard)</u>
<u>Responder number: 026</u> <u>Date received: 13/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Staffordshire County Council (James Chadwick)</u>	<u>Responder number: 055</u> <u>Date received: 07/12/12</u> <u>Responder: Nigel Johns</u>
<u>Responder number: 027</u> <u>Date received: 13/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Highways Agency (Asset Development)</u>	<u>Responder number: 056</u> <u>Date received: 12/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council (S. Bramwell)</u>
<u>Responder number: 028</u> <u>Date received: 13/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Indigo Planning (Andrew Astin)</u>	<u>Responder number: 057</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell Residents (Informal Group)</u>
<u>Responder number: 029</u> <u>Date received: 14/12/2012</u> <u>Responder: Bakewell Partnership</u>	<u>Responder number: 058</u> <u>Date received: 16/12/12</u> <u>Responder: Bob White (Nottingham Community Housing Association)</u>
	<u>Responder number: 059</u> <u>Date received: 16/12/12</u> <u>Responder: Dr Martin Beer</u>

Development Management Policies – Initial Assessment of Key Issues from Consultation

- 4.6 Following the collation of responses an analysis was undertaken of the key issues arising based on levels of support or objection (see table below). This assisted the consideration of how best to focus stakeholder engagement.
- 4.7 Principally this involved a series of contacts with local housing delivery bodies, Parish Councils and the Peak Park Parishes Forum (see table on page 6).

Issue No.	Title	Theme	Support/ Variance (Some support and some object)/ Object	Key issues
Landscape and Conservation				9
1	Natural Zone	Landscape and conservation	Support	
2	Whole landscape thinking	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
3	Cumulative harm	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
4	Removing structures	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√

5	Settlement limits	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
6	Protecting open spaces	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
7	Design	Landscape and conservation	Support	
8	Conservation Areas	Landscape and conservation	Support	
9	Listed buildings	Landscape and conservation	Support	
10	Demolishing listed buildings	Landscape and conservation	Support	
11	Conversion of buildings of historic or architectural merit	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
12	Location of conversions	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√

13	Parks and gardens	Landscape and conservation	Support	
14	Shop fronts	Landscape and conservation	Support	
15	Outdoor advertising	Landscape and conservation	Support	
16	Agri and forestry dwellings	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
17	Agri and forestry operations	Landscape and conservation	Support	
18	Farm diversification	Landscape and conservation	Variance	√
19	Cultural heritage sites and features	Landscape and conservation	Support	
20	Archaeological sites	Landscape and conservation	Support	
21	Wildlife sites	Landscape	Support	

		and conservation		
22	Safeguarding and recording	Landscape and conservation	Support	
23	Assessing non- designated wildlife	Landscape and conservation	Support	
24	Protecting trees, woodlands and landscape features	Landscape and conservation	Support	
25	Pollution and disturbance	Landscape and conservation	Support	
26	Surface water run-off	Landscape and conservation	Support	
27	Contaminated land	Landscape and conservation	Support	
28	Unstable land	Landscape and conservation	Support	
29	Site briefs	Landscape and	Support	

		conservation		
Housing				6
30	Addressing local need for affordable housing	Housing	Variance	√
31	Maximising affordable housing from development	Housing	Variance	√
32	Preventing abuse of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing	Housing	Variance	√
33	Definition of local qualification	Housing	Variance	√
34	Assessing care needs	Housing	Support	
35	Replacement of agri occupancy conditions	Housing	Support	

36	Extensions and alterations	Housing	Support	
37	Replacement dwellings	Housing	Variance	√
38	Conversion of outbuildings	Housing	Variance	√
Shops, services and community facilities				0
39	Retail and services in named settlements	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
40	Change of use of shops	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
41	Retail development outside named settlements	Shops, services and community facilities	Support	
42	Safeguarding sites for	Shops, services and	Support	

	community facilities	community facilities		
Economy				6
43	Enabling re-use of unoccupied or underused business sites in named settlements	Economy	Variance	√
44	Exceptional B1 uses	Economy	Variance	√
45	Home working	Economy	Variance	√
46	Industrial and business expansion	Economy	Variance	√
47	Retail uses in industrial and business areas	Economy	Variance	√
48	Design, layout and neighbourlines	Economy	Support	√

	s of employment sites			
Recreation and Tourism				0
49	Touring camping and caravan sites	Recreation and tourism	Support	
50	Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	Recreation and tourism	Support	
51	Holiday occupancy of self catering accommodation	Recreation and tourism	Support	
52	Facilities for keeping and riding horses	Recreation and tourism	Support	
new	Hubs and Gateways	Recreation and tourism	N/A	
Utilities				2

53	Development requiring new or upgraded utilities	Utilities	Support	
54	New or upgraded utility services	Utilities	Variance	√
55	Development close to utility installations	Utilities	Support	
56	Ancillary development necessary for renewables	Utilities	Support	
57	Telecomms	Utilities	Variance	√
58	Restoration of utility sites	Utilities	Support	
Minerals and waste				0
59	Assessing and	Minerals and	Support	

	minimising the environmental impact of mineral development	waste		
60	Small scale calcite workings	Minerals and waste	Support	
61	Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	Minerals and waste	Support	
Transport				3
62	Reducing and directing traffic	Transport	Support	
63	Implementing road hierarchy	Transport	Support	
64	Cross park traffic	Transport	Support	
65	Public	Transport	Support	

	transport route enhancement			
66	Railway construction	Transport	Support	
67	Public transport and pattern of development	Transport	Support	
68	Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	Transport	Variance	√
69	Freight transport and lorry parking	Transport	Support	
70	Car parking	Transport	Variance	√
71	Coach parking	Transport	Support	
72	Traffic restraint	Transport	Support	
73	Cycle parking	Transport	Support	

74	Design criteria for transport infrastructure	Transport	Support	
75	Public rights of way	Transport	Variance	√
76	Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians	Transport	Support	
77	Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	Transport	Support	
78	Air transport	Transport	Support	
Bakewell				0
79	Development boundary	Bakewell	Support	
80	Important open spaces and CA issues	Bakewell	Support	

81	Traffic management	Bakewell	Support	
82	Car, coach and lorry parking	Bakewell	Support	
83	Public transport	Bakewell	Support	
84	Sites for industry and business	Bakewell	Support	
85	Redevelopment of Lumford Mill	Bakewell	Support	
86	Non - conforming uses	Bakewell	Support	
87	Shopping and the central shopping area	Bakewell	Support	
88	The stall market	Bakewell	Support	
89	Community,	Bakewell	Support	

	sports and art facilities in Bakewell			
90	Scope for new hotel	Bakewell	Support	

5. Publication Stage Reg.19 (November 2016)

5.1 The Publication Development Management Policies (DMP) document takes full account of all the representations received at the Issues and Preferred Approaches stage. Appendix 1 sets out how the representations from Reg 18 have been collectively considered and actioned in the preparation of the Publication version.

5.2 Rather than publishing a preliminary draft document the Authority has chosen to develop the document using a process of continuing engagement. See table above starting on page 6. The Publication Version for consultation therefore moves the Authority on from the preferred Approach stage, incorporating amendments arising from the Issues and Preferred Approaches stage and subsequent discussions with parishes, stakeholders and member working groups.

5.3 The Publication Version also takes into changes to Government policy and law (such as Starter Homes), and has considered the findings from the final Sustainability Appraisal report.

5.4 In accordance with the regulations, the Publication version of the DMP (in effect the Authority's final version of the document at the Pre-Submission stage) was made available for public consultation between 18th November 2016 and 27th January 2017 (a period of 10 weeks). The Authority consulted the community and other stakeholders using the methods detailed in the table below.

5.5 71 people and organisations commented at this time generating several hundred separate comments. Some of these were duplicate points made by parish councils owing to support expressed for a collective response made by the Peak Park Parishes Forum.

5.6 The Authority has produced a separate Statement of Representations (which will be submitted along with the Plan) setting out the level of comment made against each policy and providing a summary of the main issues raised. This work also began a process of understanding where further improvements could be made to the plan.

5.7 On the basis of the representations the Authority decided to make a series of suggested modifications to the plan. In large part these either respond to minor grammatical points or assist in the clarity of the plan. It was decided to take the proactive approach of publicising these modifications

as a formal addendum to the plan in advance of the Submission. This has allowed further comment and it is hoped in many areas resolves representations raised at the Publication stage. The key issues arising from the Publication stage consultation are set out in the Statement of Representations submitted along with the DPD and for convenience are repeated at Appendix 4 of this document.

5.8A document containing the full set of responses from the Publication stage consultation may also be viewed on the Authority consultation website, along with additional representations made on the proposed modifications.

Publication Stage Consultation Methods

Method	Action Taken
Direct Consultation	Letters sent out to all contacts on the Policy Planning database informing them of the consultation document, how to access it and how to make representations.
Hard Copies for Inspection	Hard copies of the consultation document placed at the following locations for the duration of the consultation period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak District National Park Authority office in Bakewell; • A range of other local authority offices across the area (see statement of representations procedure); and • A range of other libraries across the area (see statement of representations procedure)
Online	A full copy of the Development Management Policies document, Policies Map, supporting documents and method of submitting representations made available on the Authority's website for the duration of the consultation.
Publicity	The following additional publicity was undertaken to help promote the consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public notice was placed in the local press (Peak Advertiser, plus • Leek Post and Times • Macclesfield Express • Glossop Chronicle • Oldham Evening Chronicle • Sheffield Telegraph • Huddersfield Examiner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A press release (see Appendix 5) was also

	issued to the local newspapers
Events	<p>1st September Parishes Liaison event to raise awareness of the upcoming consultation event</p> <p>24th September 2016 Annual Parishes Day presentation to raise awareness of consultation event.</p> <p>9th November 2016 attendance at Bradfield Parish Council to discuss consultation (requested by PC)</p>

Respondents to Publication Stage Consultation

1	Jean Howarth
2	National Farmers' Union
3	East Midlands Chamber (Derbyshire, Nottingham, Leicestershire)
4	High Peak Borough Council (Cllr Tony Ashton)
5	Lynda Aylett-Green
6	John Hollister, AECOM on behalf of Stancliffe Stone Co. Ltd
7	Holme Valley PC
8	Bakewell and District Civic Society
9	Allen Newby, PME Planning Services
10	Stella McGuire
11	Bradwell PC
12	Chapel-en-le-Frith PC
13	Canal and River Trust
14	Mineral Products Association
15	Disley PC
16	Hope with Aston PC
17	Waterhouses PC
18	Over Haddon PC
19	Taddington PC
20	Winster PC
21	Derbyshire County Council
22	Natural England
23	Peak Park Parishes Forum
24	Peter Abbott
25	Peak District Rural Housing Association
26	Chelmorton PC
27	Cheshire East Council
28	Friends of the Peak District
29	Bamford PC
30	Abney PC
31	Highways England
32	High Peak and Hope Valley Community Rail Partnership
33	Stanton in Peak PC & Sue Fogg

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

34	Derbyshire Dales District Council
35	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees
36	The Coal Authority
37	Rapleys on behalf of Castleton Caravan Club
38	NHS Property Services
39	CEMEX
40	Castleton PC
41	Edale PC
42	Patricia Miles
43	Great Hucklow, Grindlow, Windmill, Little Hucklow & Coplowdale PC
44	United Utilities
45	Heaton Planning Ltd on behalf of Tarmac
46	IBA Planning on behalf of Mr D. Clapham
47	Historic England
48	Emery Planning
49	Bakewell Town Council
50	National Trust
51	Youlgrave PC
52	Fisher German (Kay Davies)
53	Gordon Rooke
54	John Youatt
55	The Woodland Trust
56	Martin Beer
57	Nathaniel Lichfield Partners on behalf of Litton Properties
58	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
59	High Peak Borough Council
60	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultant Ltd
61	Peak Rail Plc
62	Derbyshire & Peak District Campaign for Better Transport
63	Osmaston and Yeldersley Parish Council
64	Peter O'Brien
65	Greg Potter, Alsop Rivendale Ltd
66	Anita Dale
67	Joseph Drewry, Environment Agency
68	David Carlisle, Friends of Buxton Station
69	Rowsley PC
70	The Rt hon Karen Bradley MP
71	Emma Humphreys

6. Proposed Modifications to Publication version (Nov 13th to Jan 12th 2018)

6.1 Having considered the nature of responses from the Publication Stage the Authority was keen to respond to many of the issues arising and used the established Member Steering Group to assess the scope for modifications. As a result a range of modifications have been proposed which respond in the main to issues demanding greater clarity, or simply minor grammatical and presentational improvements.

