

## Vision & Strategic Objectives

<b>Vision &amp; Strategic Objectives</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Main Issues</b>
<b>Question 1</b> Do the Vision and Strategic Objectives identify the key challenges and issues to be addressed?	34	11	17	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be greater emphasis on climate change, natural and historic environment, biodiversity, education, culture, transport, sustainable accessibility and importance of tourism to local economy</li> <li>• Should include reference to dealing with unstable land given the legacy of mining in the area</li> <li>• Conflict between growth and preserving natural environment</li> <li>• Should make reference to accepting the purposes of the National Park and the value of the National park in developing the economy through sustainable tourism and recreation</li> <li>• Should be reference to urban as well as rural environment</li> <li>• Giving priority to brownfield sites over Greenfield could adversely effect housing delivery</li> </ul>
<b>Question 2</b> What indicators should be used to measure success?	10	0	0	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range of indicators suggested covering wide range of areas such as housing, employment, landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, climate change and health/social issues.</li> <li>• Use existing indicators in national and local documents</li> <li>• Monitor regularly</li> </ul>

## Development Options

<b>Question 3</b> Which of the three development options do you prefer?	<b>Support</b>	<b>Main Issues</b>

Option 1 Concentrated Growth	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most sustainable option will promote sustainable pattern of development</li> <li>• Will minimize need to travel, support public transport and encourage sustainable transport</li> <li>• Strengthen existing services and facilities</li> <li>• Protect the countryside</li> <li>• Maximise the use of brownfield land</li> </ul>
Option 2 Semi dispersed Growth	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentrate development around existing areas</li> <li>• Will preserve services and facilities in larger villages and reduce pressure/growth of major towns</li> <li>• Allow development to be spread over a wide geographical area</li> <li>• Will provide sustainable development</li> <li>• Offers greatest benefit to landscape and biodiversity but impact on countryside needs to be considered</li> </ul>
Option 3 Dispersed Growth	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will provide housing and employment where it is needed and provide sustainable housing</li> <li>• Spread development around towns and villages</li> <li>• Allow towns and villages to thrive</li> <li>• Benefits of concentrating development in towns do not apply as people will travel where ever they live</li> </ul>
None	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the options adequately assess the potential of settlements to accommodate new growth in a sustainable manner.</li> <li>• Most sustainable option would be to locate most growth in larger towns with some limited growth in smaller settlements.</li> </ul>
Option 1 or Option 2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most appropriate to meet community /visitors needs and safeguard and enhance environmental assts of the plan area</li> </ul>
Option 2 or Option 3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect character of market towns by avoiding their overdevelopment</li> <li>• Support viability of services in towns and villages</li> </ul>
No preference/no comment	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural heritage impacts need to be taken into consideration in all options</li> </ul>

Development Options	Responses	Support	Object	Observation	Main Issues
<b>Question 4</b> Should the extent of the settlements be identified by a boundary?	31	20	6	5	Boundaries needed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To limit sprawl, create a mix of developments</li> <li>• Maintain green space between settlements and prevent settlements merging</li> <li>• Protect the countryside</li> <li>• Provide certainty regarding proposed developments</li> <li>• Promote sustainable development</li> </ul>

Development Options	Responses	Support	Object	Observation	Main Issues
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need flexibility to take account of possible future growth</li> <li>• Criteria based policy would provide flexibility</li> <li>• Need to consider local circumstances</li> <li>• Boundaries lack flexibility</li> <li>• Should use landscape character and impact based approach in delivering Strategy Option 2</li> </ul>
<b>Question 5</b> Are the settlements identified in the correct option?	22	13	5	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More emphasis needed on smaller towns</li> <li>• Various comments regarding specific settlements</li> </ul>
<b>Question 6</b> Should other settlements be included? If so, within which option?	21	5	11	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No other settlements should be included</li> <li>• More emphasis needed on smaller villages</li> <li>• All of the settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy Derbyshire Dales prepared for the Local Plan Inquiry Topic paper CD 004 should be included</li> <li>• Do not need to identify specific settlements for Option 3</li> <li>• Include Chisworth</li> <li>• Need to consider effect of larger settlements in national park</li> </ul>
<b>Question 7</b> Are there any other reasonable development options?	23		10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a need for new quarries or woodland areas?</li> <li>• More flexible approach to small-scale development within villages ensuring development results in a net environmental and community gain</li> <li>• Need to consider potential for expansion of existing settlements through the release of greenfield land</li> <li>• Housing figures should be radically reduced to protect the special character of the area</li> <li>• Should consider transport services</li> <li>• Adopt a sustainability driven criteria rather than area based criteria</li> <li>• Should have a development hierarchy majority of development should be concentrated in the large/small towns with some development in the larger villages and very limited development in the smaller villages</li> <li>• Need to provide adequate parking and bus services to market towns</li> </ul>

