



Consultation Statement

Draft Supplementary Planning Document: Landscape Character and Design June 2018

REGULATION 12 (PART 5) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012

1. This statement sets out who was consulted in the preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document: Landscape Character and Design, how they were consulted, what issues were raised and how those issues influenced the preparation of the document.

2. Supplementary Planning Documents seek to expand on existing planning policy, to provide detail and depth that may not be possible in a Local Plan. In July 2007 the District Council formally adopted the Landscape Character and Design Supplementary Planning Document. This has, since that time, sought to provide complementary guidance and advice for developers about how development should address their relationship with the landscape character of the Derbyshire Dales. The SPD has operated well since that time, however following the adoption of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan in December 2017 it can no longer be used as a “material consideration” in the determination of planning applications.

3. To ensure that the Landscape Character and Design Supplementary Planning Document can continue to be given statutory weight in the determination of planning applications it has been necessary to update its contents to reflect changes to the Local Plan policies, legislation and the approach to biodiversity and landscape management. Once adopted it can be used in the determination of planning applications as a “material consideration”.

Consultation: Stage One

4. The revised draft Landscape Character and Design SPD was subject to an internal consultation, from 21 March to 25 April 2018, with the following Officers:

- Conservation Officer
- Arboriculture Officer
- Development Management team
- Planning Policy team.

This took the form of email and meetings. No substantive issues were raised, some minor amendments were made relating to the application of fines to Tree Preservation Orders and a recommendation that the Local Plan was re-emphasised in the initial section LCD1.1.

Consultation: Stage Two

5. A six week consultation period ran from 15th June to 27th July 2018. A direct email or letter was sent to targeted contacts contained on the Council Local Plan consultation database. This included the statutory consultees, Parish and Town Councils, neighbouring authorities, agents, developers and landowners.

6. In addition, the consultation documents were available online and in the following locations:

- Derbyshire Dales District Council, Town Hall, Bank Road, Matlock DE4 3NN
- The Arc Leisure Centre, 1 Bakewell Road, Matlock DE4 3AZ
- Matlock Library, Steep Turnpike, Matlock DE4 3DP
- Ashbourne Leisure Centre, Clifton Road, Ashbourne DE6 1DR
- Ashbourne Library, Compton, Ashbourne DE6 1DA
- Wirksworth Leisure Centre, Hannage Way, Wirksworth DE4 4JG
- Wirksworth Library, Town Hall, Wirksworth DE4 4EU

7. People were invited to submit comments online or in writing to ensure that representations can be registered and considered by the Council. See www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/landscape&designSPD

8. In accordance with the Derbyshire Dales District Council Statement of Community Involvement a press release was issued regarding the consultation.

9. A summary of the main issues raised and how the issue was addressed is included in the Appendix One. Proposed amendments to the SPD are shown in italics.

10. This statement and the main issues raised were reported to Members where prior to adoption.

14th September 2018

Appendix One

This table sets out a summary of the main issues raised by the persons consulted and how those issues have been addressed. This approach complies with regulation 12 (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The text that the Council propose to delete from the SPD is ~~crossed-out~~. The new text that the Council propose to include in SPD is in *italics*.