6.2 Following advice from PINS it was decided to consult on the proposed modifications and then present the changes as an addendum to the Publication Version upon Submission.

6.3 The proposed modifications were made available for public consultation between 13th November 2017 and 12th January 2018 (a period of 10 weeks). The Authority consulted the community and other stakeholders using the methods detailed in the table below.

6.4 30 people and organisations commented at this time generating additional comments. Some of these were duplicate points made by parish councils owing to support expressed for a collective response made by the Peak Park Parishes Forum.

6.5 It is also the case that some of the responses support the modifications and that these then result in an overall reduction in outstanding objections to the DM policies document.

6.6 Representations received on the proposed modifications have also been collated and have been submitted along with the other representations. These may be viewed as part of the evidence.

Modifications Stage Consultation Methods

Method	Action Taken
Direct Consultation	Letters sent out to all contacts on the Policy Planning database informing them of the consultation document, how to access it and how to make representations.
Hard Copies for Inspection	Hard copies of the consultation document placed at the following locations for the duration of the consultation period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak District National Park Authority office in Bakewell;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of other local authority offices across the area (see statement of representations procedure); and • A range of other libraries across the area (see statement of representations procedure)
<p>Online</p>	<p>A full copy of the Development Management Policies document, Policies Map, supporting documents and method of submitting representations made available on the Authority's website for the duration of the consultation.</p>
<p>Publicity</p>	<p>The following additional publicity was undertaken to help promote the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public notice was placed in the local press (Peak Advertiser, plus • Leek Post and Times • Macclesfield Express • Glossop Chronicle • Oldham Evening Chronicle • Sheffield Telegraph • Huddersfield Examiner

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Responses received from the consultation on the modification to the published Development Management Policies Document between 13th November 2017 and 12th January 2018

6M	John Hollister, AECOM on behalf of Stancliffe Stone Co. Ltd
13M	Canal and River Trust
14M	Mineral Products Association
20M	Winstar PC
21M	Derbyshire County Council
23M	Peak Park Parishes Forum
28M	Friends of the Peak District
29M	Bamford PC
31M	Highways England
33M	Stanton in the Peak PC
34M	Derbyshire Dales District Council
35M	Chatsworth Settlement Trustees
36M	Coal Authority
38M	NHS Property Services
39M	CEMEX
43M	Great Hucklow, Grindlow, Windmill, Little Hucklow & Coplodale PC
44M	United Utilities
47M	Historic England
48M	Emery Planning
49M	Bakewell Town Council
50M	National Trust
54M	John Youatt
58M	Staffordshire Moorlands Borough Council
59M	High Peak Borough Council
61M	Peak Rail Plc
67M	Joseph Drewry, Environment Agency
72	CMC Planning on behalf of Brosterfield Shepherds Huts
73	George Challenger
74	Network Rail
75	Sheffield City Council

Appendix 1 – Evolution of policy taking account of responses to Issues and Preferred approaches

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
Chapter 3: Conservation		Chapter 3: Conserving and enhancing the National Park’s valued characteristics	Covers the same policy areas but does not include the settlement strategy because this is covered now by the Core Strategy and there is no need to repeat that.
	Issue 2: Embedding whole landscape thinking into planning decisions (New) Responses were at variance with the preferred approach to give parts of the Landscape Strategy SPD status. A key response from FOPD on issues 19 - 27 advocates the drawing together of factors constituting an ecosystems approach	DMC1: Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes	No equivalent 2001 policy because the landscape strategy didn’t exist. The new policy completely embeds the landscape strategy and action plan and valued characteristics into decision making. It considers the risk of cumulative impacts from development and it retains the potential to require removal of buildings once their functional use has gone and where there is no alternative use that would be permitted. This is a safeguard rather than a new campaign to remove buildings. It represents a cross cutting approach to landscape conservation that recognises the interconnectedness of the factors that cumulatively make up nationally significant landscape and are the reason behind national park designation
LC1 Conserving and managing the Natural Zone	Issue 1: Exceptional circumstances in which development is acceptable in the Natural Zone. There was support for the level of control proposed	DMC2: Protecting and managing the Natural Zone	New policy does not include national interest as an exceptional circumstance justifying development in NZ. The tests are otherwise the same as LC1 but there is much greater emphasis on valued landscape character and the need for any development to understand and reflect that.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC2: designated local Plan settlements		No equivalent as the Core Strategy policy DS1 achieves the same outcome of outlining a settlement strategy to concentrate development	No change to the settlement strategy in terms of numbers of villages where development is accepted in principle.
LC3: Local Plan Settlement limits	Issue 5: <i>Settlement Limits</i> . The preferred option was to add detail to previous LC3 but responses were not supportive of this option.	DMC4: Settlement Limits	The policy is largely unchanged but does require that proposals recognise and assess the impact of a proposed development on the settlement pattern in its own right but also for its contribution to landscape character. There is also greater recognition of the heritage value of settlements and the component parts of settlements including important open space. It is therefore more detailed than LC3 but adds clarity to a policy rather than making it more onerous.
LC4: Design, layout and landscaping	Issue 7: <i>Design Layout and landscaping</i> . The preferred approach was to bring forward LC4 parts (a) and (b) (iv) and (v) and consider whether Core Strategy GSP3 required expansion or explanation. General support with encouragement to include lighting schemes and outside bin storage facilities into the mix of considerations.	DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping	The new policy follows the preferred approach and does build on GSP3. It covers a wider range of things including utility services, parking, flood risk, sustainable drainage, accessibility, and also the relevance of wider landscape character. The issue of light pollution is however now dealt with by new policy DMC14: Pollution and disturbance and considers impact of light pollution on neighbours, landscape and biodiversity, recreational users e.g. enjoying dark sky landscapes.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC5: Conservation Areas	<p>Issue 8: <i>Conservation areas</i>. The preferred approach was the only approach proposed and was to bring forward detail based on LC5.</p> <p>Responses urged use of new heritage language of 'significance' and a nuanced approach to 'vernacular' which enables new vernacular and recognises the differences between different parts of the Park and between different Conservation Areas.</p>	DMC8: Conservation Areas	<p>DMC8 is largely unchanged from LC5 but brings in the new heritage language of 'significance' and contains slightly more recognition of the importance of factors such as valued street patterns and street furniture as considerations.</p> <p>The new policy does not encourage or discourage 'new vernacular' but sets out the material planning considerations for any proposal for new build.</p>
LC6: Listed Buildings	<p>Issue 9: <i>Listed buildings</i>. The preferred approach suggested updating LC6 in light of changes to the NPPF.</p>	DMC7: Listed buildings	<p>The new policy does what the preferred approach proposed. The policy introduces the term 'significance' because that is the language of heritage asset protection. Otherwise the policy is the same but the requirements for detailed information showing effect on heritage significance are outlined in supporting text and in DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings, rather than in policy DMC7.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC7: Demolition of Listed Buildings	Issue 10: <i>Demolition of listed buildings</i> . The preferred approach suggested updating LC7 in light of changes to the NPPF.	No equivalent	No policy for demolition of listed buildings brought forward but all change to listed buildings including demolition is covered by DMC7 and NPPF.
LC8: Conversion of buildings of historic or vernacular merit	Issue 11: <i>Conversion of Buildings of Historic or Architectural merit</i> . The preferred approach was to retain the intent of LC8 but replace the term vernacular merit with historical or architectural merit. Early experience of trying to use the core strategy highlighted the difficulty in defining what historic or vernacular merit actually meant particularly in the context of applications to convert buildings to open market housing. Stakeholders picked up on this and wanted clearer definition	DMC10: Conversion of heritage assets	<p>The new policy is more detailed because this was felt necessary, given the huge numbers of buildings in the National Park that are either designated or non-designated heritage assets. Policy deals with the challenges involved in converting these to new uses, whilst conserving that which makes them special, including close consideration of historic landscape setting. .</p> <p>The policy also adds details to core strategy HC1 for proposals to convert to residential use. HC1 has proved contentious since core strategy adoption in 2011 because disagreement ensued over the meaning of the term ‘valued vernacular’. DMC10 clarifies that, with regard to HC1 C, ‘valued vernacular’ means ‘designated and non-designated heritage assets’. All other buildings are not classed as valued vernacular for the purposes of this plan and therefore conversion to</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>of vernacular but not necessarily it's re-casting as historical or architectural significance partly because it was felt this would prevent the option for innovative design and the next generation of vernacular buildings.</p>		<p>open market residential use is not permitted under core strategy policy HC1.</p> <p>In terms of scope for new vernacular, the clearer definition helps in so far as it, and other guidance in SPD enables applicants to find uses for their buildings, however more clearly defining the term for the purposes of applying development management conversion policies does not prevent the Authority from approving new vernacular buildings for example where the benefits from a sustainable build justify an innovative design and use of materials and where this is achieved in such a way that valued settlement form and valued landscape character is conserved or enhanced. Chapter 3 of the Design Guide: <i>New Development – designing in sympathy and Chapter 6 Sustainable Design</i> enlarge on this point.</p>
<p>LC9: Important Parks and Gardens</p>	<p>Issue 13: <i>Important Parks and Gardens</i>. The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria based on LC9 and this was seen as the only reasonable approach. There was general support but a caution that the wording may prevent flexibility needed for estate management</p>	<p>DMC9: Registered Parks and Gardens</p>	<p>New and old policies are the same</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	(Chatsworth) and an offer to help re-word policy and text		
LC10: Shop Fronts	Issue 14: <i>Shop fronts</i> . The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria based on LC10 and possibly supplement that with an SPD. The idea of an SPD was supported by EH (now HE) and the National Trust.	DMS4: Shop Fronts	New and old policies are the same but the Authority has decided to adopt SPD on Shop Fronts.
LC11: Outdoor Advertising	Issue 15: <i>Outdoor Advertising</i> . The preferred approach was to bring forward LC11. There was stakeholder support for the preferred option with a caution that some of the wording of LC11 might prevent the Park boundary signs used	DMS5: Outdoor Advertising	New and old policy is the same and it's not considered necessary to change the wording.
LC12: Agricultural or forestry workers dwellings.	Issue 16: <i>Agricultural, forestry or other rural enterprise workers dwellings</i> . The preferred approach was to retain LC12 but with the added	DMH4: Essential Worker dwellings	The new policy supporting text contains a wider definition of essential worker to include worker housing for rural enterprises that are operationally dependant on the land i.e. the business is essential to land management as opposed to the business needing or wanting to operate from