## HOUSING

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<b>General Comments and Observations</b>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure corresponding infrastructure provision included</li> <li>• Town and Village Green applications thwarting needed development</li> <li>• Not clear how housing options tie in with development options and need to show cross region working with north west and west midlands</li> <li>• Too many flats – need small terraced affordable housing for young families; but also need affordable housing for older people too on sites with easy access to amenities and transport</li> <li>• Support development on brownfield sites in main settlements</li> <li>• Allocations in less accessible parts of the region would be less sustainable and travel demand would place pressure on local and strategic transport networks</li> <li>• SHLAA or Sustainable Community Strategy was not available at time of Issues and Options consultation</li> <li>• Flood risk needs to be taken into account, and advice in PPS25 followed</li> <li>• Housing section provides a robust analysis of the key issues supported by credible evidence base</li> <li>• Develop in main settlements but do not put any extra burdens on developers by increasing requirements for affordable housing</li> <li>• Do not overlook affordable accommodation for gypsies and travellers</li> <li>• Ensure that empty homes are occupied as a means of meeting housing needs</li> <li>• Regional Plan has imposed 10,000 dwellings without consideration of whether additional housing is required – Regional target is unsustainable and cannot underpin the Derbyshire Dales and High Peak Joint Core Strategy.</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<p><b>ISSUE H1</b> The distribution and allocation of land to meet the Regional Plan (RSS) targets of 500 dwellings per annum to 2026 (Total target of 10,00)</p>	9	3	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of provision will not meet the needs of the District</li> <li>• Account needs to be taken of dwellings already built in first two years of plan</li> <li>• Targets in Regional Plan are not a limit and can be exceeded; Current level of development is already ahead of the target envisaged for the overall plan – should also be expressed as a minimum requirement</li> <li>• New household projections should be taken into account which show an increase in household numbers</li> <li>• Housing should be provided where it is required to meet the needs of the population, not as a mechanism for securing the regeneration of areas where people do not wish to live</li> <li>• Infill development is a means for sustaining smaller communities</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION H1a</b> Maintain the distribution and allocation of the housing numbers between the Districts as set out in the Regional Plan</p>	9	5	3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand in Matlock cannot be met by this option</li> <li>• Needs of population not recognised</li> <li>• Regional Plan has looked at housing need – redistribution could favour one over the other – this option would ensure delivery of Regional Plan requirements</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<p><b>OPTION H1b</b>            Redistribute and reallocate the housing numbers as set out in the Regional Plan between the two Districts to deliver sustainable communities</p>	27	15	6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accord with Regional Plan requirements – implications for test of soundness if implemented, and would need to be justified to be in general conformity with RSS</li> <li>• Ensure that affordable housing is provided for older people to meet local needs</li> <li>• Support if this results in more development in Matlock</li> <li>• Will allow use of more sustainable sites for housing development than current allocations in High Peak Local Plan.</li> <li>• Appears to be no rationale from SHLAA about why this option is required, nor should it be relied upon as the basis for policy decisions – it is a tool for identifying sites</li> <li>• Regional Plan targets are not ceilings and there is no reason for housing numbers to be delivered on feasible sites.</li> <li>• Option supported as it will give flexibility to provide additional homes in sustainable locations where capacity exists.</li> <li>• Support as distributes according to capacity but SHLAA may paint unrealistic picture of supply; allows development to be focussed/focussed upon settlements with access to services and transport</li> <li>• Support for this option as it has a positive sustainability appraisal score compared to H1a which has a neutral score.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE H2</b>            Ensuring that an appropriate level and type of Affordable Housing is provided to meet the needs of the community</p>	14	6		8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More targeted approach is required but should be determined according to economic factors of each site use appropriateness test rather than preset percentage</li> <li>• Bear in mind link between housing and re-offending rates- possibly look at the areas with higher offending rates</li> <li>• Policies should be more localised setting right amount of affordable housing on sub area or settlement basis.</li> <li>• Other requirements of local planning authority can affect viability of sites</li> <li>• Reduction in thresholds is justified given local circumstances</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for increased provision of affordable housing identified in SHLAA and SHMA</li> <li>• Need for financial contributions to affordable housing as small as one unit is likely to increase costs of housing by increasing price of compete units</li> <li>• Need to ensure that values of sites looked at carefully, taking into account lawful use and constraints to development.