

SEA/SA
of
**THE CORE STRATEGY
PREFERRED OPTIONS**

**Volume 2
Issues and Options Reviewues and
Options)**

**Prepared for Craven District
Council
by
Land Use Consultants**

June 2006

14 Great George Street
Bristol BS1 15RH
Tel: 01179 291 997
Fax: 01179 291 998
luc@bristol.landuse.co.uk

CONTENTS

- I. Summary I**
- Initial Appraisal of the Core Strategy I
- Summary of key findings I
- 2. SEA/SA Explained..... 5**
- Introduction.....5
- Purpose of SEA/SA.....5
- Purpose of the Initial SA Report.....6
- 3. Appraisal of Options..... 7**
- Introduction.....7
- Consultation Document 1 – Vision, Strategic Objectives and Settlement Strategy8
- Consultation Document 2: Housing Strategy Distribution 11
- Consultation Document 3: Economic Strategy & Distribution 17
- Consultation Document 4: Environment & Design.....23
- Consultation Document 5: Transport.....31

I. SUMMARY

INITIAL APPRAISAL OF THE CORE STRATEGY

- I.1. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)/Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assesses and reports on the environmental, social and economic impacts of proposed plans and policies. This SEA/SA has been prepared by independent consultants to accompany the public consultation on Issues and Options for the Core Strategy of the Craven District Local Development Framework and its purpose is to inform the consultation of the sustainability benefits and disbenefits of the options proposed in the consultation paper.
- I.2. The following chapters include an explanation of the SEA/SA process and methodology and an appraisal of each option in turn. This chapter summarises the key findings of the appraisal.

Summary of key findings

- I.3. The proposed policy options are, at this stage, too general to make an accurate assessment of their impacts, but their generality also implies that the District is openly questioning the desired overall 'direction' – a central parameter which needs to be agreed and clear if it is to lead intended and effective planning policy.
- I.4. A question that runs through many of the options is whether the District wishes to prioritise economic, environmental or social objectives or if it wishes to maximise the benefits of all these objectives¹. It is no surprise that this is an issue in a District such as Craven. Craven has strong commuting flows and economic ties to the cities of Bradford and Leeds, but is also a sparsely populated rural District, with many small towns, villages and hamlets, a high proportion of small to medium sized businesses and large areas of high environmental quality. This situation may make it appropriate to adopt different approaches in different areas in the District, namely between the towns and in the more remote rural areas, to reflect their different circumstances.
- I.5. Ultimately, 'sustainability' is about simultaneously maximising the benefits to environmental, social and economic objectives, but this does not mean that the most sustainable policies will be those that express a 'balance between these three 'pillars''. Indeed, a policy that focuses on one of the pillars can be sustainable as long as it will not have a negative impact on the other pillars. Also, in identifying the most sustainable approach within the District, there is a need to consider the wider context in which the LDF policies will operate. In this context, there will be imbalances and biases and the LDF will need to redress these if it is to protect the qualities of the District which are of value to society at large. To be most effective, policy needs to state those unique characteristics of the District which are a priority to protect and which should be overriding factors when taking decisions on proposals where there is conflict between environmental, social and economic factors.

¹ see options in Consultation Document 1: Vision, Strategic Objectives & Settlement Strategy, 2: Location of New Housing Development and 3 : Location of Economic Development

I.6. A key component of the Core Strategy will be the **Settlement Strategy**. Five definitive options have been put forward, each of which identifies Key Settlement/s for Growth, Larger Local Service Centre/s and Smaller Local Service Centres. The options differ in the number and choice of settlements identified in these categories. Of the options presented, the appraisal concludes that:

- *No clear conclusion can be made as to which option is the most sustainable, since many of the options presented are very similar and judgements relating to the smaller settlements are difficult to make without a clear understanding of their services/facilities, how they function and relate to other towns and villages. However what is evident is that there is a north south divide across the District, and that Skipton, as the largest town, has the greatest opportunities for providing employment and economic growth, and public transport. It is therefore likely to be the most sustainable location for development. Settle is also a town that offers a range of services and is likely to be used as a service centre by smaller settlements in the more remote north of the District.*
- *Whilst Option 3 (Strategy led by environmental objectives) and Option 4 (Strategy led by sustainable communities) both go some way to being the most sustainable strategy, there are uncertainties associated with each Option. No information is provided on the level of protection given to environmental assets associated with Option 4, and for Option 3, whether the strategy will inhibit a diverse economic base by constraining growth outside core settlements, reduce or increase travel and the consumption of natural resources.*
- *If further detail can be provided which supports environmental protection, Option 4 could be the most logical option. It identifies Skipton and Settle as Key Settlements for Growth, with Cross Hills/Glusburn and Sutton as Larger Local Service Centres. A further six settlements are defined as Smaller Local Service Centres. This option identifies fewer settlements than the existing Local Plan, indicating a more concentrated approach to development. It also introduces the concept of 'clusters' of villages which function together in 'networks' to provide employment or, more likely, services. Villages that work in close networks are more sustainable in terms of travel patterns and offer strong support local services and will experience less access deprivation – all of which are key challenges for rural settlements.*