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>ability to restrict to sizes permitted for affordable housing to reduce risk of loss onto the open market, and retain the homes as more affordable and recyclable to those in housing need. The Authority also wanted the ability to refuse further worker dwellings where worker dwellings had been recently sold off. Stakeholders did not support such a size restriction and questioned the value of an affordable home in an unsustainable location, which is where many farms are. Stakeholders wanted a wider definition of essential worker for other rural enterprises to be consistent with the term used in the Core Strategy HC2. The use of legal agreements wasn't questioned, but caution was expressed that this should be only where necessary i.e. where conditions couldn't</p>		<p>countryside for other reasons such a neighbour amenity or to secure space to grow.</p> <p>No list of acceptable or unacceptable rural enterprises is given but the Authority states that most rural enterprises are not operationally dependent on the land and therefore most do not fit within the group of businesses for which worker housing would be acceptable in principle.</p> <p>In response to stakeholder concerns there is no restriction on size or construction costs as the test is the likely sustainable income of the business to support the property (which would in effect limit the size and cost anyway).</p> <p>There is no policy provision to refuse a worker dwelling on the grounds that a worker dwelling has recently been sold out of the business (frustrating as this is to the Authority)</p> <p>Legal agreements will be used to secure worker occupancy because this has proved necessary with all forms of development where restricted occupancy is a necessary planning outcome. The use of legal agreements is covered by DMH11 and retains strict legal requirements to prevent sale of houses out of the business and enable other plan uses to be addressed. In the event that other uses cannot reasonably be addressed by</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>achieve the required planning outcome. There was a feeling that legal agreements should not be used to dictate future uses. The idea of preventing replacement worker dwellings where others were sold off was rejected.</p>		<p>the worker dwelling, which may be the case where the size of dwelling is, for conservation and enhancement reasons, above that which would be required for affordable housing, the Authority may remove the legal agreement or not enforce it.</p>
<p>LC13: Agricultural or forestry operational development</p>	<p>Issue 17: <i>Agricultural or forestry operational development</i>. The only approach considered reasonable, and therefore the preferred approach was to bring forward LC13 but clarify what we meant by close the main group of buildings with regard to preferred location for new development. There was general support for this approach but a request that we consider widening to include biodiversity and soils</p>	<p>DME1: Agricultural or forestry operational development</p>	<p>DME1 incorporates the tests to be applied to applications for new agricultural buildings. This is felt necessary given the high levels of applications received for new agricultural buildings and the tendency for the buildings applied for to be considerably bigger and potentially more intrusive in the landscape. In terms of what we mean by close to the main group of buildings, the new policy covers this by stating in addition to the criteria LC13 (i) and (iii) that buildings should be close to <u>the farmstead</u> or main group of buildings and not <u>be in isolated locations</u> requiring obtrusive access tracks roads or services. (underlined is new wording. The need to avoid obtrusive tracks and services means that the applicant would need to look to existing building groups first in any cases so it is considered this is sufficient policy guidance. The issue of biodiversity and soils and the potential for development to harm them is picked up in DMC14: Pollution and disturbance.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC14: Farm diversification	<p><i>Issue 18: Farm diversification.</i> The preferred approach was to retain strict control over types of business permitted for diversification reasons because of the threat to national park landscapes from allowing any type of business to operate from the protected landscape. There was recognition by the Authority that landscape setting was particularly important. There were objections to this approach amongst parish councils and the NFU but support from FOPD.</p>	DME2: Farm Diversification	<p>Policy DME2 is far more encouraging of farm diversification and the buildings that may be necessary to enable that to happen. It also invites applications for new buildings where the proposal involves removal of buildings of poor quality and fit in poor locations. This recognises the scope to use existing building groups not simply through re-use of existing buildings but by careful integration of new buildings where appropriate to the form of the farmstead and its setting. The policy is therefore more encouraging but retains a strong conservation imperative which prevents inappropriate non farming business development and expansion on farms.</p>
LC15: Historic and cultural heritage sites and features	<p><i>Issue 19: Historic and cultural heritage sites and features.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policy criteria from LC15 and add detail from historic farmsteads word and landscape character work. There was only support for this approach.</p>	DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings	<p>Rolling of two policies into one with clear requirements for any applicant proposing development that impact on heritage assets and their settings</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LC16 Archaeological sites and features	<i>Issue 20: Archaeological sites and features.</i> The preferred approach was to retain LC16 criteria in new policy. There was only support for the preferred approach plus a request to incorporate new heritage language (significance etc)	DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings	Rolling of two policies into one with clear requirements for any applicant proposing development that impact on heritage assets and their settings
		DMC6: Scheduled monuments	Issue not previously covered
LC17: Sites features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	<i>Issue 21: Sites features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance.</i> The preferred approach was to retain LC17 criteria in new policy and incorporate climate change impacts into the range of considerations. There were no issue specific responses	DMC12: Sites features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance	Policy updated to recognise the various legislation that already gives protection to large areas of the Park. These laws won't be affected by Brexit before this development plan is adopted. Climate change was not included as is covered by other policy and SPD
LC18: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests when development is acceptable	<i>Issue 22: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests when development is acceptable.</i> The preferred approach was to bring	DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests	Requires no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity and links the Biodiversity Action Plan to policy. Brings cumulative impact into the equation as well

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	forward policy based on LC18. There were no issue specific responses		
LC19: Assessing the nature conservation importance of sites not subject to statutory designation	<i>Issue 23: Assessing the nature conservation importance of sites not subject to statutory designation.</i> The preferred approach was to update LC19 and Local Plan appendix 10. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC11: Safeguarding, recording and enhancing nature conservation interests	Part G of the new policy requires an assessment of the nature conservation importance of a site.
LC20: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development	<i>Issue 24: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LC20 as policy rather than SPD supplementing Core Strategy LC1. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC13: Protecting trees, woodlands or other landscape features put at risk by development	Policy updated to make it clear that loss of these features as a result of development should only be permitted as an exceptional circumstance. The onus is placed on the applicant to justify the development's impact on trees and woodlands. It is an explicit requirement that trees are protected during the course of the development.
LC21: Pollution and disturbance	<i>LC25: Pollution and disturbance.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LC21 as policy and update based on NPPF and NPVC.	DMC14: Pollution and disturbance	Updated policy that includes, as well as specifics on the types of pollution covered, a wider consideration of impacts including impacts on dark skies for example. This is more explicit than the old policy which simply specified valued characteristics without saying what they were.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	There were no issue specific responses.		Other designations are also brought into policy such designations as Source Protection Zones and Water Protection Zones which weren't recognised when the 2001 policy was adopted
LC22: Surface water run off	<i>Issue 26: Surface water run-off.</i> Preferred approach was to update policy in light of Water Management Act 2010 and fact that NPAs no longer the consenting authority for sustainable urban drainage systems. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC14: Pollution and disturbance	New policy on pollution and disturbance picks up the issue of impact of development on the water environment in its many forms.
LC23: Flood risk areas	No issue highlighted	No equivalent	No policy needed because Core strategy CC5 deals with the issue.
LC24: Contaminated Land	<i>Issue 27: Contaminated Land.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward a policy like LC24. There were no issue specific responses.	DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land	Rolling of two policies into one to address issues 27 and 28
LC25: Unstable land	<i>Issue 28: Unstable land.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward a policy like LC25. There were no issue specific	DMC15: Contaminated and unstable land	Rolling of two policies into one to address issues 27 and 28

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	responses		
Chapter 4: Housing		Chapter 6: Housing	The main shift is a greater recognition of the challenges to community vibrancy from a lack of affordable housing and a greater encouragement towards making use of existing buildings and groups of buildings to explore forms of accommodation that can both meet the needs of communities and the need to conserve and enhance built environments.
LH1: Meeting local needs for affordable housing	<i>Issue 30: Addressing local needs for affordable housing.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward an updated LH1 to reflect the Core Strategy. The response was mixed. Parishes wanted us to consider reasonable need as justification for new housing (as opposed to proven need) and they want clarity on what can and can't be brought forward by a private developer (as opposed to an RSL) The want us to permit housing for an ageing population. The NFU assurance that worker dwellings would	DMH1: New Affordable Housing	Core Strategy HC1 covers the same ground but DMH1 clarifies that new affordable housing is justified where there is a proven need for the dwelling and the housing is within prescribed floor area limits. The supporting text to DMH1 clarifies that individuals can build schemes of affordable housing provided there is a proven need. The level of proof required is made easier by recognition of the many methods of obtaining information (so not restricted to housing need surveys or choice based lettings register but allows all other methods of gathering information on need to be considered) This is considered to make the burden of proof more reasonable. The text recognises that there may be justification for elderly person's accommodation even where those persons are often home owners on the grounds that their financial means does not afford them a more suitable house if they don't exist and communities want to retain family networks