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|--------------|---|---|
| 1.1 | Introduction | A very interesting introduction, a very attractive format, which encourages the reader to continue. Welcome the District Council's approach particularly addressing need rather than demand. | No change is necessary. |
| 1.1 | Introduction | It is considered that the 'Potential for Conflict' section on page 1 could be expanded to highlight that over the period to 2033, the District will have to accommodate a minimum of 5,680 new homes and 15 ha of employment land as required by the Local Plan. This new housing and employment growth will largely be accommodated on a range of strategic allocation sites within and on the edge of the main settlements of Ashbourne, Matlock and Wirksworth and to a lesser extent within Darley Dale and a number of smaller accessible settlements. This scale and location of proposed growth could have potential impacts on the landscape and landscape character of the District without appropriate design and landscape mitigation measures | The suggestion to provide some context in the Potential for Conflict section about future growth across the plan area is considered appropriate: <i>"We value our environment for its scenic beauty, wildlife and historic interest, yet it is subject to demands for housing, industry and commerce, transport, water, energy, and food production. The adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan anticipates that over the period to 2033 that a minimum of 5,680 new homes and 15hectares of employment land will be required to meet the future needs of the area. The location and scale of this new development will need to be carefully controlled to ensure that it both protects and enhances the landscape of Derbyshire Dales"</i> |
| 1.1 | Introduction | Potential for Conflict: we agree there is the potential for conflict. Matlock relies heavily on tourism. Any policy should not adversely affect tourism or Matlock's attractiveness for visitors. Views from the named sites should be protected. The Wolds is clearly visible from the following: Heights of Abraham; | The allocation of land to the north of Matlock for residential development has been subject to significant review through the Local Plan EIP, including the potential for impact on landscape character. Furthermore the impact of a specific development on a specific site and its surrounding area will be assessed during the determination of any planning application for the site. The SPD seeks to ensure that development can achieve the |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>High Tor and Matlock bath Gorge; the PDNP and many other sites of interest to tourists- e.g. Crich Stand. Marketing Peak District and Derbyshire has invested considerable sums of money to promote tourism and business in the area. Evidence can be seen widely of their logo being used and featuring Matlock's landscape on greetings cards, paintings and the like. The Wolds features on many of these.</p> <p>Key Issue 1: in this section of LCD 1.1 an iconic view of Riber Castle has been included. This view has been taken from the Northern side of the valley very close to the site included in the Local Plan for development. Riber would no longer be seen as pictured if the landscape were to be destroyed.</p> <p>To sum up, identifying an area proposed for destruction by housing is a bad choice and a bad allocation in terms of landscape.</p> | <p>aim of protecting and enhancing the local landscape. As such this representation does not require any changes to be made to the contents of the SPD.</p> |
| 1.2 | The Landscape Profession | <p>A helpful addition to the document, encouraging developers to take professional advice – also an open door approach from DDDC.</p> | <p>No change is necessary.</p> |
| 2.1 | Legislation and Planning Policy | <p>The Local Plan Inspector recognised that The Wolds is a "locally valued landscape" and that development would change the landscape forever. We therefore agree that Planning Policy should "protect and enhance" landscape that is valued. By allocating this particular valued landscape for destruction by large scale development, the Local Plan is not sympathetic to this policy.</p> | <p>The Inspector concluded</p> <p><i>"The green fields are clearly valued locally. But the site is not protected by any national or local landscape designation and is not a valued landscape in terms of paragraph 109 of the NPPF. Although visible from the PDNP, the site does not form part of the National Park's immediate setting. The Landscape Sensitivity Study (CD49) indicated that land in this area adjoining the urban edge is of low sensitivity rising to medium and high sensitivity further up the slopes. Housing development would significantly change the site's character. But developing up the northern slopes of the valley is one of the ways that Matlock has expanded over the years,</i></p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p><i>including in the Victorian and Edwardian eras. Moreover, housing development would be kept to the south of the aqueduct so maintaining an open landscape on the upper more sensitive slopes towards the woodland.</i></p> <p><i>He went on to say that in order to provide a range of sites within the District to meet OAN, allocation of the Gritstone Road site through Policies HC2 and DS4 is justified.”</i></p> <p>As such no change is required to the SPD.</p> |