I.7. The Settlement Strategy will guide the overall level and spatial distribution of new development and will be complimented by additional housing, economy, environment and design and transport policies. Key recommendations of the SEA/SA are that the LDF should include:

- *A **housing type and tenure** policy that requires all housing developments to be mixed in type, size and tenure. This will help to provide good quality housing to meet local need in desirable locations and also support the integration of different socio-economic sectors of society. The release of exceptions sites for 100% affordable housing may also be needed to meet the need for affordable housing.*
- *An **affordable housing** policy which identifies an appropriate percentage requirement for affordable housing based on both settlement size and level of local need. It is*

suggested that the LDF adopts a 'zero threshold', requiring that all scales of housing development contribute to the development of affordable housing.

- An **employment land allocation** policy that guides developments for employment purposes to where there is need but also to where sites will have minimal impact on landscapes and biodiversity and where they will generate least additional car traffic. While this is the most sustainable approach, the District will need to identify which factors will be prioritised where conflicts arise.
- An **economic development** policy which prioritises support for the tourism industry and office-based sectors. These sectors, if developed within the framework of strong and sustainable development and transport policies, can be catered for with least land take and can enhance the natural and built environment. The sectors that are attracted to the District will however be largely beyond the control of the LDF.
- An approach to **regeneration** that utilises all available mechanisms (the market, existing and emerging strategies and funding regimes) so as to improve the quality of life within key settlements and thus attracts more people and businesses. The key settlements are likely to offer the greatest potential for economic development but a focus on these economies should not detract from supporting more rural economies.
- Planning policies relating to **renewable energy** developments are likely to cause controversy in the District. A recent report² suggests that the potential for large scale wind energy generation in the District is far greater than the potential for large scale hydro or micro renewables and that the harnessing of the wind energy resource will be necessary to meet the District's 2010 renewable energy target. The key concern with wind energy development is the visual and landscape impacts which will depend upon the surrounding landscape and its visual integration. Since there are designated landscapes within and adjacent to the District, any policy should encourage high standards and design for renewable energy project.
- The SA/SEA supports combining this with encouragement for greater energy efficiency and micro-renewables. This can make a valuable contribution to meeting the 2010 target with no extra land-take and minimal environmental impact. Energy efficiency measures are the most cost effective way of providing well-heated homes. In reality, these measures are only likely to be taken if policy makes such measures a requirement of all new build, covering new housing and business developments.

² Delivering Sustainable Energy in North Yorkshire: Recommended Planning Guidance, Land Use Consultants, October 2005

2. SEA/SA EXPLAINED

INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. Craven District Council is preparing a framework of documents which will guide development in the area. The Core Strategy is the first Development Plan Document (DPD) to be produced which will be subjected to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)/ Sustainability Appraisal (SA), ensuring that environmental, social and economic issues are considered during the preparation of the Document.
- 2.2. Land Use Consultants was appointed by Craven District Council to undertake a SEA /SA at each appropriate stage in the formulation of policies and proposals to be contained in their DPDs and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), which will form the Local Development Framework for Craven District outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents will be produced on a rolling basis and will gradually replace the currently adopted Craven District (outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park) Local Plan, which was adopted in July 1999. The SEA/SA of the DPDs and SPD will cover:
 - Core Strategy
 - Affordable Housing SPD
 - Stage A (Scoping) of the Allocations of DPD

PURPOSE OF SEA/SA

- 2.3. The purpose of SEA/SA is to:
 - Ensure significant issues are identified;
 - Achieve an element of reasonableness; and
 - Make sure that the SEA/SAs inform all stages in the decision-making process.
- 2.4. A SEA/SA has to be undertaken of all land use plans. The SEA/SA process provides a quality check on the Local Development Framework and strives to ensure that all policies with the Documents are moving towards achieving sustainable development.
- 2.5. A key component of the SEA/SA process is consultation with stakeholders. The first stage of the SEA/SA process (Scoping) has been carried out and required consultation with the four statutory consultation bodies with environmental responsibilities:
 - Countryside Agency
 - Environment Agency
 - English Heritage
 - English Nature

- 2.6. Other regional and local stakeholders representing environmental, social and economic interests were involved in a Scoping Workshop and provided valuable advice to the shape of the Scoping Report.
- 2.7. The Core Strategy document requires a SEA/SA to be undertaken at various stages in its development, retesting emerging policies. Typical stages of an SEA/SA include:
- Scoping which comprises of a review of baseline information and the development of a framework of sustainability objectives and indicators
 - Initial Appraisal of Issues and Options
 - A more detailed analysis of Preferred Options

PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL SA REPORT

- 2.8. This report constitutes the Initial SA report of the '*Shaping Places and Spaces*': *Issues & Options* consultation documents prepared by Craven District Council for public consultation between June and July 2006. The review has covered the Vision, Strategic Objectives & Settlements Strategy, Housing Strategy & Distribution, Economic Strategy & Distribution, Environment & Design and Transport.
- 2.9. The appraisal of issues and options has examined the performance of various courses of action in terms of their sustainability and reports on the findings. This is an iterative process whereby the findings of the SEA/SA may be fed into future decisions on policy development. It should be noted that the SEA/SA can only give a considered view of the relative sustainability of each option; it is the role of the plan makers, informed through public consultation, to determine which options they wish to carry forward.
- 2.10. The basic tools that are used in this part of the SA/SEA are part of a well-established appraisal toolkit and include noting whether effects are likely to be positive, negative, neutral or uncertain. As well as considering any potential alternatives to policies a "no change" or "business as usual" option must be reviewed.
- 2.11. It should be noted that based on latest interim guidance from ODPM the preparation of an interim, Initial SA report is discretionary. The initial SA report will form part of the final SEA/SA report and in accordance with Government Guidance should not be regarded as an early draft of the final SA report"³. The consideration of alternatives as part of the development of the Plan complies with the SEA Directive which states that the Environmental Report should consider "*reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme*" and give "*an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with*" (Article 5.1 and Article 1 (h))⁴

³ Interim advice note on frequently asked questions, Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks, ODPM, April 2005

⁴ This relates to Stage B of a SA as outlined in ODPM's SA guidance

3. APPRAISAL OF OPTIONS

INTRODUCTION

3.1. This chapter tests each of the options defined under the five Issues and Options Consultation documents and the findings are summarised in the tables below. The symbols employed in the Tables are detailed below:

- ✓ Supports the sustainability objective
- ✓✓ Strongly supported the sustainability objective
- 0 Has no impact on the sustainability objective
- X Works against the sustainability objective
- XX Works strongly against the sustainability objective
- ? Has an unknown or uncertain effect on the sustainability objective

Consultation Document I – Vision, Strategic Objectives and Settlement Strategy

Table 1a Analysis of options for the LDF Settlement Strategy Options against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – 'do nothing' – Retain existing Local Plan strategy	✓	?	✓/X	✓	✓/?	✓/?	✓	✓	✓	✓/X	?
Option 2 – emphasis on existing economic strengths	?	?	X	?	?	✓✓	X	X	✓	✓/X	?
Option 3 – emphasis on protecting the environment	✓✓	✓	?	✓?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?
Option 4 – emphasis on sustainable communities	?	?	✓	?	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	?
Option 5 – a combined approach	✓?	?	✓/X	?	?	✓/?	✓	✓	✓	✓/X	?
Option 6 – a different combined approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Option 7 – another way	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (Existing local plan): This option identifies towns and villages for growth and shares the sustainability benefits of preserving the natural and built environment (referred to as open countryside) outside of these settlements. It focuses the majority of development within Skipton which is already the administrative and retail centre of the District and arguably has the greatest economic potential and potential to develop public transport options. By concentrating development in Skipton, more people will have access to its facilities. Skipton clearly has economic potential but currently has a limited supply of land to meet demand and exploit opportunities to develop an economic base in high growth sectors and clusters⁵. Skipton is in a good location to exploit the economic benefits of its proximity to Leeds and Bradford. This option also allows a lower level of development in named market towns and service villages which may help to support and reinforce their roles as employment and service centres for their residents and 'hinterland' populations. It is assumed that this option seeks to restrict growth in villages which are generally not sustainable locations for development, whilst other villages will benefit from a limited amount of development to rebalance the community or to support local services. There is however a danger that this option, which seeks to encourage a dispersed settlement pattern</p>											

⁵ as identified in the Craven Integrated Development Plan for Objective 2

will lead to higher levels of movement in some locations and will be difficult to service by public transport if flows to work and residence do not correlate with adjacent settlements

Option 2 (Economic strengths): This option identifies fewer settlements for development than any of the other options. It focuses most development in the south of the District within Skipton and South Craven area and potentially along the 'Airdale Corridor'. This strategy is likely to forge a stronger relationship with Leeds and Bradford and may result in economic opportunities in Skipton and elsewhere to the south. However, it is possible that some of the settlements such as Glusburn/CrossHills will be largely commuter settlements, in which case further development there will reinforce this. Whilst this strategy may support a higher level of use of public transport between Skipton and Leeds / Bradford and adjacent settlements, particularly if Crosshill station is to be developed, to the north of the District, patterns of vehicular movements may increase. Settle is identified in this option as a Larger Local Service Centre which will support its role as a service centre particularly serving the more remote populations towards the north of the District. This strategy mainly focuses development in the south of the District and does not adequately spread wealth or redress imbalances throughout the District. It may also constrain other settlements from providing housing to meet local needs.

