

Peak District Working Group

Meeting of 19th February 2016

1. Present: David Crosby, Neil Fitzmaurice, Terry Keefe, John Woodhead.
2. It was agreed that the chairman and note taker would be David Crosby.
3. The development of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan to date including the work undertaken by the initial Steering Group and Working Group, the need to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and approved Peak District Local Plan was noted.
4. The Group acknowledged the need to review the current Draft and develop the vision, objectives and proposals. The process of agreeing a Neighbourhood Area Designation was explained. The Chairman would forward a copy of the designated Neighbourhood Area to all members of the Working Group.

The chairman explained the next steps in the plan preparation process including a formative consultation of all residents of Dore, possibly in June, before the Steering Group agreed a draft plan for formal consultation.

5. The vision statement was agreed; 'Dore Neighbourhood benefits from the natural beauty of and public access to the Eastern Moorland Fringe of the Peak District National Park. 6. The objective was agreed; 'protection and enhancement of the natural beauty and public access of the Eastern Moorland Fringe of the Peak District National Park.'

7. It was agreed that the National Planning Policy Framework context be focussed on conserving the natural beauty and public access of the National Park, excluding reference to natural and wildlife management issues.

8. It was also agreed that supporting the Peak District Local Plan policies preserving the character of the National Park gives Dore Neighbourhood Forum added weight in commenting on any potentially detrimental development proposals in the National Park. ' It was agreed that inclusion of general support for the National Park area and Peak District Local Plan policies in Dore Neighbourhood was important for 'what makes Dore a great place to live.'

9. It was agreed that having a policy to protect open access land had a basis in a similar policy for protecting definitive footpaths in the Peak District Local Plan. A copy of the Peak District Local Plan Policy LT20 was circulated. The chairman would check on the precise definition of open access land in Dore Neighbourhood.

10. The chairman would circulate a revised draft Peak District section based on the above agreements and arrange a further meeting of the Working Group.

Meeting of 22nd March 2016

Present: David Crosby, Terry Keefe, Dawn Biram, Neil Fitzmaurice & Christopher Pennell

Apologies: Gillian Farnsworth

Chair and Secretary: It was agreed that, notwithstanding the advice from the Steering Group, the Working Group was content for David Crosby remaining as Chair because the WG's work was now well advanced. CP agreed to act as Secretary for this meeting.

Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 February

1. The WG accepted the draft minutes as a true record.
2. As requested at that meeting DC tabled a revised text for the Peak District section of the Neighbourhood Plan taking account of comments made at the last meeting and a plan showing the extent of CROW Act access land in the Yorkshire Fringe part of the National Park.

The Draft Text

3. The WG noted DC's amendment to the first bullet-point of the vision and suggested that this change needed to be reflected in the first objective too.
4. Proposals were made for minor changes to the third and seventh paragraphs of page 2 of the text for the sake of better grammar: **DC** to incorporate.
5. **DC** was asked to investigate whether the UDP had had a form of words about the protection of views from within the National Park to the surrounding area, bearing in mind how important it was to control development on the fringe of the Park which might damage the Park's setting. The difficulty in getting appropriate planning decisions from SCC in this fringe area was illustrated by reference to planning cases (Whitelow Farm, Sheffield Rugby Club and Fern Glen Farm).

6. It was noted that Neighbourhood Plans were not allowed to address fracking proposals or major infrastructure projects.

7. NF and DB questioned why the text said so much about the permitted uses and restricted uses of Open Access land, including straying into the potentially contentious area of the extent of control required of dogs by their owners. DC said that the text had been included as a direct quote from the regulations to support the context and reasons for the proposed DNP policy. It was agreed that if this was a quote **DC** should refer to it as such in the text which would then have to appear in its entirety. NF wondered if the Graves covenant over Black a Moor overrode the Open Access provisions with regard to dogs. **NF** was asked to research this to find out if the text needed to be amended to take account of the Graves covenant.

8. DC pointed out that PDNPA had put in its Policy LT20 provisions to protect designated rights of way and it was this which had suggested to him that the same might be done for Open Access land. CP pointed out that if that part of Dore within the Park had been included on the Park's updated Natural Zone map, that in itself would provide powerful protection against almost any development in that area.

9. CP made a case for more general references in the DNP text to the Authority's listed 'valued characteristics' for the Park and Dore's support for them; to the important implications of Dore's residential proximity to the Park boundary which led to the strong affinity which Dore people had to their local part of the Park; to the importance of protecting local views from within the Park; and to the fact that landscape character areas on the edge of the Park flowed into the Dore buffering fringe. NF argued that he would not wish to see the level of management control in the Park visited on its fringe and DB suggested that some of the fine words in the Park document meant little when it came to on the ground control. The WG concluded that it would be inappropriate to repeat in the DNP text high-level PDNPA planning policies which in any case automatically applied to development proposed for Park land within Dore; but it was important, as TK suggested, to ensure that the DNP text stated the Dore community's support for the PDNPA planning policies as they applied to Park land in Dore. **DC** would amend the text to this effect.

Consultation

10. It was agreed that the WG should consult by letter with groups having a strong interest in the parts of Dore lying within the National Park. The local Wildlife Trust, the Ramblers organisation, the Wyvern Ramblers, the Friends of Black a Moor, and CPRE/Friends of the Peak District were cited. **WG members** were asked to let DC have any other possible addressees. **DC** was asked to circulate by e-mail to WG members a draft consultation letter for comment/agreement which would stress our text's support for PDNPA planning policies and indicate that there was one sole area where Dore Neighbourhood would like to create an additional policy, viz. in connection to open Access land.