</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<p><b>OPTION H2a</b> Require the provision of affordable housing or a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing on sites of 1 unit and above as part of a sliding scale</p>	10	5	3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrealistic, too low and will deter development; low thresholds may have adverse effect on land value which deters sites from coming forward</li> <li>• Thresholds encourage sites brought forward at just less than set threshold- a sliding scale will prevent this</li> <li>• Need to do more to deliver more – need for government funding to achieve more</li> <li>• Smaller sites should contribute as it shares responsibility amongst all developers and not just larger ones</li> <li>• Greater clarity about operation required</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION H2b</b> Require the provision of affordable housing or a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing on sites of 5 unit and above as part of a sliding scale</p>	16	11	3	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be development appropriate to location</li> <li>• Need to devise affordable housing payment scheme</li> <li>• Each site needs to be considered on merits</li> <li>• Use site area not numbers</li> <li>• Support this as well as Option H2a</li> <li>• Consider each site on merits and ability to deliver affordable housing</li> <li>• There is no justification for lowering threshold</li> <li>• Greater clarity about operation required</li> <li>• Alternative suggestion 2 units and above as a sliding scale</li> <li>• Land required to be released for affordable housing to achieve greater numbers</li> <li>• Flexible approach required to reflect current economic conditions</li> <li>• More achievable; less likely to impact upon delivery and viability</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<b>OPTION H2c</b> Maintain the current policy requirement that 45% of all dwellings are provided in Derbyshire Dales and 30% with High Peak	12	4	6	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If dispersed option is added then scale has to be lower</li> <li>• Need to consider allocating 100% affordable housing schemes</li> <li>• Too high – will deter development</li> <li>• Too inflexible – different sites demand different solutions</li> <li>• Does evidence in Housing Needs Survey complete in 2007 remain valid given the change in housing market since then?</li> <li>• Policy does not deliver alone – Government funding required</li> <li>• Need to take account of Blyth Valley case on viability of sites</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H2d</b> Require 61% of all new dwellings on eligible sites to be provided as affordable housing	15	4	10	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too high a requirement, sites unlikely to be developed and standard of design likely to be reduced</li> <li>• RSS target is correctly identified, but should be seen as indicative targets not maxima; would appear to be only target to achieve the RSS figures</li> <li>• Does evidence in Housing Needs Survey complete in 2007 remain valid given the change in housing market since then?</li> <li>• Need to take account of Blyth Valley case on viability of sites</li> <li>• This should be starting point for negotiation</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H2e</b> Require 80% of all new affordable housing to be provided as social rented properties and 20% as intermediate housing	10	3	5	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrealistic, not viable and may actually reduce level of provision</li> <li>• More flexible approach required determined on a site by site basis</li> <li>• This should be used as starting point for negotiation with developers</li> <li>• Should be based upon SHMA and Housing Needs Survey taking account of viability of schemes</li> <li>• Adopting this approach is based upon need and should help meet specific identified need for affordable housing</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H2f</b> Require a different split of rented to shared ownership	7	3	1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest greater proportion of shared ownership at least 50%</li> <li>• Split on tenure should be based upon need</li> <li>• This approach provides much more flexibility but need to ensure that split does not have impact upon viability of</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
					scheme.
<b>ISSUE H3</b> Addressing the housing needs of the gypsy and traveller communities	4	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figures in Regional Plan are minimum requirement</li> <li>No reference to travelling show people</li> <li>Both options should be pursued i.e. identify sites where possible and have criteria for other sites.</li> <li>2 pitches is an unrealistic assessment in the Derbyshire Traveller Group</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H3a</b> Meet the identified gypsy and traveller need through the identification of suitable site	4	4	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some provision should be within High Peak</li> <li>Plan led approach should ensure that suitable sites are allocated in sustainable locations – sites should be easily found</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H3b</b> Use a criteria based policy approach to determine planning applications for gypsy and traveller sites	5	2	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unacceptable unless used in conjunction with Option H3a</li> <li>Contrary to government advice</li> <li>Support gypsy and traveller sites lifetime homes and the mix of housing needs for the whole community.</li> <li>Sites should be privately run and brought forward in a similar manner to housing allocations, but retain criteria based approach for flexibility.</li> </ul>
<b>ISSUE H4</b> Meeting the needs of an aging population	6	2	0	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Plan give guidance Paragraph 3.3.11</li> <li>There is an urgent need to address the housing needs of elderly people</li> <li>This issue never seems to be addressed or delivered adequately enough.</li> <li>Should be addressed within the mix of housing types</li> <li>The two options could be combined under “Meeting the Needs of Different Groups”</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H4a</b> Require developers to build to the Lifetime Homes standard	7	3	4	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unduly restrictive, costly and early introduction of Lifetime Homes before Regulation may discourage investment</li> <li>Cannot look at the needs of elderly population in isolation from the rest...</li> <li>However the application of the Life time Homes standard would be beneficial especially in rural areas close to amenities</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION H4b</b>	10	10	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported as it maims to ensure new developments</li> </ul>