Option 3 (Environmental protection): Option 3 seeks to protect the natural and historic environment, siting development away from the most sensitive locations including the Yorkshire Dales National Park, Forest of Bowland AONB and SPA. It focuses most growth in Skipton with some growth in settlements along the main road and rail corridors which are identified as offering a range of services and having previously developed land available to bring forward for regeneration. However as a result of its focus it may constrain economic growth and employment opportunities in particular locations. The resulting pattern of movement throughout the District is uncertain. In principle, developing centres that offer services reduces the need to travel. However, in practice, settlements along transport routes can also develop a strong reliance on larger settlements that are relatively quick and easy to reach. It is therefore uncertain whether this strategy option will reduce or increase travel and consumption of natural resources.

Option 4 (Sustainable communities): This option focuses most development in Skipton and also Settle, which has the raised status as a 'key settlement for growth'. It also identifies Cross Hills/Glusburn and Sutton as Larger Local Service Centres and introduces the concept of 'clusters' of smaller settlements which may function in networks to provide employment or, more likely, services. The report identifies three possible clusters, and proposes that there may be others. The focus on Skipton and Settle is a concentrated approach and development of Settle will reinforce its strong service centre role for villages further north in the district. This supports many objectives of sustainable development. In principle, recognition and strengthening of clusters of smaller settlement can allow greater access to services and reduce the need to travel to larger settlements. However, as stressed in Consultation Paper 1, there is a need to ensure that identified clusters are a functional reality. This is questionable in settlements to the south of Skipton which have strong transport links to Skipton and Leeds / Bradford and are likely to be heavily dependant upon these larger settlements rather than upon each other. The strategy will not be able to reinforce networks if they do not exist. Clusters of villages are more likely in the more remote areas such as between Ingleton and High Bentham where there are no other employment or service centres within easy access. This option does not consider the natural and historic environment and it is therefore uncertain what the implications of the strategy will be on issues associated with landscape, flooding, biodiversity, culture and heritage.

Option 5 (Combined approach): This option combines elements of each of the options above. It develops those settlements lying along the key transport routes (both rail and road) and aims to identify and strengthen clusters of local service centres. Option 5 identifies more settlements as Larger Local Service Centres than the other options, suggesting a more dispersed approach. There is however a danger that this option, which seeks to encourage a dispersed settlement pattern will lead to higher levels of movement in some locations and will be difficult to service by public transport if flows to work and residence do not correlate with adjacent settlements

Option 6 and 7 (Different combined approach, new way): These approaches will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.

Conclusion: Given the level of detail for each option it is very difficult to determine which the most appropriate strategy is. Whilst Option 3 and 4 both go some way to being the most sustainable development strategy there are uncertainties associated with the level of protection given to environmental assets associated with Option 4, and for Option 3 whether the strategy will inhibit a diverse economic base by constraining growth outside core settlements and whether it will reduce or increase travel and consumption of natural resources. Option 4 is preferred if further detail can be provided which support the environmental objectives.

Focusing in more detail on Option 4, it identifies Skipton and Settle as the key settlements and therefore

develops a stronger service centres both south and further north of the District. While there is a risk that development almost anywhere in the District will lead to higher levels of commuting to Bradford, this is less likely for Skipton and Settle which offer employment and services and are likely to be more 'self-contained' and therefore more sustainable locations for development . This option identifies fewer settlements as Smaller Local Service Centres, implying a higher concentration of development in Skipton and Settle, and introduces the concept of settlement clusters, which may be a functional reality particularly in the more remote areas in the north of the District. The enhancement of such clusters can improve access whilst reducing the need to travel. .

Consultation Document 2: Housing Strategy Distribution

Table 2a Analysis of options for the location of new housing development against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – 'do nothing', responding to market forces	?/X	?/X	?/X	?/X	?/X	✓	XX	XX	?/X	?/X	0
Option 2 – emphasis on meeting local needs	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?	?	0
Option 3 – emphasis on minimising impact on the environment (flooding, historic character, setting of settlements)	✓✓	✓✓	?	✓✓	✓	?/X	?/X	?	?/X	?	0
Option 4 – emphasis on sustainable development (previously developed land, employment opportunities, good transport links)	?	?	✓✓	?	✓✓	✓✓	?/x	?	✓✓	✓✓	0
Option 5 – an integrated approach	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0
Option 6 – a different approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (Market forces): This option will result in the highest levels of development, will increase land take and impact on the natural and built environment. This option will provide housing for the more affluent rather than the meeting local need and will not help to reduce inequalities.</p> <p>Option 2 (Meeting local needs): This option will help to meet local need and enable these householders to contribute to the economy. The new development will not help to protect the natural environment in areas where this conflicts with local need for housing.</p> <p>Option 3 (Minimising environmental impact): This option scores well against objectives relating to the natural and built environment; air, water and soil quality; and responding to the effects of climate change. While this option will protect environmental assets it may not steer development towards areas where it will reduce the need to travel (hence uncertainty of impact on resource consumption) and may not site development in locations where there is the greatest community need or economic drive (hence uncertainty / possible negative</p>											

effect on economic objectives and social inequalities).