| 2.1 | Legislation and Planning Policy | Overall, the document largely consists of a review of an existing SPD primarily being updated in response to changes to national planning policy and the Local Plan. In that context the SPD continues to be strongly developed around the DCC Landscape Character Assessment and the 'Landscape Character of Derbyshire' publication. This is welcomed and in that regard DCC has no further substantive comments to make. However, it would suggest that the document should be amended to take account of the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework, published in July 2018. | In light of the publication of the revised NPPF on 24 th July 2018 it is considered that the Section in LCD 2.1 on the NPPF be subject to modification to ensure compliance with the most up to date version of the NPPF. |
| 2.1 | Legislation and Planning Policy | It is vital that The District Council adheres to the NPPF and the Local Plan to ensure continuity in decision making and confidence in the planning system. | All planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan, the SPD seeks to offer additional guidance and advice to the applicant or developer. No change is necessary. |
| 2.1 | Legislation and Planning Policy | Wirksworth Neighbourhood Plan addresses landscape and design issues that define the Town Council's position regarding the Parish of Wirksworth and Bolehill. This should be taken into account in the SPD. | Neighbourhood Plans are written in such a way that the policies within them positively support the strategic needs set out in the Local Plan, they do not duplicate policies in the Local Plan and they plan positively to support local development. Therefore there should be no contradiction between a SPD and the Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is considered appropriate to include reference to Neighbourhood Development Plans. Suggested insertion (LCD2.1 page 6): Neighbourhood Development Plans <i>Neighbourhood Development Plans form part of the development plan and are taken</i> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>into account when making decisions on planning applications. Neighbourhood Plans are written in such a way that the policies within them positively support the strategic needs set out in the Local Plan, do not duplicate policies in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development. Therefore, where Neighbourhood Plans contain policies regarding landscape character and landscape design these should be considered alongside the Local Plan policies and this SPD. For more information on the Neighbourhood Plans that are 'made' and those in the process of being produced see; http://www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/planning-a-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning</i></p> |
| 2.1 | Legislation and Planning Policy | The reference to National Park legislation is welcomed. | No change is necessary. |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | <p>We strongly agree that less tangible qualities should be given a high value. The Wolds is a tranquil place and development of such magnitude would destroy this forever; such a huge development would take years to complete and its tranquillity would be totally destroyed. visual amenity for local residents would also be destroyed but also visual amenity from the South side of the valley including the places already listed above, and the PDNP.</p> <p>All of this would have an adverse impact on Matlock's value to the area's " contribution to the economic environmental and social well-being of the plan area"</p> <p>We strongly agree that historic landscape should be preserved and that the setting of the PDNP should be protected, including its visual amenity.</p> <p>SITE LOCATOR: "settled Valley Pastures" - The Wolds is an example of SVP and is</p> | These comments relate to one specific site where the impact of future development on landscape character has been assessed during the Local Plan EIP and will be assessed in detail during any subsequent determination of a planning application. No change to the SPD required. |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------------------|--|--|
| | | actually a continuation of Farley. This can be clearly seen from a distance from the sites mentioned above, including the PDNP | |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | Building materials should reflect the natural stone. It is not desirable to use red brick in limestone and grit-stone areas. | It is not considered necessary to modify to the document to address this representation as the issue of materials of construction can be adequately dealt with during the determination of a planning application against Policy PD1 in the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | Accessible part of the document that is helpful to the layperson and very interesting | No change is necessary. |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | <p>Natural Flood Management</p> <p>This document refers the different landscapes within the Derbyshire Dales District. We would highlight that as part of the landscaping opportunities mentioned within this document that Natural Flood Management techniques could be considered, where appropriate. Further information on the natural flood management processes can be found at the following url (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-with-natural-processes-to-reduce-flood-risk)</p> | <p>Local Plan Policy PD8 Flood Risk Management and Water Quality in the Local Plan will apply to all relevant applications. However it is accepted that additional guidance may help the applicant. Additional text is suggested for LCD3.1: Landscape Design and Development Sites.