

PDNPA LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED APPROACH CONSULTATION

3 NOV– 21 DEC 2025

Derwent & Hope Woodlands Parish Council Response Part 2

Page	Policy/Draft Policy Direction (DPD)	Comments
25	Outcome 5 Peak District is a welcoming place	Delete support for development in defined recreation locations including for visitor management Should not be an ‘in principle’ approach to dev in recreation hubs in the countryside; consider on case by case. Management of visitors should take the approach of travel hubs in settlements with public transport and walking wheeling cycling routes connecting to the key visitor destinations. The Sustainability Appraisal 5.102 states <i>‘All of the travel and transport policies could place more emphasis on encouraging the use of public transport instead of private cars to improve accessibility to the Park’</i> , and advises better guidance on designing active travel routes <i>‘to maximise health, biodiversity and carbon reduction benefits.’</i>
40	Policy Securing NP purposes	Support
41	Policy 2 Sustainable development	Support but add to first bullet reducing the need to travel by private car, otherwise is in contention with Outcome 5 Welcoming place
42	Policy 3 Enhancing NP	Support
46	DPD 2	Delete Diii. Dev in countryside should not be permitted in principle. It will undermine policy 2 particularly first and second bullets <i>‘Makes efficient use of land and infrastructure, in particular by prioritising the use of previously developed land and buildings, encouraging mixed uses and reducing the need to travel’</i> and <i>‘Conserves the quality and quantity of natural resources, including water, air, soils, biodiversity & geodiversity’</i> . Need to qualify reduce the need to travel by adding by private car. This would accord with Sustainability Appraisal 5.102 <i>‘All of the travel and transport policies could place more emphasis on encouraging the use of public transport instead of private cars to improve accessibility to the Park’</i>
61	DPD 4	Support BNG 20%
66	Policy 7 Natural Zone	Support
67	Policy 8 protecting sites species and networks	Support. With following amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To title, add ‘and enhancing’ after protecting. • Begin first sentence with ‘Nature is critical national infrastructure and’ • Insert new Cii ‘increasing connectivity and stepping stones to create a comprehensive and cohesive network’

80	Policy 15 Recreation education & interpretation	A and B could lead to inappropriate development. ' <i>Opportunities for access to these facilities by sustainable transport</i> ' will be encouraged needs qualification. Sustainable travel includes EVs which, excluding carbon emissions, have all the impacts of fossil fuelled vehicles on the PDNP's special qualities
81	Draft Direction 7	<p>Delete 'acceptable in principle'. If retained strike out Fairholmes from list of hubs. The principle of visitor management should be to offer visitors high quality public transport that takes them out to key destinations from a settlement with a travel hub e.g. from Hathersage station to Stanage Edge or from Hope or Edale Stations to the Castleton Caverns and Mam Tor. This accords with the Sustainability Appraisal 5.102 '<i>All of the travel and transport policies could place more emphasis on encouraging the use of public transport instead of private cars to improve accessibility to the Park</i>'.</p> <p>Fairholmes is an excellent example of why a case by case approach towards development at recreation hubs is required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bamford rail station is only 5.8miles from Fairholmes and provides the perfect travel hub for all visitors to Bamford Edge and the Upper Derwent Valley. Development as a travel hub with an interchange between bus and rail services has already commenced. Additional visitor facilities (toilets cafes cycle hire) are available at Hope Valley Centre and could be improved at the station. Frequent bus services from the station to the destinations would make visitor travel sustainable in every sense of the word. 2. Such an approach means there will be no need to expand the car parks at Fairholmes or Heatherdene or provide additional visitor facilities (except for a changing places toilet). Increasing car parking undermines use of public transport. 3. Development at Fairholmes would urbanise what has retained a relatively undeveloped and wilder entrance to the Dark Peak. It would increase the impact of the site, increase noise and light pollution, encourage travel by private car and car dependency, and undermine use of public transport. 4. The Plan states '<i>Larger well visited locations provide a range of facilities such as cafes visitor centres and shops</i>'. This will become the template for all recreation hubs and will reduce the experience of visiting the varied landscapes of the NP by creating a similar gateway at every recreation hub. Yet more than 90% of all respondents indicated that the facilities at several of these hubs [Langsett, Mapleton Road, Parsley Hay and Fairholmes] were satisfactory (Draft Recreation Hubs, Supplementary Planning Document, 2020, 4.17). 5. The public's perception of Fairholmes is as a wilder gateway. A survey undertaken by the PDNPA in 2016, found 92% of visitors thought the facilities at Fairholmes were satisfactory and only 22%