Option 4 (Sustainable development): This option is led by objectives relating to the efficient use of land and locating development where it will reduce the need to travel and improve access by a variety of public transport options. This option thus scores well against objectives relating to land use, sustainable transport patterns, economic development and accessibility. There are uncertainties as to whether this option would also offer protection for development against flooding and whether or not it would prioritise the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment and air, water and soil quality.

Option 5 (Integrated approach): This option guides development to where there is housing need, where it will respect environmental limits and where the availability of employment and transport routes will enable more sustainable patterns of movement throughout the settlement.

Option 6 (A new approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.

Conclusion: In principal, Option 5 appears to be most sustainable, as it satisfies all of the SEA objectives. However the priorities for the plan area are unclear and it is therefore uncertain whether market forces, social need for housing or protecting the environment would take priority where they conflict.

Table 2b Analysis of type of tenure options against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1: 'do nothing' - market determines mix and tenure	?	?	?	?	?	X	X	X	?	?	?
Option 2 – mix of types, sizes and tenures, affordable and market housing on sites	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓✓	✓	?	?	?
Option 3 – releasing sites for 100% affordable housing	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓✓	?	?	?
Option 4 – combination of 2 and 3	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?	?	?
Option 5 – a different approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p><i>Note that none of the options relate to the overall level, spatial distribution or design of development and the options do not therefore relate to many of the objectives.</i></p> <p>Option 1 ('Do nothing'): This option is unlikely to provide a sufficient level of affordable housing and will reinforce rather than alter existing patterns of development. This will lead to greater social inequalities, rather than mixed/balanced communities, and segregation. This option is not in line with the Government's Sustainable Community agenda⁶.</p> <p>Option 2 (Mix on sites): This option will provide a higher level of affordable housing, thereby enabling those in need of affordable housing to participate fully in society and the economy. This option will also integrate all types of housing and thus support better social integration. This option strongly supports a reduction in inequalities as smaller and cheaper housing will be provided in areas that offer the highest quality of life.</p> <p>Option 3 (100% affordable housing sites): This option could be particularly beneficial in providing affordable housing on the edge of smaller rural settlements where there is a particularly high need for affordable housing and where development is heavily restricted. This is however a more segregated approach to distributing affordable housing.</p> <p>Option 4 (Combination of 2 and 3): A combination of the appraisal of Options 2 and 3.</p> <p>Option 5 (Different approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.</p> <p>Conclusion: Option 4 which combines mixed types and tenures of housing on all sites and also enables the release of exceptions sites for 100% affordable housing will lead to the highest level of affordable housing, thereby</p>											

⁶ *Securing the Future – the UK Sustainable Development Strategy (2005)*, Appendix A Definition and Components of Sustainable Communities

11: Promote good governance	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	
<p>encouraging those in need of affordable housing to participate fully in society and the economy. In some areas this option will help to integrate different socio-economic sectors of society.</p>											

Table 2c Analysis of options relating to the provision of affordable housing against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – ‘do nothing’ / market forces	?	-	X	-		X	X	X	X	X	0
Option 2 – a District-wide threshold and percentage	?	-	-	-	-	?/X	?/X		-	-	
Option 3 – threshold and percentage based on settlement size	?	-	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	?/X	✓	✓	
Option 4 – threshold and percentage based on need	?	-	-	-	-	✓	✓✓	✓✓	-	-	
Option 5 – threshold and percentage based on settlement size and need	?	-	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Option 6 – a “zero” threshold	?	-	-	-	-	✓	✓✓	✓✓	-	-	-
Option 7 – a new approach	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p><i>Note that none of the options relate to the overall level or design of development and do not relate to all of the objectives.</i></p> <p>Option 1 (Market forces): Going with the market is unlikely to achieve an adequate provision of affordable housing. This option will not ensure the efficient use of land or resources, good access by public transport and is unlikely to have a positive effect on the environment.</p> <p>Option 2 (District wide) The appraisal of this option depends upon the threshold and percentages set. It has been assumed that these levels will not be high enough in the Craven District where affordable housing need is particularly high. This option would not therefore meet local needs and would not contribute to sustainability.</p> <p>Option 3 (Based on settlement size): Larger settlements are likely to provide a greater range of services and transport options; placing a higher level of affordable housing in these settlements will therefore score highly against related accessibility and resource consumption objectives. Concentrating such development in larger settlements may also increase the efficiency of land use. There is a risk however that development may not address local need.</p> <p>Option 4 (Based on need): It is assumed that this option will provide an adequate level of affordable housing and in those settlements where there is greatest need, it therefore scores positively against economic and social objectives.</p> <p>Option 5 (Based on settlement size and need): This option combines the positive attributes of Options 3</p>											

and 4.