</p> <p>Suggested insertion (LCD3.1 page 26):</p> <p><i>Natural Flood Management</i> <i>Natural Flood Management techniques such as catchment woodland or river restoration, can be considered where appropriate. Further information on the natural flood management processes can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-with-natural-processes-to-reduce-flood-risk</i></p> |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | Building more housing is taking away the natural landscape with wildlife to a concrete jungle. | This is contrary to the intent of the SPD, no change is necessary. |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | The 'Landscape Designations' section captures the ways in which heritage designations and undesignated heritage sites with a landscape dimension are a material consideration within the planning process. What is missing at present is any consideration of historic landscape character and Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC). This is a national programme generally commissioned on a county basis by Historic England in | <p>It is accepted that Historic Landscape Characterisation is an important consideration which was omitted from the consultation version of the SPD.</p> <p>Suggested insertion: (LCD2.2 page8)</p> <p><i>Historic Landscape Character:</i> <i>Derbyshire's landscape is formed by its topography and geology in interaction with human activity and management over millennia, so that the landscape itself can be seen as a historic artefact. For example, field boundaries can preserve the shape of medieval strip fields, and this can be reinforced by surviving hedgebanks, ancient hedgerows and cultivation earthworks; or a regular grid patterns of fields with hawthorn hedges can preserve a landscape laid out by Enclosure Act in the late 18th century.</i></p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>response to the European Landscape Convention, the aim being to map the historic dimension of the landscape to record how historic land use is still manifest in the landscape today, producing a GIS dataset for each county. HLC data is useful as an adjunct to thinking about landscape character because historic features can be important attributes in certain character areas, and can also be considered as part of the heritage assessment of a particular site.</p> <p>I recommend therefore that a section on Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) is added in. This would perhaps make most sense as part of the 'landscape character' discussion, as part of the section on character areas or even in a section of its own.</p> | <p><i>Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) is a GIS-based approach to mapping the historic dimension of the landscape, recognising that the landscape itself is historic, in addition to historic buildings and archaeological sites within it. Recognising the historic character of a landscape is intended to allow the landscape itself to be managed and protected within the planning regime operating in England. HLC work is most commonly commissioned by Historic England and is conducted in line with the European Landscape Convention.</i></p> <p><i>Historic features and attributes can contribute to the overall landscape character of a site or area, or can be considered as 'heritage assets' when assessing the historic character of a site. Derbyshire has a HLC dataset (2016) and an older Historic Landscape Character Assessment study dating from the 1990s. Data for a particular site or area can be obtained by contacting the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record (HER)</i></p> <p><i>https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/environment/conservation/archaeology/archaeology.aspx, and the full HLC dataset can be downloaded from the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/derbyshire_hlc_2016/.</i></p> |
| 2.2 | Landscape Character | The recognition of the relationship of the Dales Planning Area to the National Park and the clear guidance that development should have no unacceptable impact on the setting of the National Park is welcomed. | No change is necessary. |
| 2.3 | Biodiversity | We agree more work is needed in this area. the Wolds is a habitat for many birds (some endangered) , badgers and bats. (and there are more) | <p>Where there are statutory or local designations the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan sets out how applications should be assessed.</p> <p>The SPD seeks address the relationship between new development and the landscape. Enhanced biodiversity could be a potential consequence of how development integrates with the landscape – it is not considered appropriate to set detailed requirements as suggested rather it is considered that the following under Local Biodiversity Action Plans provides an indication that other measures may be required to achieve the outcomes of the LBAPs:</p> <p><i>“To achieve the outcomes of Local Biodiversity Action Plans the District Council may seek the inclusion of structures or other measures within developments, the purpose of which will be to the benefit of local biodiversity”</i></p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|------------------------|---|--|
| 2.3 | Biodiversity | <p>The Environment Agency welcomes the specific inclusion of biodiversity within this document and the reiteration that ‘enhancement’ of biodiversity should be considered for all development as well as mention to wherever possible create new areas of wildlife habitat.</p> | <p>No change is necessary.</p> |
| 2.3 | Biodiversity | <p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>We support the use of Local Biodiversity Action Plans as part of your consideration for the Supplementary Planning Document. We support the creation of Wildlife Habitat and increasing Biodiversity and the important link between landscape character and biodiversity and the use of the SPD to identify habitat characteristics and appropriate creation within each landscape type. This is strengthened with the regard to biodiversity in Policy PD5: Landscape Character.</p> | <p>The purpose of the SPD is to address the relationship between new development and the landscape. Enhanced biodiversity could be a potential consequence of how development integrates with the landscape – it is not considered appropriate to set detailed requirements as suggested rather it is considered that the following under Local Biodiversity Action Plans provides an indication that other measures may be required to achieve the outcomes of the LBAPs.</p> <p><i>“To achieve the outcomes of Local Biodiversity Action Plans the District Council may seek the inclusion of structures or other measures within developments, the purpose of which will be to the benefit of local biodiversity”</i></p> |