		<p>thought a new food outlet was required. Severn Trent Water's attempts to get a café were met by strong resistance from both visitors and residents (all but of one of the parishioners objected to it)</p> <p>6. Additional visitor facilities at Fairholmes or Heatherdene would undermine the current offer made by local pubs (Anglers Rest, Ladybower Inn, Yorkshire Bridge Inn)</p> <p>7. Improvements to walking and cycling routes from Bamford to these destinations should be made to offer alternatives.</p>
166	DPD 22	<p>Support. Add implement the sustainable travel hierarchy. 'sustainable travel' could be EV cars which have all the adverse impacts on the Park's special qualities of fossil fuelled vehicles, apart from climate emissions. Need to ensure not opening the door to influx of EVs because they're considered sustainable. Do not agree with Sustainability Appraisal on this direction. As the hierarchy places travel by walking wheeling and cycling, then buses and trains above travel by EVs its implementation would help to avoid this outcome. Adding this to the policy would make explicit the need to reduce travel by private car. It should be applied by planning and transport authorities and developers when planning and investing in development.</p>
167	DPD 23 Reducing & directing traffic	<p>Support Add implement the sustainable travel hierarchy. The hierarchy places travel by walking wheeling and cycling, then buses and trains above travel by EVs its implementation would help to avoid this outcome. Adding this to the policy would make explicit the need to reduce travel by private car. It should be applied by planning and transport authorities and developers when planning <u>and</u> investing in development.</p>
168	Policy 58 Cross Park Roads	Strongly support
169	Policy 59 Local road traffic	support
170	Policy 60 Managing demand for freight	support
171	Policy 61	Delete P&R at new stations 61F(i) P&R at new rail stations conflicts with 61C. removing road traffic from parallel routes.
172	Policy 62	Support Need to address Sustainability Appraisal 5.102 recommendation ' <i>Clearer guidance could be provided within Policies 62 and 63 on how active travel infrastructure can be designed to maximise health, biodiversity and carbon reduction benefits.</i> '
174	Policy 63 Development affecting PRow	<p>New routes are subject to criteria including 63D(iv) '<i>where it is likely to act as a destination in its own right, that appropriate, new or existing visitor facilities are made available.</i>' What would be the impact of this?</p> <p>Need to address Sustainability Appraisal 5.102 recommendation '<i>Clearer guidance could be provided within Policies 62 and 63 on how active travel infrastructure can be designed to maximise health, biodiversity and carbon reduction benefits.</i>'</p>
176	DPD 24 Minimise impact of MVs	In addition to managing traffic, it should aim to reduce it.

179	Policy 66 Visitor parking	To 66A add 'and public transport alternatives have been shown to fail.' The Sustainability Appraisal 4.30-4.33 concludes existing policy performs best – 'a balance between environment and economic concerns'. Yet states elsewhere para 5.102 ' <i>All of the travel and transport policies could place more emphasis on encouraging the use of public transport instead of private cars to improve accessibility to the Park</i> '. Based on latter, more restrictive measures are needed to protect the environment. Across the UK monitored wildlife populations have declined by 19% since 1970. Any negative impact on tourism and the local economy could be averted by transforming the public transport offer.
181	Policy 67 Air transport	Support – drones have negative impacts on tranquillity, a very special quality of the NP, and on people's amenity and enjoyment of the NP
184	Policy 68 New reservoirs	Strongly support
189	DPD 26 Restoration of utility & Telecomms sites	Support - V. important