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<p>Ensure that the new developments provide a mix of housing types to meet the needs of the whole community</p>					<p>provide mix of housing to meet needs of whole community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More provision for bungalows and flats</li> <li>• Allows for family homes to be built, as indicated within SHMA, which will provide a more balanced mix of housing types</li> <li>• Allows for greater flexibility than just Lifetime Homes standard</li> <li>• Ensure development deliver the right mix of development to meet local needs not that each site provides all types of accommodation</li> </ul>

## EMPLOYMENT

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
	37				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs more analysis of local economy</li> <li>• More reflection on quarrying, agriculture and tourism</li> <li>• Increase local job opportunities</li> <li>• Reduce commuting</li> <li>• Development should consider local character/ landscape</li> <li>• Council has little power to increase employment</li> <li>• Use brownfield / existing land</li> <li>• Allocate new sites</li> <li>• Consider on-site biodiversity improvements</li> <li>• Importance of rail links to quarries</li> <li>• Enable sustainable access to employment sites</li> <li>• Balance employment and housing</li> <li>• Make reference to RSS policies 8,10,13a,24,14,19</li> <li>• Flood risk sequential test for allocations</li> <li>• Homeworking important in rural areas</li> <li>• Need improvements to IT infrastructure</li> <li>• Existing sites will not attract modern businesses</li> <li>• Encourage business to reduce burden on sewers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Issue EMP1</b> Ensuring there is sufficient quality land and premises to support growth of the local economy and changing business needs.</p>	7	1		6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop existing sites before new land is allocated</li> <li>• Encourage business growth</li> <li>• Do not locate employment in middle of housing development</li> </ul>

<p><b>OPTION EMP1a</b> Identify new employment sites for new and expanding businesses</p>	8	6	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make better use of existing stock</li> <li>• Would ensure that there are attractive sites for businesses</li> <li>• Existing sites may no longer be suitable for employment-should permit change of use</li> <li>• Current supply will not meet demand. Identify new sites or a criteria based policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION EMP1b</b> Do not identify any new employment sites and retain existing sites to meet business needs</p>	6	1	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will not meet demands of the population/ businesses/ growth sectors</li> <li>• Will harm the economy</li> <li>• Existing sites not always suitable. Change of use should be permitted</li> <li>• Protects open spaces</li> <li>• Conflicts with central aim of Core Strategy</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION EMP1c</b> Identify some new employment land and encourage re-development of existing employment sites to meet the needs of modern businesses</p>	13	13			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit development to Matlock, Ashbourne and Wirksworth</li> <li>• Public sector funding may be required for redevelopment of existing sites</li> <li>• Make adequate provision for new sites</li> <li>• Combine this option with EMP1d</li> <li>• Some existing sites are poorly located. New sites needed to compensate for this.</li> <li>• Could develop poor sites with housing</li> <li>• Identify sites which are no longer suitable</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION EMP1d</b> Address health inequalities by focussing on improving local employment opportunities</p>	1		1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating economic development into deprived areas will not attract businesses and will be counter productive.</li> </ul>

<p><b>ISSUE EMP2</b> Need to strike a suitable balance between enabling business growth and protecting the area's high quality environment</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit development land to Matlock, Wirksworth and Ashbourne</li> <li>• Conversion of existing buildings in the countryside is vital to local economy, e.g. live/ work</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION EMP2a</b> Direct new employment development away from areas of high environmental quality, including Greenfield sites</p>	8	6	2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield sites will be needed</li> <li>• Define Greenfield areas of high environmental quality</li> <li>• Preserve Greenfield sites/ natural heritage</li> <li>• Some brownfield sites should be preserved as they can support biodiversity/ open space etc</li> <li>• This promotes a sequential approach to brownfield first</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION EMP2b</b> Provide specific design guidance for business / industrial units</p>	11	5	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will open the door to Greenfield development / harm to the environment</li> <li>• Area is too diverse for general design guidance- consider sites on own merits</li> <li>• Keep development away from most sensitive areas</li> <li>• Allows flexibility</li> <li>• Relying on design criteria is contrary to national policy</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE EMP3</b> Assist the growth of the local economy by improving the range of job opportunities (including high skill/high wage) across all sectors and contribute to the development of sustainable communities</p>					

<b>OPTION EMP 3a</b> Adopt a local labour agreement policy to help maximise employment opportunities for local people arising from new developments	7	6	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How workable is it</li><li>• How will it work</li><li>• It will deter investment</li><li>• Difficult to achieve</li><li>• Flexibility required. Apply only when it is likely to work and not put investors off.</li></ul>
--	---	---	---	--	---

## ENVIRONMENT

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<b>ISSUE ENV1</b> Landscape and Townscape Protection and Management	7			7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preservation of Greenbelt Boundaries</li> <li>• Restriction of development in countryside</li> <li>• Landscape/Townscape protection</li> <li>• Need to deliver renewable energy development</li> <li>• Landscape is key environmental asset</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION ENV 1a</b> Pursue a landscape character approach to managing development in the countryside	25	16	7	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to have flexible approach to development</li> <li>• Must be proven need for rural development</li> <li>• Implementation of this approach would require more skills and training for officers.</li> <li>• Approach should be combined with development restrictions in certain areas.</li> <li>• Should be accompanied by guidance on building design</li> <li>• Concern that it would open the door to harmful development in the countryside</li> <li>• Approach lacks precision needed for dealing with environmental issues.</li> <li>• Consistent with national &amp; regional policy</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION ENV 1b</b> Limit development in the countryside	15	7	7	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too restrictive</li> <li>• Could lead to out migration jeopardising services and facilities</li> <li>• Too simplistic</li> <li>• Would be sympathetic to landscape, wildlife and tourism</li> <li>• Need to be flexible to needs of farmers &amp; land managers</li> <li>• Environmental impact of development must be mitigated</li> <li>• Brownfield land should take preference</li> <li>• Should be combined with OPTION ENV 1a</li> <li>• Would restrict opportunities in rural areas</li> </ul>