| 2.4 | Landscape Designations | <p>The H of A , and High Tor as already stated, these are of paramount importance to</p> | <p>These comments relate to one specific site where the impact of future development on landscape character has been assessed during the Local Plan EIP and will be</p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>Matlock, its landscape and tourism as well as business. Views from these should not be preserved at all costs.</p> <p>7: Historic Environment record: The Wolds is of archaeological and historical value. It has strong links to the Roman and Saxon periods, listed buildings from the seventeenth century, of significant importance to Matlock's heritage. The setting of these listed buildings should be protected by a significant distance. There are obvious Enclosure field patterns which would need to be preserved. John Smedley's pipe which supplied the Hydros and made Matlock a well known spa town and subsequent tourist destination , has its source on the Wolds. This adds significant historic value to this landscape. John Smedley's contribution should be given great weight equal to that of Sir Joseph Whitworth and Sir Richard Arkwright.</p> | <p>assessed in detail during any subsequent determination of a planning application. No change to the SPD required.</p> |
| 2.4 | Landscape Designations | <p>We welcome/acknowledge that the Peak District National Park is mentioned within the introductory paragraph and that this chapter has been largely updated from the original SPD (2007). However we see the updating of this SPD as an opportunity to include the National Park as an additional sub-heading within 'Other Areas of Special Designation'. This could outline the need to take account of the setting of the National Park when developing schemes and to outline the 'duty' contained within s62 of the Environment Act 1995</p> | <p>It is considered that it is appropriate for a section on the Peak District National Park to be included within this section of the SPD:</p> <p><i>“Peak District National Park In 1951 the Peak District National Park was the first national park to be designated in England and Wales. It occupies approximately half of the Derbyshire Dales local authority area, and is a local planning authority in its own right. Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 requires that the District Council take account of the purposes of the National Park of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the areas and of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of those areas by the public. As such it necessary for the District Council to take account of the impact of any development proposals on the Peak District National Park and its purposes.</i></p> <p><i>Policy PD1 in the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan makes it clear that development needs to take account of its relationship to both the setting and</i></p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>'Developers' Responsibilities' - It is considered that setting should also be included under this sub-heading (i.e. the impact of a development on the setting of these special designations).</p> | <p><i>character of the Peak District National Park."</i></p> <p>It is considered appropriate to that developers should take account of both development within and affecting the setting of an area with a special designation. As such this section should be modified to read:</p> <p><i>"The Council will expect potential developers of any site benefiting from a special designation to demonstrate how they will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Avoid any adverse effects on designated or important features</i> • <i>Minimise unavoidable effects to the designated areas or their settings</i> • <i>Compensate for unavoidable adverse effects."</i> |
| 2.4 | Landscape Designations | <p>It is recommended that the Historic England Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) information is incorporated into the document since it could assist as a raw data set which can be interrogated to inform site landscaping and design work and reveal potential enhancement opportunities within Masterplans and site layouts:</p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/research/methods/characterisation-2/</p> <p>One option would be to reference HLC within LCD 2.4, and include more information about it in the Baseline Information section of LCD 3.2.</p> | <p>These comments are similar to those made by the County Council's Archaeologist and as such it is considered appropriate to include a reference to the Historic Landscape Characterisation information as set out in Section 2.2 above.</p> |
| 2.5 | Protected Trees | <p>Trees can create major problems for homes and should not be preserved when they are exceptionally large if the home was present first or the tree was planted or grew by accident or folly such that its size dominates a residential site and is detrimental to the site.</p> | <p>Making a tree/trees subject of a Tree Preservation Order is determined by the specific circumstances of each tree or group of trees – it does not mean that no works to the tree/trees can be undertaken, rather any works are properly assessed by the local planning authority before authority to proceed is given. In the context of the SPD LCD 2.5 seeks to highlight that Protected Trees are important components of the landscape and should be respected accordingly. As such no change is required in respect of this representation.</p> |