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	still be possible within policy.		including the older generation. Policy DMH4 updates Local plan policy LH2 in respect of agricultural workers.
LH2: Definition of people with a local qualification	Issue 33: Definition of people with a local qualification. The preferred option was to keep the local connection as it is now rather than strengthen or weaken it. The response did not support the preferred option and officers took this back to the member steering group	DMH2: First occupation of new affordable housing and DMH3 Second and subsequent occupation of affordable housing (The occupancy cascade)	Based on discussions with members and parishes following the consultation the Authority has decided to retain the same local qualification. This enables flexibility from a policy position of strength. The new policies confirm the definitions that have operated throughout the previous local plan period and especially since the housing SPG was adopted in 2003. The cascade mechanism is unchanged from that which has operated since 2009 when it was slightly relaxed in response to RSLs troubles filling property and the void times that resulted.
LH3: Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions	<i>Issue 35: Replacement of agricultural occupancy conditions.</i> The preferred approach was to retain a position as set down in LH3. The response was generally supportive but there was less support to try and recycle the houses to local need or holiday occupancy in the event of agricultural need	DMH11: Section 106 agreements	The new policy covers the circumstances under which a legal agreement restricting occupancy would be temporarily or permanently lifted and retains the requirement that the houses are retained for future agricultural worker use and in the intervening period that they be used to address a local need or holiday use i.e. meet other plan needs that would be permitted but not be given over to demands for open market housing use which isn't a plan objective and wouldn't be permitted.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	changing either temporarily or permanently.		
LH4: Extensions and Alterations to dwellings	<i>Issue 36: Extensions and alterations.</i> The preferred approach was to refresh the criteria used in LCH4 to encompass extensions to the curtilage and to consider clarifying the issue of extensions in regard to affordable housing. The response was generally supportive but there was dislike for the idea of restricting growth of affordable homes.	DMH7: Extensions and Alterations and SPD Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide	<p>New policy covers the same ground but brings in control where extension of the curtilage is/would lead to undesirable change to landscape. Supporting text to DMH1 clarifies that extensions to affordable housing may be permitted provided the floorspace in the policy does not exceed the upper limit for 3 bed houses (the limit above which we could not sustain the argument that the house could remain affordable in perpetuity for those in housing need) This means we have accepted the argument that affordable houses can grow to accommodate family needs but by small proportion and within limits.</p> <p>New SPD gives greater guidance to encourage better schemes.</p>
LH5: Replacement dwellings	<i>Issue 37: Replacement dwellings.</i> The preferred approach was to retain policy LCH5 but not restrict replacement to small substandard pre-fabricated houses. Responders sought re-assurance that non designated heritage	DMC9: Replacement dwellings	<p>The main change is the removal of the requirement to replace with same size building, but the introduction of a significant enhancement test before larger replacements are acceptable. This recognises the difficulties in applying the 'same size' test, when many sites and locations could take a larger building and conserve and enhance the site and setting. The policy now clearly protects heritage assets, but also now</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	assets wouldn't be lost. They wanted no arbitrary size limits and they urged that the opportunity for more sustainable build was taken, along a request for space for a new vernacular and a shift away from slavish devotion to design guide houses.		enables replacement of one with more than one in DS1 settlements provided it is justified for the enhancement it provides and provided it addresses an evidenced need for affordable housing.
LH6: Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings to ancillary residential uses	<i>Issue 38: Conversion of outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings to ancillary residential uses.</i> The preferred approach was to amend the criteria established in LH6 to bring about greater definition and control	DMH5: Ancillary dwellings in the curtilages of existing dwellings by conversion or new build	The new policy recognises the potential to provide accommodation within groups of buildings either by conversion or new build. Previously we did not make the potential for new build clear.
LH7: Gypsy caravan sites	No issue	No equivalent policy	Core Strategy HC3 covers this issue so there is no longer a need for a local plan policy.
Chapter 5: Shops Services and Community Facilities		Chapter 7: Shops, services and community facilities	
LS1: Retailing and services in Local Plan Settlements	<i>Issue 39: Retailing and services in Local Plan Settlements.</i> The preferred approach was to	DMS1 Shops, professional services and related activities in Core Strategy named	The new policy works alongside Core Strategy HC5 and there is little change other than the removal of the protection for convenience shops

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	widen the protection given to Castleton and Hartington to all LC2 (now DS1) settlements. There was no response	settlements	in Castleton and Hartington, which didn't preclude change of use within A use class and only related to new development. The policy applies to all DS1 settlements equally.
LS2: Change of use of a shop to any other use.	<i>Issue 40: Change of use of a shop to any other use.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward LS2. There were no responses	DMS2 Change of use of shops, community services and facilities	Policy is widened and gives greater clarity on the marketing required under Core Strategy HC4 before the Authority would consider the loss of shops and other community facilities to other uses. This is intended to protect communities against the loss of valued services whilst leaving the door open to change of use if the evidence justifies it. The policy works alongside Core Strategy HC4.
LS3: Retail development outside Local Plan Settlements	<i>Issue 41: Retail development outside core strategy named settlements.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria of LS3. There was support for the preferred approach provided it isn't too strict on what can be sold	DMS3 Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements	Policy remains the same i.e. to discourage retail use outside of settlements other than in a few select circumstances, and even then, the retail activity must remain ancillary to the main business. The aim remains to prevent the establishment or growth of retail units in unsustainable locations because the tendency is for these to want to grow in that location rather than move to settlements or retail parks.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LS4:Community facilities		DMS2: Change of use of shops, community services and facilities; and DMS7 Retention of community recreation sites or sports facilities	Policies works with Core Strategy HC4. Collectively, policies give a high level of protection to community buildings, and encourage replacement of one community use with another rather than outright loss.
LS5: Safeguarding sites for community facilities	<i>Issue 42: Safeguarding sites for community facilities.</i> The preferred option was to safeguard sites on the proposals map and provide a policy to capture those not known at time of plan adoption. There was no response	DMS6: Safeguarding sites for community facilities	No change to LS5.
Chapter 6: Economy		Chapter 4: Farming and Economy	Change of chapter title because policies for farming (barring the essential worker policy) are included under the broad area of economic policies rather than under Conservation policies. This recognises that farming, whilst critical to land management practice and conservation of the National park landscapes, is first and foremost a business.
LE1: Employment Sites in the Hope Valley	<i>No issue</i>	DME3: Safeguarding employment sites	The plan continues to safeguard a strategic level of employment sites for predominantly B1, B2, B8 uses but gives scope for other uses alongside B uses provided the B uses remain the predominant use.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LE2: Exceptional permission for Class B1 employment uses	<i>Issue 44: exceptional permission for B1 employment uses.</i> The preferred approach is to retain LE2 criteria. The response was mixed with a call to protect more business space and provide live work units on the one hand, and a call for a more flexible approach based more on impact on neighbour amenity than landscape considerations on the other.	DME5: Class B1 employment uses in the countryside outside DS1 settlements	The policy is unchanged except for the inclusion of cultural heritage significance and the requirement that new development does not have adverse impact on that.
LE3: Home working	<i>Issue 45: Home working</i> The preferred approach was to retain an approach based on LE3 to manage the activity and prevent unsuitable work activity where it harms buildings landscape or neighbour amenity. The response was limited with a request that the Authority consider policy that provides for live work units (in effect a proactive encouragement for such facilities)	DME6: Home working	The Authority investigated whether there was any demand for live work units by consulting the economic development officers of the largest constituent authority by population (Derbyshire Dales) There was no evidence of latent demand for live work units and officers were nervous that such development would be used as the first step towards turning small living space into large living space by discontinuance of the business element. There is still scope to include such units on mixed schemes of housing and business space subject to demand and design and legal agreements to ensure the relationship between the living and working space can be retained. The new policy is

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
			therefore the same as the old policy.
LE4: Industrial and Business Expansion	<i>Issue 46: Industrial and Business expansion.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LE4. The response was limited with a request for a more encouraging suite of policies that protects viable sites to allow small business to expand within the area and makes clear where business can grow	DME7: Expansion of existing industrial and business development where it is not ancillary to agricultural business.	Essentially unchanged with criteria for proposals inside DS1 settlements and criteria for proposals outside DS1 settlements. The Authority's policies give in principle support to business development in DS1 settlements and support the protection of a strategic level of employment space. Policy does not distinguish between local firms and other firms in terms of acceptability of development since local firms can employ people from anywhere and the use once established cannot be limited to local firms.
LE5: Retail uses in industrial and business areas	<i>Issue 47: Retail uses in industrial and business areas.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LE5. There was no response.	DMS3 Retail development outside Core Strategy named settlements	DMS3 covers the scope for retail activity in business areas and outside DS1 settlements. DMR1 protects against the development of shops on camping and caravan sites where development of such a use would significantly undermine the same shop in a nearby village. This means that policy can permit shops where they would add to the range of facilities available to a community, or where the Authority considers both shops can co-exist with neither threatening the others viability.
LE6: Design layout and neighbourliness of employment sites, including haulage depots	<i>Issue 48: Design layout and neighbourliness of employment sites, including haulage depots.</i> The preferred approach	DME9: Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots	No change

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	was to bring forward LE6. There was no response.		
Chapter 7: Recreation and Tourism		Chapter 5: Recreation and Tourism	
LR1: Recreation and Tourism Development	No issue explored	No equivalent policy	Recreation Zones were dispensed with by the Core Strategy and a move to landscape character assessment as a means of determining suitability of proposals.
LR2: Community recreation sites and facilities	No issues explored	DMS6: Safeguarding sites for community facilities	No change
LR3: Touring camping and caravan sites	<i>Issue 49: Touring camping and caravan sites.</i> The preferred approach is to retain policy criteria based on LR3 and mop up any issues not covered by Core Strategy RT3. There was no response	DMR1: Touring camping and caravan sites	New policy outlines exceptional circumstances under which other structures such as pods and yurts might be acceptable development
LR4: Holiday chalet developments	No issue	DMR1 Touring camping and caravan sites	As above
LR5: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	<i>Issue 50: Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites.</i> Preferred approach is to	DMR2 Holiday occupancy of camping and caravan sites	No change

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	retain policy based on LR5. There was no response		
LR6: Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	<i>Issue 51: Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation.</i> The preferred approach is to retain a policy based on LR6. There was no response	DMR3 Holiday occupancy of self-catering accommodation	No change
LR7: Facilities for keeping and riding horse	<i>Issue 52: Facilities for keeping and riding horses.</i> The preferred approach is to retain a policy based on LR7 but include criteria to secure simpler design standards for stabling. There was no response	DMR4 Facilities for keeping and riding horses	No change
Chapter 8 Utilities		Chapter 10 Utilities	
LU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure	<i>Issue 53: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure.</i> The preferred approach was bring forward policy based on LU1. The response	DMU1: Development that requires new or upgraded service infrastructure	No change as no development of a scale that requires detailed loading requirements in policy