Option 6 (Zero threshold): This option will be supplementary to Options 2 and 5 and relates to the overall level of affordable housing provided rather than the spatial mix between affordable and market housing. It is not therefore possible to draw conclusions over the impacts of this option on many of the objectives.

This option will increase the overall level of affordable housing developed and will ensure that it is spread more evenly within settlements. It will therefore strongly support objectives relating to reducing inequalities and meeting local housing needs, and will support better social integration.

Option 7 (A new approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage

Conclusion: A combination of Options 5 and 6 will ensure that high levels of affordable housing are provided in the District and that the location of such development provides housing to meet identified need but also where the people will have the greatest access to employment, services and transport options. Ensuring that housing is provided in such locations will ensure good accessibility to services and employment (social development), thus allowing the inhabitants to contribute to the economy (social and economic development) and encourage more localised patterns of travel (environmental objectives).

Consultation Document 3: Economic Strategy & Distribution

Table 3a Analysis of location of economic development against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – 'do nothing' – employment land is distributed where there is a market demand	?/X	?/X	?/X	?/X	XX	✓	X	0	?/X	?/X	0
Option 2 – distributed according to the needs of businesses	?/X	?/X	?/X	?/X	XX	✓	?/✓	0	?/X	?/X	0
Option 3 –distributed where it will minimise the impact on the environment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	0	?	✓	0
Option 4 –distributed according to the principles of sustainable development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0
Option 5 – an integrated approach	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0
Option 6 - A new approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (The market): Releasing employment land where there is market demand may attract new businesses and cause a quick upturn in the economy. The location of this employment land would not however ensure protection of the environment and would steer employment developments to the periphery of settlements where land values are lower. It is likely that development will be sited close to main transport hubs (areas which can usually be reached only by car). This option will therefore widen inequalities (restricting employment options for those without a car) and will inhibit the use of public transport. It will not make efficient use of land and natural resources, and will not ensure protection of the natural and built environment.</p> <p>Option 2 (Needs of businesses): Whilst this option is similar to Option 1, it may release sites that are within settlements where land values are higher but where development lies in close proximity to a local labour force. Through this option there is an opportunity to reduce vehicular travel, overcome potential inequalities and promote the use of sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>Option 3 (Minimising environmental impact): This option supports all of the environmental objectives, but it is uncertain whether such a policy approach would support the development of the economy or provide employment in locations where it can reduce inequalities and improve accessibility.</p> <p>Option 4 (Principles of sustainable development): The principle of Sustainable Development is a balance</p>											

between social needs, environmental protection and economic development. If employment land can be allocated so as to balance these needs, then all the SA objectives will be supported.

Option 5 (Integrated approach): Same as option 4.

Option 6 (New approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.

Conclusion: Options 4 and 5 will support a balanced approach between supplying land where it will respond to business need and market forces, while also protecting the environment and encouraging more efficient land use and more sustainable patterns of travel. These are the most sustainable options. This approach does not however indicate whether business need, market forces, social needs or the environment will be an overriding factor where conflicts arise.

Table 3b Analysis of types of economic development against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – Encouraging live/work units	✓	✓	✓✓	?	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	0
Option 2 – Encourage farm diversification	?	✓/X	✓/X	?	?	✓✓	✓✓	0	?	?!/X	0
Option 3 – Encourage tourism based enterprise	✓	✓/X	✓/X	?	?	✓✓	✓✓	0	?	?!/X	0
Option 4 – Encourage high technology based companies	✓	?	?	?	?	✓✓	?	0	?!/✓	?!/✓	0
Option 5 – Provide for warehousing / distribution	XX	XX	X	?	X	✓	?	0	?	?	0
Option 6 – Encourage retail companies	?	?	?!/X	?	?	✓	?	0	?!/✓	?!/✓	0
Option 7 – Encourage the development of offices	✓	?	?	?	?	✓✓	?	0	?!/✓	?!/✓	0
Option 8 – Encourage a combination of the above economic sectors	?	?	?	?	?	✓	?	0	?	?	0
Option 9 – 'Do nothing' – planning policy does not actively encourage any specific economic sectors	?	?	?	?	?	X	?	0	?	?	0
Option 10 – A new approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (Live/work units): The development of live/work units seems appropriate in a District with a high proportion of small businesses and an already high proportion of residents working from home. It is likely that this option could be applied in Local Service Centres, Villages and the Open Countryside. This option will reduce the need to commute, reduce the consumption of natural resources, noise and air pollution and manage climate change. It also uses land efficiently.</p> <p>Option 2 (Farm diversification): This option applies only in the Local Service Centres, villages and open countryside. The main sustainability advantage of farm diversification is that it supports the rural economy and therefore reduces inequalities between rural and urban areas. Environmental impacts will depend upon the type of development proposed and its specific location but, as rural areas are less accessible and have poor public transport, this type of economic activity could result in increased car-based travel with the consequential increase</p>											

in use of natural resources and pollution.