| 2.5 | Protected Trees | <p>Concern that the protection of trees is not a high priority in practice.</p> | <p>Trees are given appropriate protection in accordance with the legislation and Local Plan policies. The SPD seeks to offer further guidance in LCD2.5 Protected Trees</p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | | | and LCD 3.3 Development Sites with Trees. No change is necessary. |
| 2.6 | Hedgerows and the Hedgerow Regulations | There is an ancient and significant hedge which runs across The Wolds and this would need to be preserved. | These comments relate to one specific site where the impact of future development on landscape character has been assessed during the Local Plan EIP and will be assessed in detail during any subsequent determination of a planning application. No change to the SPD required. |
| 2.6 | Hedgerows and the Hedgerow Regulations | Hedgerows are essential for wildlife to thrive. They must be legally protected. | It is agreed that Hedgerows are essential for wildlife – however to legally protect them would require a change in legislation, and is not therefore something for this SPD. |
| 2.6 | Hedgerows and Hedgerow Regulations | The document is very good, however hedgerows do need protection or replacement, does this happen? | Hedgerows are given appropriate protection in accordance with the legislation and Local Plan policies. The SPD seeks to offer further guidance in LCD2.6 Hedgerows and Hedgerow Regulations. No change is necessary. |
| 3.1 | Landscape Design and Development Sites | We agree that valuable existing site features , such as dry stone walls ,vegetation and habitats need to be properly incorporated ,not removed or destroyed. Landform; the landform should be maintained as it is and not excavated, flattened or terraced because it is important to maintain the natural shape of the landscape. | These comments relate to one specific site where the impact of future development on landscape character has been assessed during the Local Plan EIP and will be assessed in detail during any subsequent determination of a planning application. No change to the SPD required. |
| 3.1 | Landscape Design and Development Sites | A good section. Questioned whether it is implemented. The objective to ensure development integrates with its surroundings, the contribution to the wider street scene has failed with the new development adjacent to the golf club. Hope that green infrastructure is retained in Tansley | Planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan, the Local Plan policies and relevant legislation is set out in LCD2.1. The SPD provides additional guidance to the applicant for planning consent, the level of detail required is set out on page 23. The impact of a development on the surrounding landscape and integration with the surrounding landscape forms part of the assessment of a planning application. No change is necessary. |
| 3.1 | Landscape Design and Development Sites – Green Infrastructure | This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should | This section provides detailed guidance on how the District Council expects applicants to address the inclusion of Green Infrastructure within developments. As such no change is required to the document. |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | <p>plan '<i>positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure</i>'. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this.</p> <p>Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities.</p> <p>There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • green roof systems and roof gardens; • green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling; • new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). <p>You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</p> <p>Further information on GI is include within The Town and Country Planning Association's "Design Guide for Sustainable</p> | |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|--|--|--|
| | | Communities" and their more recent "Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity". | |
| 3.1 | Landscape Design and Development Sites | <p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p> <p>The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (para 125).</p> | The purpose of the SPD is to achieve all these aims. The contents of which seek to achieve all these aims. As such it is considered that no modification is necessary to address these comments. |
| 3.2 | Landscape | These should be carried out impartially by | In circumstances where impact upon landscape character is a significant issue, it is |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|--|--|--|
| | and Visual Impact Assessments | an independent professional. the impacts of development should not be minimised by developer sponsored assessments. they should be realistic, and the assessor should be nominated by the District Council, not the Developer in order to maintain accuracy and impartiality. | not unknown for the District Council to commission consultants to assess the relationship of development proposals to the surrounding landscape – in such instances the consultant are providing independent advice to the local planning authority. By adopting this approach the District Council ensures that it has had independent advice on development proposals. Notwithstanding these comments - no change required to the SPD. |
| 3.2 | Landscape and Visual Impact | Can the Peak District National Park be included in the list of Special Designations ? | It is considered appropriate for the National Park to be included in the list. |