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	was supportive with an urge to include any new 'loading' requirements into policy for gas supply purposes		
LU2: New and upgraded facilities	<i>Issue 54: New and upgraded facilities.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward a policy based on LU2. The response was mixed on this with calls for clear guidance on landscape impact where wires can't be undergrounded and calls for clarity between policies DMU2 and proposed policy	DMU2: New and upgraded utilities services	New policy doesn't include a reference to overhead power lines, which were in any case an exception for which the least environmental impact was to be sought. It does however say that infrastructure should be placed underground. This is important since it is counterproductive to permit renewable energy infrastructure in the Park if the transmissions lines required cannot be installed in a way that protects landscape character. The policy does not refer to new reservoirs either, which responds to a major utilities company response that the policy shouldn't rule them out.
LU3: Development close to utility installations	<i>Issue 55: Development close to utility installations.</i> The preferred approach is to supplement Core Strategy GSP3 Development Management Principles. There was little response and no objection	DMU3: Development close to utility installations	DMC3: Siting design layout and landscaping policy of the Development Management Policies document picks up the need for all new development including utilities infrastructure to be designed in sympathy with the landscape. For safety reasons, DMU3 specifically protects the close environs of utilities infrastructure irrespective of landscape character. There was no response that warranted a different approach to that preferred.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LU4: Renewable energy generation	<i>Issue 56: Ancillary development necessary for renewable energy generation.</i>	No policy required a matter covered by other policies and SPD.	CC2 of the Core Strategy and the SPD for Climate change and sustainable building plus DMU2 cover this area
LU5: Telecommunications infrastructure	<i>Issue 57: Telecommunications infrastructure.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria based on policy LU5. Responses urged that telecoms infrastructure should, under NPPF, be supported.	DMU4: Telecommunications infrastructure	LU5 is brought forward as DMU4 but the new policy requires more information from applicants to justify their proposals for telecommunications infrastructure in terms of the need and to justify in terms of impact it would have on landscape character. The 2013 Code of Best Practice on Mobile network development is recognised in supporting text.
LU6: Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	<i>Issue 58: Restoration of utility infrastructure sites.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward LU6. There was only support for this approach.	DMU5: Restoration of utility infrastructure sites	No change
Chapter 9 Minerals		Chapter 11: Minerals and waste	
LM1: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral activity and	<i>Issue 59: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development).</i> The preferred approach is to	DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and waste development on amenity; and DMMW3: The impact of Minerals and Waste Development on the	These two new policies pick up LM1 but not LM9 which is picked up in part by DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare (with regard to removal of plant and machinery after work has ceased) but also by a restated policy DMMW8 for ancillary mineral development.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	combine the contents of LM1 and LM9 into one policy. There was one supportive response.	Environment	Overall DM policies have been rationalised where possible, leaving those policies considered most pertinent to day to day development management needs.
LM2: Reclamation of minerals sites to an appropriate after use	No issue raised	No equivalent policy	Core Strategy MIN1: Mineral Development B. covers requirements for restoration.
LM3: Provision of aggregate minerals	No issue raised	No equivalent policy	The supporting text to Core Strategy MIN 1 outlines the capacity for aggregates and the expectations for delivery alongside mention of regional aggregate working parties and their role in apportionment of mineral reserves to particular parts of the area formerly known as the east Midlands region.
LM4: New aggregate extraction	<i>No issue raised</i>	DMMW1 – the justification for mineral and waste development	DMMW1 supplements Core Strategy MIN1.
LM5: 10 year land banks for aggregates	<i>No issue raised</i>	DMMW1 – the justification for mineral and waste development	The supporting text to Core Strategy MIN 1 outlines the capacity for aggregates and the expectations for delivery alongside mention of regional aggregate working parties and their role in apportionment of mineral reserves to particular parts of the area formerly known as the east Midlands region.
LM6: Building stone and roofing slate	<i>No issue raised</i>	None required	Core Strategy MIN3 covers this issue

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LM7: Limestone removal from opencast vein mineral sites	<i>No issue raised</i>	None required	Core Strategy MIN 1 and MIN2 already prevent removal of limestone from vein mineral opencast sites.
LM8: Small scale calcite workings.	<i>Issue 60: Small scale calcite workings. The preferred approach is to bring forward a policy based on LM8. There was only support for this approach.</i>	DMMW1	DMMW1 supplements Core Strategy MIN1.
LM9: Ancillary mineral development	<i>Issue 59: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of mineral development (and ancillary minerals development). The preferred approach is to combine the contents of LM1 and LM9 into one policy. There was one supportive response.</i>	DMMW8: Ancillary mineral development	See rationale under LM1 above and also in part by DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare (with regard to removal of plant and machinery after work has ceased)
LM10: Producing secondary and recycled materials	No issue raised	DMMW1: The justification for mineral development;	The policy changes from one that specifies conditions required for working secondary and recycled materials to one that specifies that secondary or recycled materials will only be permitted where evidence of viability and need justifies working taking into account existing

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
			availability of secondary or recycled materials.
Chapter 10: Waste Management		Chapter 11: Minerals and waste	Minerals and waste rolled into one chapter
LW1: Sustainable waste management	No issue raised	DMMW1: The justification for mineral development.	The policy criteria in DMMW1 cover the same ground as LW1.
LW2: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities	<i>Issue 61: Assessing and minimising the environmental impact of waste management facilities.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward LW2 criteria and combine with those assessing environmental impact of mineral working. The response was generally supportive with one objection to the approach on waste (driven by disagreement with the Authority's Core Strategy CC policy for anaerobic digesters)	DMMW2: The Impact of Mineral and waste development on amenity; and DMMW3: The impact of Minerals and Waste Development on the Environment	Suggested changes related to Core Strategy CC3 and CC4 rather than LW2 so were not taken on board in constructing DMMW2 and DMMW3.
LW3: Reclamation of waste disposal sites to an acceptable after use	No issue	DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare	
LW4: Household waste recycling centres	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4 give the same policy coverage
LW5: Recycling of construction	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
and demolition waste		Facilities	Management and DMMW4 , but no provision for facilities to process construction or demolition waste unless justified by a Site Waste Management Plan (which only applies to construction projects with a cost upwards of £300,000)
LW6: Waste transfer stations and waste processing facilities	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4
LW7: Disposal of Waste from construction or restoration projects	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4
LW8: Disposal of domestic, commercial, industrial and other non-inert waste by landfill at new sites	No issue	DMMW4: Waste Management Facilities	Policy covered by Core Strategy CC3 Waste Management and DMMW4
LW9: Disposal of inert, domestic, commercial, industrial and other non-inert waste by land raising	No issue	DMMW5: Restoration and aftercare	No change to presumption against land raising
Chapter 11 Transport		Chapter 9: Travel and Transport	
LT1 Implementing the road hierarchy: the main vehicular network	<i>Issue 62 Reducing and directing traffic.</i> The preferred approach is to develop a more restrictive approach to travel planning building on core strategy T1b to deter	No equivalent but DMT1 makes it clear that new roads or rail lines or upgrades to existing routes will not be permitted unless there is compelling national need and	Core Strategy T1 and T2 covers this

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	cross park traffic, incorporating the signage element of LT1 in an SPD and mapping the road hierarchy. The response was positive	that need cannot be accommodated by reasonable alternative means	
LT2: Implementing the road hierarchy: very minor roads	<i>Issue 63: Implementing the road hierarchy: very minor roads.</i> The preferred approach is to include text to supplement core strategy objectives. The approach is supported	No equivalent	Core Strategy T2 covers this adequately so no additional text is included in the Development Management document.
LT3: Cross-Park: road and rail	<i>Issue 64: Cross-Park traffic: road and rail.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria based on LT3a. The approach is supported	DMT1: Cross Park infrastructure	The new policy is categorical that new road and rail schemes or significant upgrades are not accepted in principle but it does outline the circumstances in which development may be permitted as an exception to the principle. This includes a requirement to demonstrate national need for development as well as long term environmental and economic benefit to the National Park.
LT4: Safeguarding land for road schemes	No issue	No equivalent	The core strategy removed the safeguarded status of land for improvement of the A57/A628; the A628/A616; and an A6 to A619 relief road at Bakewell.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LT5: Public transport: route enhancement	<i>Issue 65: Public transport: route enhancement.</i> The preferred approach is bring forward LLT5 criteria to build on core strategy T1. The approach is supported	No equivalent	General policies, such as T3: Design of transport infrastructure, cover this so there is no need for a specific local plan policy
LT6: Railway construction	<i>Issue 66: Railway construction.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria based on LT6. The approach is generally supported apart from by Chatsworth Estate for which there was exploration of options for improving public transport (see Issue 68)	DMT3: Railway construction	New policy is much tougher in terms of environmental benefits required of any new development.
LT7: Public transport and the pattern of development	<i>Issue 67: Public transport and the pattern of development.</i> The preferred approach is not to bring forward development management policy as its felt that the core strategy adequately covers this	No equivalent	Core Strategy DS1 directs most new development to a range of settlements to make it as easy as possible to justify retention of existing services or introduction of new services. There is no specific development management policy.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	issue. The approach was supported		
LT8: Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth	<i>Issue 68: Improving public transport to Bakewell and Chatsworth.</i> The preferred approach was to not bring forward policy specific to these sites and places because of the options in the Yorkshire Dales. A survey of 70 ba Trail and the inability of current policy to provide public transport routes to Chatsworth and the availability of alternatives.	No equivalent	No requirement for a Bakewell and Chatsworth specific policy for public transport
LT9: Freight transport and lorry parking	<i>Issue 69: Freight transport and lorry parking.</i> The preferred approach is to combine LT9 and former structure plan T7. The approach is supported.		Core Strategy T4 covers this area of policy with regard to freight transport and the approach has not changed

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
<p>LT10: Private non-residential (PNR) parking LT11: Residential Parking LT12: Park and ride</p>	<p><i>Issue 79: Car parking.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policies LT10 to LT12 and LT14 and LT15 and add different parking standards to reflect size of a development and alternative means of access to a service. The preferred approach will not name potential locations of new car parks as had been done for LT15. There was some support for the approach but a caution to avoid negativity towards new car parking, and accept that most visitors come by car.</p>	<p>DMT6 : Visitor parking DMT7: Residential off street parking No equivalent to LT12 – some link to DMT3, otherwise under DMT5 Business Parking</p>	<p>New policy includes a standard for spaces per unit within the policy Core Strategy T7 maintains the encouragement to Park and ride schemes but unlike LT12 it doesn't include limits on the size of schemes that may be permitted.</p>
<p>LT13: Traffic restraint measures</p>	<p><i>Issue 72: traffic restraint.</i> The preferred approach is to rely on the core strategy strategic principles and promote traffic restraint initiatives as necessary. The approach was supported</p>	<p>No equivalent</p>	<p>Core Strategy policies T3 Design of transport infrastructure brings the emphasis back to designing in sympathy with national park purposes when new infrastructure is proposed for any reason including achieving a reduction in speed of traffic.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LT14: Parking strategy and parking charges	<p><i>Issue 79: Car parking.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policies LT10 to LT12 and LT14 and LT15 and add different parking standards to reflect size of a development and alternative means of access to a service. The preferred approach will not name potential locations of new car parks as had been done for LT15. There was some support for the approach but a caution to avoid negativity towards new car parking, and accept that most visitors come by car.</p>	DMT5, DMT6, DMT7	<p>These policies cover operational and non-operational parking i.e. business parking (operational); parking not directly required by business (non-operational); and residential off street parking (that provided for dwelling units) Unlike LT14, new policies no longer places size thresholds on car parks but retain a presumption against new or enlarged car parks that aren't exclusively required by businesses or residents.</p>
LT15: Proposals for car parks	<p><i>Issue 79: Car parking.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward policies LT10 to LT12 and LT14 and LT15 and add different parking standards to reflect size of a development and alternative means of access to a service. The</p>	No equivalent	<p>The new plan does not create a policy presumption for new car parks (as was previously done by naming places where they would be accepted in principle)</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	preferred approach will not name potential locations of new car parks as had been done for LT15. There was some support for the approach but a caution to avoid negativity towards new car parking, and accept that most visitors come by car.		
LT16: Coach Parking	<i>Issue 71: Coach Parking.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward LT16. There was support for the approach.	No equivalent	Core Strategy T7 covers this issue and retains the potential for coach parking within environmental capacity to deliver it.
LT17: Cycle parking	<i>Issue 73: Cycle parking.</i> The preferred approach is to retain the policy principle of LT17 but deal with it alongside provision for horse riders and pedestrians the approach is supported.	No equivalent	The general thrust of core strategy policies T1 T3 and T6 is to encourage and facilitate use of sustainable modes of transport wherever possible so there would be a presumption in favour of cycle parking within development where that can be achieved within conservation purposes.
LT18: Design criteria for transport infrastructure	<i>Issue 74: design criteria for transport infrastructure.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward detailed	DMT1, DMT2 Access and design criteria	Core Strategy: T3 Design of Transport Infrastructure plus the new policies DMT1 and DMT2 stress the need for high quality design in tune with the valued characteristics of the National Park with the statutory requirements for safe