<b>OPTION ENV 1c</b> Require high quality design in urban areas	8	6		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourages local distinctiveness, sense of place and development of green infrastructure</li> <li>• Use of landscape character assessment and village/town design statements to deliver this</li> <li>• Needs to be broadened to encompass all development in the plan area.</li> <li>• Requirement already stated in national policy (PPS 1,3 &amp; 6)</li> <li>• Important when considering development in heritage areas and on the edge of settlements.</li> <li>• Needs to be clear indication of what good design is.</li> </ul>
<b>ISSUE ENV 2</b> Protection and enhancement of the historic and built environment	8	5	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to adapt buildings to changing needs</li> <li>• Need to consider English Heritage guidance</li> <li>• Should consider all buildings with local value and importance instead of just those with statutory designations.</li> <li>• Consider landscape and townscape components of historic environment.</li> <li>• Importance of historic environment should be reflected in vision and objectives.</li> <li>• Must balance need for renewable energy generation with protection of the historic environment</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION ENV 2a</b> Protect the historic built environment and all elements that contribute ton the historic character of settlements	9	6	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There must be explicit reference to settings.</li> <li>• Consistent with national and regional policy</li> <li>• New development in conservation areas should maintain the character of the area.</li> <li>• Planning restrictions should be reviewed to enable energy efficiency measures in areas of historic interest.</li> <li>• Development to meet local needs should be allowed in conservation areas providing local</li> </ul>

					materials are used and design is in context with surroundings
<b>OPTION ENV 2b</b> Encourage high quality new development within built up areas	6	4	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designs should be in keeping with local environment</li> <li>• Would be more responsive to protection and enhancement of historic environment.</li> <li>• Historic buildings should be seen as a catalyst for regeneration rather than a restraint</li> <li>• Too much development crammed into towns will erode their character. Needs to be balanced approach between use of brownfield land and sustainable urban extensions.</li> <li>• High quality design should incorporate energy efficiency</li> <li>• Need innovative buildings that create a new local distinctiveness</li> </ul>
<b>ISSUE ENV 3</b> Protection and enhancement of biodiversity	7	6		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many pressures on wildlife sites in the plan area with many badly managed and in poor condition</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION ENV 3a</b> Restrict development in areas designated for wildlife and nature conservation importance	17	12	4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential to maintain landscapes rich in wildlife</li> <li>• Will ensure that there is sufficient space for wildlife to adapt to changing climates</li> <li>• Objection from farmers union to restricting all development in areas of nature conservation.</li> <li>• All development should be prevented/excluded.</li> <li>• Protection of habitats essential for maintaining biodiversity in the area.</li> <li>• Habitats and species contribute to the character of the area and improve quality of life (Social, environmental &amp; economic implications)</li> <li>• Green corridors can make a contribution to nature conservation</li> <li>• Development should not be restricted if it can</li> </ul>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contribute to the repair/enhancement of habitats</li> <li>Presence of wildlife should not restrict renewable energy generation in some cases.</li> <li>Need to balance need for economic and social development with nature conservation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION ENV 3b</b>  Ensure that all new development makes a contribution to the repair, creation and enhancement of natural habitats, including the creation of green infrastructure for wildlife corridors.</p>	18	8	7	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development would destroy biodiversity, wildlife and natural beauty</li> <li>Not possible to compensate for the loss of natural habitats</li> <li>Locally important wildlife sites should not be considered any less important than national ones</li> <li>Trojan horse allowing development to encroach on wildlife sites and areas of natural beauty</li> <li>Offer of GI or habitat creation should not be at the expense of existing sites.</li> <li>Appreciation of proactive approach that development can make to repair &amp; enhancement of habitats.</li> <li>Care must be taken with wording of policies as they may be open to misinterpretation</li> <li>This policy may allow development too close to areas of nature conservation interest and some element of protection should be worked into it.</li> <li>This option would ensure that there isn't a presumption against all development in the countryside.</li> <li>Important sites should be buffered against development</li> <li>Creation of or contribution to GI should be a part of all developments.</li> </ul>

<p><b>ISSUE ENV 4</b> Protection of green infrastructure</p>	6	5		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI should be protected</li> <li>• GI strategy would contribute to LDF</li> <li>• GI provides variety of multi-functional benefits e.g. for health and fitness, nature conservation and flood alleviation.</li> <li>• All green spaces must be linked as part of an effective network</li> <li>• Allotments should form part of the network</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION ENV 4a</b> Protect and maintain existing green infrastructure resource</p>	7	5		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies should support protection of existing and creation of new GI</li> <li>• Mapping of GI should be subject to public consultation</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION ENV 4b</b> Develop new green infrastructure</p>	12	10		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider land ownership issues when aspiring to increase GI network</li> <li>• Essential to ensure that communities have access to quality green spaces and for wildlife conservation.</li> <li>• Need to promote interaction between communities and environment for benefit of health and well being</li> <li>• Will reduce reliance on the car</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE ENV 5</b> Need to protect natural resources from harmful development</p>	11	9		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access to local services and facilities will reduce car dependency and reduce emissions.</li> <li>• New development should consider benefits of rainwater harvesting and minimising the use of water.</li> </ul>