| 3.2 | Landscape and Visual Impact | Where planting is required as part of a development it is essential that the planting must be nurtured to ensure it survives and thrives. Nurturing over 10 years say should be a condition of granting planning approval | It is normal for conditions to be imposed which reasonably seek the replacement of planting schemes where they have failed within five years. The purpose of the SPD is to provide guidance on what the planting schemes should contain. It is not necessary to make any changes to the SPD to address this representation. |
| 3.2 | Landscape and Visual Impact | Having reviewed the contents of the Landscape and Design SPD, Gladman are concerned that both LCD 3.1 and LCD 3.2, are inconsistent with the Framework and indeed the adopted Policy of the Local Plan, further to the above listed main modification. We consider the contents of both LCD 3.1 and LCD 3.2 to once again seek to afford landscape protection beyond the scope of the Framework. As such Gladman suggest that the Council revisit these policies and ensure that the approach taken in the Draft Landscape and Design SPD is consistent with the requirements set out in the NPPF. | Both Sections LCD 3.1 and LCD 3.2 provide detailed guidance, which is intended to compliment the policies in the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. They do not include any policy, which would be contrary to the purpose of SPDs. As such no change is considered necessary to address these comments. |
| 3.2 | Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment | Need to ensure visual effects are assessed within short, medium and long term. | The section on Impact Assessment on page 28 recognises that landscape and visual effects of development are independent but related. The criteria set out that the effects of development, operation and constructions should be assessed including the “the duration of the effect”. No change is necessary. |
| 3.2 | Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment | Natural England recommends your authority liaise with the Peak District National Park Authority, in particularly the Landscape Specialists to ensure that the SPD | Peak District National Park have made representations on the contents of the draft SPD, and as a result of the consultation various modifications have been made to address the points raised by the Peak District National Park. |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | document has considered all Landscape and Visual impact criteria | |
| 3.3 | Development Sites with Trees | Where possible all mature trees should be retained even if this is inconvenient | As set out in the SPD, where it is appropriate to do so the District Council can and will impose conditions that seek to protect trees on development sites. No change necessary to the SPD. |
| 3.3 | Development Sites with Trees | More care should be taken for trees on building sites to ensure all sites are monitored maybe more staff need to be employed. | LCD 3.3 Development Sites with Trees is compliant with the British Standard: Trees In Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction BS5837:2012 and seeks to give guidance to developers when on site. The District Council has a Tree and Landscape Officer who provides an advice service for applicants. No change is necessary. |
| 3.4 | Boundaries | Where possible walls should be kept in the style and character of the rural nature of the district and hedges should be the same; varieties consistent with the area eg hawthorn. Fences should be unobtrusive rather than imposing and where possible, hedges should be planted instead of fencing to help protect the environment. Substantial buffer zones should be incorporated where there is any historical asset. Between 30 and 100m to sensibly protect the asset. | This section of the SPD sets out advice on how boundary treatments should be addressed as part of developments. The advice contained within the SPD seeks to ensure that the comments made in the representation are met. No changes necessary to the SPD. |
| 3.4 | Boundaries | Any Derbyshire dry stone wall that is removed “falls down” should be reinstated as part of a planning permission strict enforcement should be in place to ensure our valued stone walls are preserved. | The SPD seeks to give guidance to the applicant about the boundary treatment of development sites. Should it be considered necessary the retention of a stone wall can be subject to a planning condition, in these circumstances planning enforcement action may take place should the wall subsequently be removed. No change is necessary. |
| 3.5 | Domestic Curtilages | Boundary treatments are very important – they tend to be optional, should there be a more prescriptive approach to ensure harmony? | LCD3.5 cross refers to the advice contained in LCD3.4 concerning boundary treatment. It is possible to specify boundary treatment for domestic curtilage as part of a planning approval but not as part of the SPD which provides guidance and advice. No change is necessary. |
| 4.1 | Planting | The warning regarding Ash trees and Ash dieback is welcomed, however the planting | It is considered that whilst ever there is a statutory order in place relating to Ash Dieback that the text should indicate that the inclusion of Ash in the Species Mix in |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | plans at the end of the document all contain Ash trees. In response to Ash dieback, the Peak District National Park Authority has stopped specifying Ash within planting plans/schemes. We consider that the planting plans at the end of the document should be updated to delete any reference to Ash and for the mixes to be amended accordingly | <p>LCD 4.2 to LCD 4.6 is not supported. By taking this approach it allows for Ash to form part of future planting schemes in the event that this SPD endures beyond the period in which the Statutory Notice is in place.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Native tree and shrub species suitable for planting within each Landscape Type are listed within LCD 4.2 – LCD 4.6.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PLANTING OF ASH TREES WARNING</p> <p>A Plant Health Order of October 2012 prohibits the import of ash seeds, plants and trees and all internal movement of ash seeds, plants and trees. This is to prevent/restrict the spread of ash dieback disease. Whilst ever this Order is in place the District Council does not consider it appropriate for Ash to form any part of the species mix set out in the planting schemes LDC4.2 to LCD 4.6</p> |