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	criteria based on LT18 and LT19. The approach was supported		access etc. recognised within the statutory constraints imposed by National Park designation and the responsibilities placed on statutory highways authorities by the Environment Act.
LT19: Mitigation of wildlife severance effects.	No issue as covered under issue 74	DMT2C: Access & Design Criteria	Core Strategy T3 requires mitigation measures where development has to sever a wildlife corridor, but such development is in any case discouraged by DMC11 part F. DMT2C states that appropriate & sympathetic measures including wild bridges or cut and cover tunnels, will be provided where transport infrastructure results in wildlife severance.
LT20: Public Rights of Way	<i>Issue 75: Public rights of way.</i> The preferred approach was to bring forward criteria based on LT20 but seek alternative alignments for Trans Pennine and Monsal Trail. The approach was supported	DMT4: Development affecting public right of way	New policy DMT4 repeats old policy but also requires better linkage to the rights of way network and better facilities for those wishing to link into the rights of way network. Alternative alignments have not been agreed for the Trans Pennine or Monsal Trails in the period between 2012 and Development Management Policies document production so no new routes are safeguarded in the plan. DMT4D provides new criteria for the introduction of new multi-user routes.
LT21: Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.	<i>Issue 76 Provision for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward criteria	DMT4D – partly covers this	New policies don't specify particular routes for improvement (as LT21 had) but Core Strategy T6 includes provisions protecting established routes from new development that would compromise

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	based on LT21b and LT17. The approach was supported		their transport function. The trails are all protected with clarity that future rail use could only happen if the continuity of these routes can be assured through suitable re alignment if necessary. T6 also protects the only inland waterway used for leisure purposes (the Huddersfield Narrow Canal) Core Strategy: T3 Design of Transport Infrastructure plus the new policies DMT1 and DMT2 stress the need for high quality design in tune with the valued characteristics of the National Park with the statutory requirements for safe access etc recognised within the statutory constraints imposed by National Park designation and the responsibilities placed on statutory highways authorities by the Environment Act. This applies to provision for access by horse, bike, or foot. DMT4D provides new criteria for the introduction of new multi-user routes.
LT22: Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty	<i>Issue 77: Access to sites and buildings for people with a mobility difficulty.</i> The preferred approach is to retain the criteria of LT22 but frame it as design criteria to be considered across all development types with the objective to improve access for people with	DMT2: Access and Design criteria; DMT4: Development affecting a public right of way	New policy DMT2 makes it clear that new or improved access must be safe and achievable for all people. New policy DMT4 makes it clear that where rights of way are diverted or altered through development the change should result in improved access for people with special needs, including disability

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	mobility difficulty. The approach was supported.		
LT23: Air Transport	<i>Issue 78: Air Transport.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward the Core Strategy preferred approach T11, which built on LT23 by adding detail. The approach was supported	DMT8 Air Transport	New policy DMT8 covers drones and model aircraft as well as the traditional forms such as helicopters. It also protects not just all valued characteristics but specifies that where bird and wildlife populations would be adversely impacted upon, the activity will be restricted.
Chapter 12: Bakewell		Chapter 8: Bakewell	
LB1: Bakewell's development boundary	<i>Issue 79; Bakewell's Development boundary.</i> The preferred approach is to review the boundary and have policy based on LB1. Responses in respect of the boundary agree the need for review and in some area new extensions are suggested	No policy, but Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan to identifies the boundary and in accordance with Core Strategy DS1 a development boundary will be retained and is shown on the DMP document proposals map.	No change in the principle, but the boundary has been altered to reflect the housing aspirations of the town, by agreement with the NPA that the change does not undermine the development plan.
LB2: Important Open Spaces in Bakewell	<i>Issue 80: Important open spaces in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to agree open spaces with the community (under NP process) Responses included suggestions for additional spaces to be	No new development plan policy, but the emerging neighbourhood plan has a policy protecting Local Green Spaces in addition to the important open spaces retained by the Conservation Area appraisal and covered by	No equivalent policy but under the Neighbourhood Plan process the community has identified identify Local Green Spaces complying with criteria for LGS designation as set down in NPPF. The LGSs identified do not undermine the development plan expectations for development in Bakewell.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	protected, some of which flow beyond the current settlement boundary, so it will be necessary to consider such areas in the context of the wider Bakewell Parish as opposed to just those spaces within a development boundary.	DMC12: Conservation Areas	
LB3: Traffic management in Bakewell	<i>Issue 81: Traffic management in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to bring forward any aspects of LB3 that aren't covered by general policies. There was support for continued enhancement of the town, including specific initiatives to aid traffic management.	DMT2: Access and design criteria	No DM policy but the emerging neighbourhood plan process has seen the community produce policy to enhancement traffic management in the town. The change is in the list of projects to be tackled with partners under TC1 and the wish to safeguard the line of a Bakewell relief road under TC3.
LB4: Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell	<i>Issue 82 Car, coach and lorry parking in Bakewell</i> No preferred approach was offered and the community were invited to suggest preferred approach	DMT5: Operational Parking DMT6: Non-operational parking DMT7: Residential off street parking	Neighbourhood Plan Policy TC2: Vehicle Parking adds local flavour to the Park wide policies.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	Responses indicate a desire to rethink the provision of parking in the town including thoughts on linking the Smiths Island car park to the ABC		
LB5: Public Transport in Bakewell	<i>Issue 83: Public Transport in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to specifically safeguard the line of the Matlock to Buxton railway. There was broad agreement for the safeguarding of parking at Bakewell Station and for improvements to bus stops in the town	No policy for public transport generally or in Bakewell	Neighbourhood Plan does not propose policies for public transport
LB6: Sites for general industry or business development in Bakewell	<i>No issue:</i> Mixed views are expressed on the preferred uses for the employment sites at Ashford Road and Cintride, e.g. the Civic Society state a desire for employment sites to be protected whereas the Town Council appear happy for other uses to be explored.	Core Strategy E1 allows for new sites and buildings for business development in Bakewell	There are no plan proposals for additional business sites because Ashford Road (Deepdale) and Land adjoining the Cintride factory have been largely developed or have permissions in place (though the land adjoining Cintrides remains a potential source of employment space in spite of the extant permission for an Aldi store) The neighbourhood plan policies Econ 4, and Econ 5 set down the communities aspirations for existing business sites such as Riverside Business Park and Torne Valley site on the A6. These are in conformity with the development plan.

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>Overall there may be some appetite for an overall shrinkage in the area deemed necessary for B1 and B2 uses in favour of a mixture of other uses, but this needs careful consideration owing to the low overall potential for such high quality sites in the National Park.</p>		
<p>LB7: Re-development at Lumford Mill</p>	<p><i>Issue 85: Re-development at Lumford Mill.</i> In light of the relative lack of success of LB7 in encouraging re-development, no preferred approach is offered. Responders viewed this as an opportunity to recast the site but need to consider the Lumford and Riverside Business Park areas alongside other employment sites to give an overview on the town's business land as a whole.</p>	<p>No local plan equivalent because Core Strategy E1 protects the business use as the predominant use whilst offering scope for enhancement possibly through mixed use. There is no development management policy however.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood plan policies Econ 5 sets down the community's aspirations for Riverside Business Park. (Lumford Mill) This is in conformity with the development plan. The other neighbourhood plan policies consider the future of this site in the context of other employment sites and the 'health' of the central shopping area.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
LB8: Non-conforming uses in Bakewell	<p><i>Issue 86: Non-conforming uses in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach was to rely on GSP2. There was support to reply on GSP2 regarding non-conforming uses.</p>	None needed	Core Strategy General Spatial Policy GSP2 replaces Bakewell specific policy.
LB9: Shopping in Bakewell	<p><i>Issue 87: Shopping in Bakewell.</i> The preferred approach is to retain the central shopping area but reserve policy options until further community work is done</p> <p>There was concern over the dominance of café uses. There was support to bring forward greater control in the Central Shopping Area, e.g. over the no. of A3 uses in any one street.</p> <p>Need to consider the impact of changed PD regs with the possibility of using article 4 powers within the Central Shopping Area.</p>	Core Strategy DS1 seeks to protect the range and integrity of the Central Shopping Area and HC5 prevent significant out of centre retail development and allows food and drink premises provided it doesn't undermine the role or character of the area including its vitality and viability. There is no development management policy	Neighbourhood Plan policy Econ 1 seeks to prevent further change of use away from A1 to A3 in the Central Shopping Area, which is more proactive than simply limiting the uses of new development, which are few and far between in Bakewell central shopping area.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>Bakewell Civic Society would like the Torne Valley site included within the CSA.</p> <p>There was a request to fully consider the planning reasons for restricting town centre uses. For example, has an increase in café uses been at the detriment of the health of the centre? and is there a shortage of shops ?</p>		
LB10: Bakewell stall market	<p><i>Issue 88: Bakewell stall market.</i> No preferred approach is offered. There is widespread support to extend the scope of the market area.</p>	No development plan equivalent	No specific policy but principle of use of the central shopping area is established so no need for policy. No neighbourhood plan policy is proposed.
LB11: Community, sports and arts facilities in Bakewell	<p><i>Issue 89: Community, sports and arts facilities in Bakewell</i> No preferred approach is offered There is support to retain policy.</p>	DS1 does the job so no need for a development management policy	Neighbourhood Plan proposes replacement of sports education and other community facilities if development enabled by the change of boundary is otherwise acceptable but would lead to loss of such facilities. The objective is no net loss of facilities in the event of change of use e.g. to housing
Range of uses not tied to previous Local plan policies			
	Issue 3: cumulative harm	No local plan policy to replace	Cumulative impact was not part of previous policy