## RETAIL

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<b>ISSUE SH1</b> Identifying the most appropriate hierarchy and network of centres for the Core Strategy Area					
<b>OPTION SH1a</b> Identify the following retail hierarchy (a- Main towns- Buxton, Glossop, Matlock, Ashbourne) (b- Small towns- Chapel, New Mills, Whaley Bridge, Wirksworth) (c- Other Centres- Cromford, Darley Dale, Matlock Bath, Hadfield, Charlesworth, Chinley, Hayfield)	6	5	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Would ensure that shops are retained in Matlock and Ashbourne</li><li>• This is inflexible and may stop smaller centres reducing leakage</li><li>• This reflects the hierarchy of centres in the area</li><li>• Practical development control implications of SH1a and SH1b are not clear</li></ul>

<p><b>OPTION SH1b</b> Identify following retail hierarchy: (town centres- Buxton, Glossop, Matlock, Ashbourne, Chapel, New Mills, Whaley Bridge, Wirksworth) (Other local centres and parades- Cromford, Darley Dale, Matlock Bath, Hadfield, Charlesworth, Chinley, Hayfield)</p>	3	3			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More flexible than SH1a. Opportunity for centres to increase retail offer.</li> <li>• Fits with concentrated growth in market towns development option</li> <li>• Accords with PPS6</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE SH2</b> The need for additional retail floor space</p>					
<p><b>OPTION SH2a</b> Strategically plan for retail growth where Peak Sub Region retail study has identified a specific need in Buxton, Matlock, Glossop, Wirksworth and New Mills</p>	9	7	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buxton has too many supermarkets</li> <li>• Aldi anticipate the need for stores in Ashbourne, and Matlock by 2026</li> <li>• Policy should either list all settlements where a need is identified or be reworded to make it more general</li> <li>• Retail/supermarket development in town centres improve viability and vitality</li> <li>• Extend town centre boundaries where appropriate Matlock and Glossop- (to include Woods Mill)</li> <li>• Develop a foodstore in Wirksworth (Veola site)</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION SH2b</b> Do not plan for any retail growth identified in the Peak Sub Region retail and town centre study</p>	1		1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would fail to meet retail needs</li> </ul>

## ACCESS AND TRANSPORT

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
<p><b>General Chapter Comments</b></p>	<p>36</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to cultural, educational and leisure activities</li> <li>• Link to employment</li> <li>• Poor public transport to Peak Park, Stockport, Sheffield, Manchester</li> <li>• Canals/Towpaths provide opportunity for travel and should be improved</li> <li>• Improve Bus/ Train integration</li> <li>• Need highway improvements in Matlock and Ashbourne</li> <li>• Long distance traffic should avoid the National Park</li> <li>• Relieve pressure on park by developing walking/cycling links</li> <li>• Divert traffic away from A515</li> <li>• Introduce smarter choices/ soft measures/ sustainable travel towns</li> <li>• Concentrate development in most accessible areas</li> <li>• Allocations should be underpinned by an evidence</li> <li>• Dial a bus/ on call services needed in rural areas</li> <li>• Support Matlock-Buxton rail</li> <li>• Support greenways and refer to greenway strateg</li> <li>• Refer to transport plans of adjoining areas.</li> <li>• Give priority to pedestrians in towns</li> <li>• Include Mottram bypass/ Glossop Spur</li> <li>• Drop support for Mottram Bypass/ Glossop Spur</li> </ul>

<p><b>ISSUE TR1</b> Connecting people to places by improving infrastructure, services and locating new development in sustainable locations</p>	126				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrate bus and rail</li> <li>• Invest in walking and cycling</li> <li>• Allocate land near stations</li> <li>• Park and Ride</li> <li>• Planning gain for infrastructure travel plans</li> <li>• Development option 1 best suited for access</li> <li>• No new roads</li> <li>• Support Gamesley station</li> <li>• Buses to Manchester, Tameside hospital, National Park, Buxton</li> <li>• Weight/ speed limit restrictions A628 A57 etc</li> <li>• Adequate parking business, retail, train stations</li> <li>• New roads- Bypass/ ring road in Buxton</li> <li>• Strategic approach to commuter, visitor and freight journeys across the sub region/ wider area</li> <li>• Open Woodhead tunnel for freight and passengers</li> <li>• Listed infrastructure projects not broad enough. Alternatives exist</li> <li>• ICT/ broadband investment</li> <li>• Funding uncertain for Mottram Bypass/ Spur</li> <li>• Create sustainable towns</li> <li>• Protect lines of Spur, Mottram Bypass, Gamesley Station, Matlock/ Buxton rail.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE TR2</b> Connecting key services and facilities with people by providing mobile and outreach services</p>	6	5		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Cost</li> <li>• Little Impact</li> </ul>