| 4.1 | Planting | We agree that species that can spread disease should not be used. They should be used to visually screen development from historic assets. Any development should be encouraged to have a significant level of planting to prevent adverse climatic and environmental conditions, as well as encourage habitat creation. We agree that feature planting should be discouraged | <p>The contents of the SPD seek to achieve all of the aims set out in the representations.</p> <p>No change necessary to SPD.</p> |
| 4.1 | Planting | There seems to be little concern by the District Council about maintenance once a development is constructed. The document is meaty and well written , the presentation is very good – all we need now is for it to be followed. | No change is necessary, the SPD aims to offer advice and guidance to the applicant. Responsibility for long term maintenance for landscaping schemes is varied and subject to discussions and agreements at the planning application stage. |
| 4.2 | Planting in the Dark Peak | Very informative. | No change is necessary. |
| | Other | SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning | An SEA is not considered necessary, as the SPD is in accordance with the Environmental Assessment undertaken on the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------|---|---|
| | | <p>Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p> | |
| | Other | <p>We have reviewed the document and note that it does not highlight the need for new developments to incorporate sustainable drainage methods at the earliest possible phase of the site design and masterplanning process, and as such we have the following comments to add.</p> <p>All new development should include the use of sustainable drainage systems, unless adequately demonstrated to be inappropriate, and reduce areas of existing impermeable surfaces. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) are a natural approach to managing drainage in and around properties and other developments. SuDS work by slowing and holding back the water that runs off from a site, allowing natural processes to break down pollutants. Examples of SuDS include green roofs, permeable surfaces, infiltration trenches,</p> | <p>The inclusion of SUDs as part of development proposals is advocated in Policy PD8 – Flood Risk Management and Water Quality in the adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan. As such this SPD does not seek to compliment that specific policy in the Local Plan. However the provision of SUDs can have landscape consequences. As such it is considered appropriate to include with LCD 3.1 the following text:</p> <p><u>“Sustainable Urban Drainage</u> Sustainable Urban Drainage systems can have beneficial effects in terms of the managing drainage in and around properties. They work by slowing and holding back the water that runs off from a site. Examples include green roofs, permeable surfaces, infiltration trenches filter drains/strips, swales, detention basin and purpose built ponds and wetlands. These should be considered as an integral part of development proposals, where considered appropriate.”</p> |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | <p>filter drains/strips, swales, detention basins, and purpose built ponds and wetlands. SuDS offer imaginative designers opportunities, rather than just technical problems to be solved. They should be considered as one of the key design considerations from the very start of projects, exploring innovative solutions that form an integral part of an overall scheme. Open space and recreation provision in new developments present an opportunity to provide much needed SuDS, to manage flood risk and reduce the amount of surface water run-off from developments, whilst also contributing to quality neighbourhoods, providing opportunities for wildlife, and enhancing the leisure and play on offer, resulting in a significant positive health effect. Green Infrastructure also needs to be multi-functional. The SPD should make it clear that GI can offer multiple benefits, such as opportunities for outdoor recreation, sustainable travel, ecological conservation and enhancement, landscape enhancement as well as sustainable drainage. Well-designed sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) can form valued, functional elements of open space.</p> <p>Any drainage proposal will be expected to be part of a site wider strategy to avoid piecemeal development and demonstrate how the site delivers sustainable drainage as part of interconnecting phases. Approved schemes will be expected to be supplemented by appropriate maintenance and management regimes for the lifetime of</p> | |

| LCD | Section | Summary of main issue | How the issue has been addressed |
|-----|---------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | <p>any surface water drainage schemes.</p> <p>Alternatives to the public sewerage system for surface water discharges must be considered. Applicants wishing to discharge to the public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available. Surface water discharge to a combined sewer would be the last resort, and is strongly discouraged.</p> | |