Option 3 (Tourism): This option applies mainly to Skipton, Local Service Centres and Villages. Tourism is an important economic sector in the District (30% of jobs are in the distribution, hotels and restaurants sector). Whilst tourism is largely based on the quality of the environment, it can also generate negative effects on the natural and built environment through for example an increase in visitor numbers and traffic generation. Tourism is particularly important to the rural economy and can reduce inequalities between rural and urban areas. The sustainability benefits of tourism will depend upon the type of tourism that is encouraged and the ability of the location to accommodate the number of visitors.

Option 4 (High tech): High technology developments are only likely to be sited in the main centres, e.g. Skipton and possibly Settle. Whilst this option is a high value-added sector, it will only attract highly skilled employees, and as such the benefits of such developments in reducing inequalities may not be widely felt. These businesses may therefore attract high skilled employees into the District who will be looking for a high quality living environment. These companies are largely office-based and can be designed to have limited impact on the natural and built environment and to be serviced by public transport.

Option 5 (Warehousing/distribution): Warehouse and Distribution developments are generally large and located on the periphery of settlements close to the strategic transport network where there is good access to the road/rail network. Such developments take large areas of usually greenfield land and induce large freight traffic flows. Such developments can be controversial and can have strong impacts on neighbouring communities. This option will support the generation of new employment opportunities but is unlikely to offer a diversity of work or high incomes.

Option 6 (Retail): Developments for retail may be established anywhere across the District and are more likely to be accessible and served by public transport. The precise location and level of development will determine its environmental impacts.

Option 7 (Offices): Offices are mainly used by the service sector. The impacts of this option are the same as for Option 4 and will be more sustainable if sited in the larger settlements of Skipton or Settle.

Option 8 (Combination): The impacts of this option will be a combination of the impacts of each of the economic sectors. Supporting a combination of economic sectors will help to build a diverse economic base but may not offer adequate support for any specific sector for substantial economic growth.

Option 9 (Do nothing): The impacts of this option are unclear and will depend upon which economic sectors develop in the absence of policy. It is likely however that business development will require positive policy support and this option may therefore slow economic growth in the District.

Option 10 (New approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.

Conclusion: Out of all the options "developing live/work units" (Option 1) is the most sustainable option, particularly because it is land and resource efficient. Options 2, 3, 4 and 7 also have many sustainability attributes but their environmental impacts are uncertain and depend largely on the spatial distribution of development and increased use of public transport. Options 1, 2 and 3 will support sustainable development in the smaller villages and open countryside. Options 4 and 7 attract higher value-added sectors to the District and are most sustainable in the larger centres such as Skipton and Settle.

It is unlikely that only one option will be selected and it is therefore considered that Option 8 could attract a combination of the more sustainable employment sectors (Options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7) and encourage a more diverse economic base in the District, but the effectiveness of such an option would depend upon the potential and needs of the combined sectors and it is possible that supporting multiple sectors would not afford sufficient support for any particular sector to enable it flourish in the District.

It is important to note that policy alone can not attract particular economic sectors and so the feasibility of these options needs to be assessed in light of the economic potential of the District, including consideration of how it can benefit from its proximity to Leeds and Bradford.

Table 3b Analysis of questions on local economic regeneration against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Qn 1a – Key settlement regeneration influenced by market	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?	0
Qn 1b – Key settlement regeneration influenced by existing and emerging strategies	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?	0
Qn 1c – Key settlement regeneration influenced by existing and emerging funding regimes	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?	0
Qn 1d – A combination of the above	✓✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓✓	✓✓	?	?	?	0
Qn 2 – Safeguarding existing employment sites	?	?	?	?	?	✓✓	?	?/x	?	?	0
Qn 3 – Supporting development of urban economy	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓✓	?	?	✓	✓	0
Qn 4 – Providing range of employment sites	?	?	?	?	?/✓	✓✓	?	?	?	?	0

Question 1 relates to regeneration in key settlements and the appraisal has assumed under all options that regeneration will attract people and businesses to these key settlements.

Qn 1, Options a, b and c (various influencing factors): These options all use an available and effective mechanism to influence regeneration, and will all therefore support economic, environmental and social objectives.

Qn 1, Option d (combination): Combining mechanisms will make the most efficient use of resources available for regeneration and will therefore support most strongly economic development and a reduction in inequalities.

Qn 2 (Safeguarding employment sites): This option will strongly support the development of the economy but may prevent an adequate provision of housing to meet needs. As the objectives of improving well-being and reducing inequalities requires both an adequate provision of employment and housing, it is unsure what impact this option will have on this objective.