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p>as a material consideration (New) There was no stakeholder response on this issue</p>	<p>but new DMC1: <i>Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes</i> states that an assessment of development must include an assessment of cumulative impact of existing or proposed development including outside the National Park boundary</p>	<p>but now has profile through inclusion in policy.</p>
	<p>Issue 4: <i>removing non-traditional structures from the countryside once their use has ceased (new)</i> Statutory bodies NE and EH (HE) supported the approach towards removing structures but landowners and estate owners who responded did not support the approach</p>		<p>Core Strategy GSP2: <i>Enhancement of the National Park</i> provides the policy hook to require removal of buildings and DMC1 <i>Conservation and enhancement of nationally significant landscapes confirms this</i> as something the Authority wants the option to require where <i>a building or structure is no longer needed or being used for the purposes for which it was approved and its continued presence or use is considered by the Authority, on the evidence available to it, to be harmful to the valued character of the landscape.</i> This makes the circumstances in which removal would be required very clear and it is not expected that this would be used in many circumstances because of the concerns voiced by landowners in 2012. It does however set down expectations for use of the building so it does indirectly restrict the wider use of buildings permitted for agricultural purposes.</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p><i>Issue 6: Protecting important open spaces.</i> The preferred approach was to identify them and show them on the proposals map. There was support for this approach</p>	<p>Proposal map will show open spaces</p>	<p>Important open space previously only showed on inset maps of conservation areas</p>
	<p><i>Issue 12: The need for clearer guidance on acceptable new uses for traditional buildings of historic or architectural merit in different locations.(new)</i> The preferred approach was to introduce spatial guidance that says what uses might be appropriate in what locations. There was general support and a request that this be dealt with alongside issue 11</p>	<p>Supporting text to DMC10 picks up the spatial guidance concept and also clarifies scale of different uses most appropriate to particular types of building in particular locations.</p>	<p>This is a development of current policy recognising the difficulty experienced in bringing forward good quality conversions in some locations. (a Barns Conversion SPD will help further and is ready to be brought forward on adoption of the development management policy document)</p>
	<p><i>Issue 29: Use and Scope of site briefs (new)</i> The preferred approach was to use them selectively as necessary to bring forward development of difficult sites. The approach was supported</p>	<p>None since GSP2E already allows for them</p>	<p>No change to current approach</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	<p><i>Issue 31: Maximising affordable housing from development and conversion sites and buildings (new)</i> The preferred approach is not to set thresholds of size of scheme above which affordable housing would be required but work it through on viability assessments , employing specialist advice where necessary . there was generally support for this approach though one developer asked for more certainty in policy</p>	<p>DMH6 specifies that the level of affordable housing required will be subject to viability</p>	<p>No change to current approach</p>
	<p><i>Issue 32: preventing abuses of policies seeking contributions to affordable housing (new).</i> The preferred approach is to use legal agreements and conditions as necessary to ensure optimum re-development of sites and buildings and prevent piecemeal applications or site subdivision. There was general support for the approach but a caution that subdivision of</p>	<p>Supporting text explains that applications which would undermine /prevent the scope for development in line with national park purposes and plan objectives will be resisted.</p>	<p>Reference to the potential problem and strong statements that the Authority will resist attempts to prevent proper re-development of land is a new part of the plan. It recognises the difficulties experienced in trying to achieve optimum planning outcomes and how those difficulties are more sharply focussed when such re-development opportunities are scarce and the benefits can prevent pressure on other more valued national park land. The matter of subdivision is addressed in policy DMH10 in so far as it relates to buildings and residential use, but subdivision of land cannot ordinarily be prevented through the planning</p>

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	land can't be prevented by planning system.		system (unless conditions have previously been used to prevent it e.g. in relation to ancillary dwelling uses relationship with main dwelling house) Nevertheless sub division can change the planning status of land and that in itself can be a deterrent.
	<i>Issue 34: Assessing care needs. (new)</i> The preferred approach is to work to County Council standards when need is evidenced and consider care needs as a legitimate form of housing need. The approach is supported.	No specific policy	No change to the established policy
	<i>Issue 43: Enabling appropriate re-use of unoccupied or under-occupied business sites in named settlements (new).</i> The preferred approach was to apply core strategy strongly and develop criteria to be followed before release of business land was supported. The approach was generally supported but there was some thought to protect sites on	DME3 identifies safeguarded sites whilst DME4 identifies criteria and marketing test to be applied before the Authority agrees to loss of business space to other uses	The policies protect a wide range of sites in Bakewell and Hope valley but also set clear tests to be met before business space is forsaken for other uses. This responds to a strategic need to protect a level of business space, a community desire to remain living working villages and a developer desire to optimise best use of space.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Local Plan 2001	Peak District National Park Development Management Policies: <i>A consultation into Issues and preferred approaches</i> Sept. 2012	Local Plan 2016 equivalent	Rationale for new policy
	plan		

Appendix 2 – Contacts at Regulation 18 Issues and Preferred Approaches Stage

Statutory bodies - Specific consultation bodies as set out in regulations

Coal Authority

Environment Agency

Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)

Natural England

Network Rail

Highways Agency,

a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the local planning authority's area (see following list)

Mobile Operators Association and Mono Consultants (representing people to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus in the area,

Primary Care Trusts (see following list)

Persons to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989([11](#)) (see following list)

Persons to whom a license has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986([12](#)) (see following list)

Sewerage undertakers (see following list)

Water undertakers (see following list)

Homes and Communities Agency

Constituent and adjoining authorities

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
 Cheshire East Council
 Derbyshire County Council
 Derbyshire Dales District Council
 East Staffordshire Borough Council
 High Peak Borough Council
 Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council
 North East Derbyshire District Council
 Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
 Sheffield City Council
 Staffordshire County Council
 Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
 Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
 Tameside MBC

Abney and Abney Grange
 Alstonefield CP
 Ashford CP
 Bakewell Town Council
 Ballidon CP & Bradbourne CP
 Bamford CP and Thornhill CP
 Barlow CP
 Baslow and Bubnell CP
 Beeley CP
 Birchover CP
 Blackwell in the Peak CP
 Blore with Swinscoe CP
 Bonsall CP
 Bosley CP
 Bradfield CP
 Bradwell CP

Parish Councils

Langsett CP
 Little Longstone CP
 Litton CP
 Longnor CP
 Lyme Handley CP
 Macclesfield Forest & Wildboarclough PM
 Meltham CP
 Middleton and Smerrill CP
 Middleton by Wirksworth CP
 Monyash CP
 Mossley Town Council
 New Mills CP
 Northwood and Tinkersley CP
 Offcote and Underwood CP
 Onecote CP
 Outseats CP

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Brampton CP	Over Haddon CP
Brassington CP	Peak Forest CP
Butterton PC	Pilsley CP
Calver CP	Pott Shrigley CP
Chapel en le Frith CP	Quarnford CP
Charlesworth CP	Rainow CP
Chelmorton CP	Rowsley CP
Chinley, Buxworth and Brownside CP	Saddleworth CP
Chisworth CP	Sheen CP
Curbar CP	Sheldon CP
Dunford CP	South Darley CP
Eaton, Alsop and Newton Grange CP	Stanton CP
Edale CP	Stocksbridge CP
Edensor CP	Stoney Middleton CP
Elton CP	Sutton CP
Eyam CP	Taddington CP
Fawfieldhead CP	Thorpe CP
Fenny Bentley CP	Tideswell CP
Flagg CP	Tintwistle CP

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Foolow CP	Tissington CP and Lea hall CP
Froggatt CP	Wardlow CP
Gratton CP	Waterhouses CP
Great Longstone CP	Wetton CP
Grindleford CP	Whaley Bridge CP
Grindon CP	Wincle CP
Hartington Middle Quarter CP	Winstar CP
Hartington Upper Quarter CP	Wormhill CP
Hassop CP	Youlgreave CP
Hathersage CP	Castleton CP
Hayfield CP	
Highlow and Offerton PM	
Hollinsclough CP	
Holme Valley CP	
Holmesfield CP	
Holymoorside and Walton CP	
Hope CP	
Ilam CP	
King Sterndale CP	

Detailed contact list – General Consultation Bodies

Aggregate Industries UK
Alsop Rivendale
ASDA
Bakewell Access Group
Bakewell & District Civic Society
Bakewell & Eyam Community Transport
Bakewell and District Historical Society
Bleaklow Industries Ltd
Bonsall Energy Group
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority
British Aggregates Association
British Mountaineering Council
British Telecommunications plc
British Waterways
Broads Authority
Cairngorms National Park Authority
Campaign for National Parks
Cemex UK Materials Limited
Central & Eastern Cheshire PCT
Central & Eastern Cheshire PCT
Centrica plc
Chatsworth House Trust
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees
Cheshire Community Action
Cheshire Constabulary
Cheshire Wildlife Trust
Community Council of Staffordshire
Council for British Archaeology
Country Land and Business Association
Dartmoor National Park Authority
Department for Transport
Department for Transport Rail group

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Derbyshire Aggregates Ltd
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory Committee
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils
Derbyshire Coalition for Inclusive Living
Derbyshire Dales CVS
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust
Derbyshire Mental Health Service NHS Trust
Derbyshire Sport
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust
East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust
East Midlands Housing Association
Electricity North West Ltd
ENPAA
Environment Agency
Environment Agency Midlands Region
E.ON UK plc
Equity Housing
Exmoor National Park Authority
Fisher German LLP
Forest Enterprise
Freight Transport Association
Friends of the Peak District
Geoplan Limited
GL Hearn
Glebe Mines Ltd
Guinness Northern Counties Housing Association
High Peak CVS
Highways Agency
Highways Agency East Midlands
Home Builders Federation
Hope Valley Access
Indigo Planning Limited
Kirkwells town planning & sustainable development consultants

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Lafarge Cement
Lake District National Park Authority
Litton Properties Ltd
Local Access Forum
Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park Authority
Loxley Valley Protection Society
Mexichem
Mineral Products Association
Ministry of Defence
Mobile Operators Association
Mono Consultants Ltd
Moorlands Together LSP
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Farmers Union (NFU)
National Grid
National Grid c/o AMEC
National Trust
Natural England
Network Rail
New Forest National Park Authority
North Staffordshire PCT
North York Moors National Park Authority
Northern Rail
Northumberland National Park Authority
Nottingham Community Housing Association
Oldham LSP
PDRHA c/o Midlands Rural Housing Housing
Peak Park Parishes Forum
RWE npower
Silson Planning Services
Eryri National Park Authority (Snowdonia)
South Downs National Park Authority
South Yorkshire & North East Derbyshire Area Ramblers
SPACE
Sport England
Sports England
Staffordshire CC

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Staffordshire Historic Building Trust
Staffordshire Moorlands Community & Voluntary Services
Staffordshire Police
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
Stagecoach East Midlands
Stockport MBC
Sustainable Bakewell cic
Sustainable Bakewell cic
Sustainable Youlgrave
Sustrans
Tameside MBC
Tarmac Ltd
The Coal Authority
The Planning Cooperative
The Planning Inspectorate
The Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester & High Peak)
The Ramblers Association (New Mills & District Group)
The Woodland Trust
TM Travel Ltd
Trent Barton
UK ANPA
United Utilities
Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
Yorkshire Water