<b>ISSUE TR3</b> Raising awareness of the availability of alternatives to the car through personalised travel planning services, publicity and marketing	17			17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public transport info</li><li>• Waste of time- Car is viable in rural areas</li><li>• Conflict with TR1 (Road schemes)</li><li>• Sustainable travel towns</li><li>• Walking/cycling/ public transport needed</li><li>• Support</li></ul>
---	----	--	--	----	--

## HEALTH AND WELL BEING

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rights of way network must adapt to future change in climate and demography</li> <li>• Waterways should be seen as a valuable public asset forming part of an effective green infrastructure network</li> <li>• .Need local A&amp;E department</li> <li>• Need to design out crime.</li> <li>• Support the co-location of cultural and community facilities</li> <li>• Residents in rural communities have difficulty in accessing services and facilities without use of a car.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE WB1</b> Making the core strategy area a healthier place to live</p>	2	1		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community.</li> <li>• Countryside recreation opportunities will contribute to enjoyment of the countryside and benefit the health of residents.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION WB 1a</b> Enhance existing community infrastructure and improve access to these from surrounding areas</p>	3	2		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All options should be combined for benefit of communities</li> <li>• This should link into enhancement of the green infrastructure network</li> <li>• Access to countryside and other tranquil places is important to help people de-stress.</li> </ul>

<p><b>OPTION WB 1b</b> Target development of new community infrastructure services and facilities in areas with higher levels of health deprivation</p>	2	2			
<p><b>OPTION WB 1c</b> Promote and enhance opportunities for outdoor recreation in the countryside and across the core strategy area.</p>	2	2			
<p><b>OPTION WB 1d</b> Allocate new land for health service facilities in rural areas to meet identified need</p>	5	1	1 (3)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of negative impact on landscape and character of countryside.</li> <li>• Potential damage to rural environment.</li> <li>• Such development should be focussed in town centres</li> <li>• Would improve access for rural communities</li> <li>• Would have to be supported by improved public transport</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE WB 2</b> The need to accommodate and care for an ageing population</p>	1			1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to care for an ageing population is paramount</li> <li>• Fear of crime violence and fire should be considered in developing homes</li> <li>• Provision of care homes in core strategy area</li> </ul>

<p><b>OPTION WB 2a</b>          Prioritise the delivery of social care facilities for the elderly in the core strategy area to areas of high demand</p>	3	3			
<p><b>ISSUE WB 3</b>          To improve safety and reduce crime and fear of crime.</p>	1			1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crime prevention and safety are at the heart of sustainable development</li> <li>• Design of buildings, lighting, landscaping, surveillance of open spaces and siting of pedestrian and vehicular access must pay close attention to deterring opportunities for crime.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION WB 3a</b>          All developments are required to address safety and security issues through appropriate design</p>	3	3			

## OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION

Issue / Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observations	Main Issues
				23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to protect and enhance inland waterways</li> <li>• All new housing should have adequate open space</li> <li>• Parishes need more funding for maintaining and improving existing open spaces</li> <li>• Demand for new allotments to address demand, contribute to informal recreation space and maintain character of areas.</li> <li>• Core Strategy should be aligned with County Council sports strategies</li> <li>• Partnerships should be set up to ensure effective delivery</li> <li>• Safe accessibility and integrated transport is key in ensuring success of open spaces.</li> <li>• Culture needs greater consideration</li> <li>• Good quality facilities need to be provided and maintained</li> <li>• High level of demand for allotments</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE OS 1</b> How to improve the quality and supply of open spaces for sport and recreation</p>	5	4		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New allotment sites should be made a priority</li> <li>• Support for developer contributions to open spaces</li> <li>• All new development should incorporate sufficient green space</li> <li>• Open space should be in accordance with English Nature natural green space standards (Within 300m of every home)</li> <li>• Existing wildlife features should be retained</li> <li>• Improve facilities for sport and recreation</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION OS 1a</b> Maintain and enhance the quality of existing open spaces and improve access to them</p>	5	4		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be done in conjunction with OS 1b</li> <li>• Should be an approach to improvement in multi-functional value of open space in terms of biodiversity and SUDS</li> </ul>

<p><b>OPTION OS 1b</b> Ensure that developers make a contribution to the provision or improvement of new and existing open spaces for sport and recreation as part of all new development</p>	15	11	3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to develop approach to gathering S106 money for open space</li> <li>• Need to ensure that money generated from development is spent in the local area (of the development)</li> <li>• Consistent with national policy</li> <li>• Level of open space provision should be decided on a site by site basis, based on what is already available in the local area.</li> <li>• New space should be provided where there is currently a shortage</li> <li>• S106 agreements are murky and dubious</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION OS 2a</b> Identify locations to meet demand for allotments</p>	15	15			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be priority for council</li> <li>• Enable people to grow their own food, ensuring food security now that we have reached peak oil.</li> <li>• Contribution to health and well being</li> <li>• Sites should be in close proximity to settlements</li> <li>• Accessibility is a major issue</li> <li>• Contribution to habitats for wildlife.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ISSUE OS 3</b> How to meet the needs for indoor sports and leisure facilities</p>	2			2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are expensive and greater overall benefit would be derived from investing in the Green Infrastructure Network</li> <li>• New sports and leisure development should not just be focussed in the town centres</li> </ul>

## CLIMATE CHANGE

<b>Climate Change Issues/Option</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Main Issues</b>
<b>Whole Chapter</b>	13	6	0	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No objections</li><li>• General support for new measures to tackle climate change</li><li>• Emphasis should be on small-scale schemes</li><li>• Protect landscape and historic character</li></ul>
<b>Introduction/Key Issues</b>	17	6	0	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Climate change should be the overarching theme of the Core Strategy</li><li>• The support for bypasses and road schemes is inconsistent with measures to reduce climate change</li><li>• More consideration needed of waste generation issues and the inefficient use of resources</li><li>• Should be more key issues</li><li>• Council should set standards</li><li>• Green Belt not referred to, it encourages commuting and car journeys</li><li>• Issues should also apply to existing development</li></ul>
<b>Issue CC1</b> Development to be resilient to the effects of climate change and use sustainable resources	5	3	0	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Council should set high standards in its own housing</li><li>• Consider the effect of climate change on biodiversity and landscape</li><li>• Fuel poverty</li></ul>

<b>Climate Change Issues/Option</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Main Issues</b>
<b>Option CC1a</b> ensure developments use sustainable design and construction techniques	11	7	3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reword to deal with wider issues including ground stability</li> <li>• Sustainable design and construction is not a matter for planning policy it is dealt with through the building regulations and Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>• Planning policy should not replicate other legislation</li> <li>• SUDS should not be required for all developments as there are problems with implementing these schemes on some sites</li> <li>• Include biodiversity in this option</li> <li>• Climate change section should be after the Vision and Strategic Objectives given its overarching importance</li> </ul>
<b>Issue CC2</b> Promote the development of energy efficient buildings	2	2			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to set challenging targets</li> </ul>
<b>Option CC2a</b> Promote development which has higher than minimum standards for Code for Sustainable Home and BREEAM	10	6	2	2	<p>Responses fell into two categories those in favour of higher targets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should set challenging targets</li> <li>• Minimum standards are inadequate to address climate change</li> </ul> <p>And those objecting to the option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets should not be above statutory requirements</li> <li>• Will adversely effect the delivery of housing and affordable housing</li> </ul>
<b>Option 2b</b> Only require minimum standards in developments	7	1	6	0	<p>Responses fell into two categories similar to Option 2a</p> <p>Those in favour of minimum standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets should not be above statutory requirements</li> <li>• Will adversely effect the delivery of housing and affordable housing</li> </ul> <p>And those against</p>

<b>Climate Change Issues/Option</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Main Issues</b>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Should set challenging targets</li><li>• Minimum standards are inadequate to address climate change</li></ul>

Climate Change Issues/Option	Responses	Support	Object	Observation	Main Issues
Issue 3 Increase the use of renewable and low carbon energy	8	3	2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage farm renewables</li> <li>• Effect on historic buildings and environment</li> </ul>
Option 3a Develop renewable energy wherever it is technically feasible	8	2	3	3	<p>Range of views from different consultees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider methane from landfill and sewage as energy sources</li> <li>• Adverse effect on the environment</li> <li>• Object to separate on site renewable energy targets for housing as Code for Sustainable covers sustainable development in relation to house building</li> <li>• Allow large scale wind farms</li> <li>• This will lead to conflict with community and waste of resources</li> </ul>
Option 3b Develop renewable energy where it will have least impact on the landscape, biodiversity and historic environment.	11	8	3	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope for river steam energy and solar</li> <li>• Renewable energy particular wind turbines can sterilized mineral resources</li> <li>• Option should be make reference to renewable development not adversely effecting mineral resources</li> <li>• Need to consider potential adverse effect on landscape and biodiversity</li> <li>• Object to separate on site renewable energy targets for housing as Code for Sustainable covers sustainable development in relation to house building</li> </ul>
Option 3c Have a Merton style target	8	5	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentages given are too low</li> <li>• Adopt targets as soon as practical</li> <li>• Targets should be uniform across the area and all developments</li> <li>• Contribution to off site renewables should be acceptable</li> </ul> <p>Object to separate on site renewable energy targets for housing as Code for Sustainable covers sustainable development in relation to house building</p>
Issue 4 Reduce the risk of flooding	8	0	0	8	<p>Only observations as no options proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use approach detailed in PPS 25</li> <li>• Avoid development in flood risk areas</li> <li>• Use SUDS</li> <li>• Consider the benefit of SUDS on the wider landscape</li> </ul>