**Appendix 3 – Contacts at Regulation
19 Publication Stage**

*As Appendix 1 other than following
additions or amendments from July 2015*

Specific Consultation bodies

Mobile Operators Association
HSE
Fisher German re Oil pipeline
The Planning Inspectorate
English Heritage
Historic England
Environment Agency
Highways England
Natural England
Homes & Communities Agency
Homes & Communities Agency (Midlands
area)
Staffordshire PCC
South Yorkshire PCC
Derbyshire PCC
Greater Manchester PCC
West Yorkshire PCC
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service
Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service
Staffordshire Fire and Rescue
West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue
NHS North Derbyshire CCG
NHS Southern Derbyshire CCG
North Staffordshire CCG
Eastern Cheshire CCG
Sheffield CCG
Barnsley CCG
Tameside and Glossop CCG

Oldham CCG
Greater Huddersfield CCG

General Consultation Bodies

Aggregate Industries UK
Alsop Rivendale
Bakewell & District Civic Society
Bakewell & Eyam Community Transport
Bakewell and District Historical Society
Bonsall Energy Group
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority
British Aggregates Association
British Mountaineering Council
British Waterways
Broads Authority
Cairngorms National Park Authority
Campaign for National Parks
Cemex UK Materials Limited
Chatsworth House Trust
Chatsworth Settlement Trustees
Cheshire Community Action
Cheshire Wildlife Trust
Community Council of Staffordshire
Council for British Archaeology
Country Land and Business Association
Dartmoor National Park Authority
Derbyshire Aggregates Ltd
Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber
of Commerce
Derbyshire Archaeological Advisory
Committee
Derbyshire Association of Local Councils
Derbyshire Coalition for Inclusive Living

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Derbyshire Dales CVS
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust
Derbyshire Mental Health Service NHS
Trust
Derbyshire Sport
Derbyshire Wildlife Trust
East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS
Trust
East Midlands Housing Association
East Staffordshire BC
ENPAA
Equity Housing
Eryri National Park Authority (Snowdonia)
Exmoor National Park Authority
Fisher German LLP
Forest Enterprise
Freight Transport Association
Friends of the Peak District
Friends of the Peak District
Geoplan Limited
GL Hearn
Glebe Mines Ltd
Guinness Northern Counties Housing
Association
High Peak CVS
Home Builders Federation
Hope Valley Access
Indigo Planning Limited
Kirkwells town planning & sustainable
development consultants
Lafarge Cement
Lake District National Park Authority
Litton Properties Ltd
Local Access Forum
Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National
Park Authority

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Loxley Valley Protection Society
Mineral Products Association
Mono Consultants Ltd
Moorlands Together LSP
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Farmers Union East Midlands
Region
National Trust
National Trust
Network Rail
New Forest National Park Authority
North York Moors National Park Authority
Northern Rail
Northumberland National Park Authority
Nottingham Community Housing
Association
Oldham LSP
PDRHA c/o Midlands Rural Housing
Housing
Peacock & Smith
Peak Park Parishes Forum
Peak Rail
Ramblers Association (Derbyshire Dales
Area)
Ramblers Association (Derbyshire Dales
Area)
Ramblers Association (New Mills)
Ramblers Association (Greater Manchester
& High Peak)
Renewable UK
Re-open Woodhead Railway Line
Campaign
RSPB
Rural Action Derbyshire
Rural Action Derbyshire
Rural Action Derbyshire
Sanctuary Group

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

SC Andrew LLP
Sheffield Area Geology Trust
Sheffield First
Silson Planning Services
South Downs National Park Authority
South Yorkshire & North East Derbyshire
Area Ramblers
SPACE
Sports England
Staffordshire Historic Building Trust
Staffordshire Moorlands Community &
Voluntary Services
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
Stagecoach East Midlands
Sustainable Bakewell cic
Sustainable Youlgrave
Sustrans
Taddington and Priestcliffe Parish Council
Tarmac Ltd
The Energy Conservation Group
The Planning Cooperative
The Woodland Trust
TM Travel Ltd
Trent Barton
Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
Mark Alix
Anne Ashe
Carole and Mr Alan Baines
Fred Baker
A Baker
Richard Banks
Martin Beer
S Booth
Phillip Burnip
Christopher Cartledge
Andrew Critchlow
Jeni Edwards

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

Roger Floyd
Grant Hattle
Jean Howarth
Andrew Humphries
Peter Huxtable
Cath Johnstone
David Jones
Ian Lints
William Moss
G D Nancolas
Ian O'Toole
Thelma Pickard
Andrew Pitt
Sue Prince
Richard Sandbach
Edwin Searle
Alan Shaw
Peter Simon
Chris Stait
Laura Stevens
John Tanner
Philip Thompson
Hugh Wright
Alan Yarwood
Bob Banks and Ms Maggie Norman
SSA Planning Limited
Stainton Planning
David L Walker Ltd
JMP (on behalf of Highways England)
Planning Potential (01423 502115)
Arcus Consultancy Services Ltd
Fisher German
CMC Planning
RG+P Ltd
Heaton Planning Ltd
Paul Testa Architecture
Richard Mundy Building Design Ltd

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

IBA Planning Ltd
PME Planning Services
NMA Studio
Emery Planning Partnership
Norton Mayfield Architects
R Bryan Planning
A & H Structures Ltd
Community & Renewables Planner
Peak Architects
Studio Gedye Ltd
A R Yarwood
Trigpoint Conservation & Planning Ltd
Kevin Bradbury Architects
Martin H Seddon Ltd Planning and
Environment Consultants
Architectural Design
Robin Ashley Architects LLP
Fisher German LLP
Bench Architects
DLP Consultants
Bagshaws LLP
RPS Planning & Development
Richard Wood Associates
Cheshire Association of Local Councils
Staffordshire Association of Local Councils
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust
Canal and River Trust
Index Property Information
Nature after Minerals (RSPB)
Wyg

Appendix 4 - Statement of Representations from Publication Stage

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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 ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor Modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Request for 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)*

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

List of responses

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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	60	60.3	N	N	N	Y

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

	Consultants Ltd						
DMC7	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.4	N	N	N	Y
DMC7	Roger Yarwood Planning Consultants Ltd	60	60.5	N	N	N	Y
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	Minor Modification	Main modification	Request for hearing
-------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

				respondent	proposed by NPA	proposed by NPA	
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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

“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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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 Consultants Ltd	60	60.7	N	N	N	Y
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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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
-------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

					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	Main modification proposed	Hearing request

					by NPA	by 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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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:-

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Para/policy	Respondent/agent	Respondent ID	Representation ID	Considered sound by respondent	Minor modification proposed by NPA	Main modification proposed by NPA	Hearing request
6.38	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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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
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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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
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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

					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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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)

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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).

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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 fail 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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	Representation 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- 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 ID	Representation ID	Sound? Y/N	Minor Modification proposed? Y/N	Main modification proposed? Y/N	Hearing 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	Main modification	Hearing request
-------------	------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

					proposed? Y/N	proposed? Y/N	
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/Polic y	Respondent/agent	Represent or 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

- General tidying up of maps

List of responses

Para/Policy	Respondent/agent	Representation 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	Representation 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

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

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.

Appendix 5 - Press Releases

People's views sought on national park development policies

Friday 14 September 2012

Residents, businesses and interest groups are asked to give their views on a range of proposed new planning policies for the Peak District National Park.

The National Park Authority is running a 12-week public consultation on development management policies that will be used to make decisions on planning applications for the next 14 years.

The consultation runs from Monday September 24 to Sunday December 16.

Policies in the Development Management consultation document cover: landscape and conservation; housing; shops, services and community facilities; economy; recreation and tourism; utilities; minerals; waste management; transport; and Bakewell.

The document discusses issues such as: conservation and enhancement of the landscape; managing the growth of settlements taking account of new approaches to neighbourhood planning; assessing local eligibility for affordable housing; finding ways to protect and promote community facilities; guidance on re-use of traditional barns; environmental criteria for utilities, transport, minerals and waste developments; and planning for the future growth and viability of Bakewell, the national park's main town.

Policy planning manager Brian Taylor said: "This consultation is part of our work to explore a range of policy options to help us respond positively to the constant changes in society, the economy and this protected landscape.

"The final version of the document will form part of the Local Development Plan for the national park, taking us forward from 2012 through to 2026."

Cllr Lesley Roberts, who chairs the national park authority's planning committee, said: "As the planning authority, we want to manage development to conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the national park, now and for future generations.

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

“We need to make sure that, as buildings are developed, the national park maintains the right mix of homes, work spaces, local shops and open space to meet the needs of residents and businesses. We also need to manage the impact on transport, the environment and make sure new development helps create sustainable communities and respects the area’s natural beauty and heritage. We are working to help address these challenges through the planning process.”

Anyone may make comments, and officers will be available to help explain any of the points throughout the period to help people make their responses.

People can read the draft document at www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/consultations from Sept 24. Groups or individuals may respond by online survey or by email to policy@peakdistrict.gov.uk .

Paper copies are available at Peak District National Park HQ, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, DE45 1AE, and respondents may send comments to Brian Taylor, policy planning manager, at that address.

Anyone with queries should phone 01629 816200 or email customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk

Have your say on Peak District planning

This is an archived press release

Monday 21 November 2016



People can have their say on future planning policies in the Peak District National Park as part of a new consultation.

The Development Management Policies document forms part of the Local Plan for the UK's first and original National Park and will guide all important decisions on the use of land and buildings including locally needed affordable housing, business and community facilities and conserving the distinctive character of the area.

The consultation began on November 18 and runs until January 27, 2017. It is the last formal stage to make representations and the focus of comments should be on the soundness of the plan and the process.

Head of Policy and Communities Brian Taylor said: "These are detailed policies used every day by the Authority to consider planning applications. We've worked closely with communities and service providers over the past few years to find opportunities for communities and businesses to thrive whilst conserving the landscape scenery of the National Park and its many valued

Consultation Statement - Development Management Policies

features. We've also developed a completely new set of maps showing the different designations that make up the National Park landscape and historic environment. People can comment on any of this detail during the consultation period.”

The document clarifies many of the principles in the Core Strategy providing greater opportunities for development where it helps to drive the conservation and enhancement of the National park and where it provides benefit for local communities and business, such as ancillary housing developments on farms through extensions and re-use of outbuildings, and finding new uses for traditional buildings such as roadside field barns.

Policies seek greater awareness and appreciation of heritage in such schemes in order to conserve local character.

The document clarifies the approach to affordable housing and also offers scope for market led housing where this can help restore derelict sites.

There is also a strengthening of economic policy by actively safeguarding a series of high quality business sites across the National Park. Moreover policies seek to protect local shops and services by demanding rigorous market testing of schemes involving for example the change of use of such uses to housing.

How to comment

The consultation documents can be found at many locations in and around the National Park and [online here](#). Comments can also be submitted via email at policy@peakdistrict.gov.uk. If you do not have access to the internet you may submit comments in writing to Brian Taylor, Head of Policy and Communities, Peak District National Park Authority, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell DE45 1AE

If you have any difficulty in commenting, or would like help to do so, contact the Policy Planning Team on 01629 816200.

Following this consultation we will be submitting the publication version of the DMP along with the representations to the Secretary of State for examination during 2017.