Qn 3 (Urban economy): There are no urban areas within Craven but the economy of Skipton may be said to

be an 'urban economy' where it is linked to the urban economy of Bradford and Leeds. Focussing on this element of the District's economy is, in theory, the most efficient use of resources and land and concentrating jobs and houses in Skipton may reduce the need to travel by car. This may also be the greatest potential in the District for economic development.

Qn 4 (range of employment sites): The LDF will need to provide a range of employment sites in order to support existing and new businesses.

Conclusion: The LDF can strongly support regeneration by taking advantage of market support, existing and emerging strategies and funding regimes. The LDF can support economic development by safeguarding employment sites and by providing a range of employment sites, with the only danger being the possible loss of land for housing developments in areas of local need. Supporting the element of the District's economy that is linked to the economy of Bradford and Leeds (the urban economy') is likely to be beneficial to the economy and will lead to a higher population concentration in Skipton, but will not cater for the majority of the population who live elsewhere in the District. It can therefore be concluded that a range of issues carried forward to be considered in the development of a strategy to support local economic regeneration.

Consultation Document 4: Environment & Design

Table 4a Analysis of options to protect the rural landscape against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – Protect and maintain character of countryside through Special Landscape Area designations	✓	✓	?	0	?	?/X	?	?	?	?	0
Option 2 – Approach informed by landscape character types	✓✓	✓✓	?	0	✓?	?	?	?	?	?	0
Option 3 – ‘Do nothing’ – protection through National and Regional Policy	?/X	?/X	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0
Option 4 – Another way	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p><i>These policy options will sit alongside other policies that more directly influence the overall level and spatial distribution of development. These options are not therefore assessed against all of the objectives.</i></p> <p>Option 1 (Special Landscape Area designations): This option will protect the landscape and natural environment throughout the District. However in doing so it may constrain economic growth.</p> <p>Option 2 (Landscape character types): This approach will be integrated with all development decisions and will therefore help to protect the landscape and natural environment across the District responding appropriately to local characteristics. This approach can be used not only to inform decisions on which broad areas have the highest capacity to incorporate development but will also inform decisions on what types and designs of development will be most in-keeping with the existing landscape.</p> <p>Option 3 (do nothing): The outcomes of this approach are uncertain but it is unlikely that such an approach will offer a tool by which to assess landscape impacts and to respond to local characteristics.</p> <p>Option 4 (Another way): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.</p> <p>Conclusion: Option 2 offers a level of flexibility in the protection of the natural and built environment and environmental resources throughout the District, informed by a landscape appraisal. Landscape Character Types can be used to inform decisions on developments across the District and to identify what type and design of development will be most suitable in each of the character areas.</p>											

Table 4b Analysis of options for development on floodplains against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – ‘Do nothing’ – development where there is market demand	?/X	?	?	X	?/XX	✓/X	XX	XX	?	?	0
Option 2 – Development where there is lowest risk of flooding	✓✓	✓✓	?	✓	✓✓	✓/X	✓/X	✓/X	?	?	0
Option 3 – Development on low risk sites with some flood risk if appropriate risk measures are taken	✓	✓	?	✓/?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	0
Option 4 – Sequential approach taking account of the results of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment/Study	✓✓	✓	?	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?
Option 5 – A new approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (Do nothing): This option will have a negative effect in responding to the effects of climate change, but may support economic growth by taking an unconstrained approach to development.</p> <p>Option 2 (Lowest flood risk): This option will constrain the overall level of build and may encourage a higher concentration of households which will result in a greater level of protection for the natural and built environment, more sustainable land use and also a reduction in the consumption of natural resources. The economic and social implications of this option are uncertain. On the one hand, this approach would protect society from the social and economic cost of flooding, but on the other hand, this approach will restrain the development of businesses and homes and may therefore have negative economic and social consequences.</p> <p>Option 3 (Low flood risk plus risk measures): Similar to option 2, but this approach is less restrictive and may therefore allow an adequate level of development to meet economic and social needs.</p> <p>Option 4 (Sequential approach): This option will depend upon the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but this is likely to guide development to appropriate areas where risk is balanced with the socio economic need for development.</p> <p>Option 5 (New approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.</p> <p>Conclusion: Option 4 takes the most informed and measured approach to flood risk. It balances the need for development with the risk of flooding.</p>											

Table 4c Analysis of scale of provision from wind⁷ against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – Bringing forward large-scale wind sites	?/xx	✓✓	✓✓	0	?/✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0
Option 2 – Bringing forward small – medium scale wind sites	?/xx	✓✓	✓✓	0	?/x	✓	✓	0	0	0	0
Option 3 – Encouraging micro schemes	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0
Option 4 – Upgrade existing renewable energy installations	?/0	✓	✓	0	?/0	?	?	0	0	0	0
Option 5 – Market determines location of wind farms	?/xx	✓✓	✓✓	0	?/✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0
Option 6 – Combination of above	?/x	✓✓	✓✓	0	?/x	✓	✓	0	0	0	0
<p><i>The District has signed up to the target for 17.6MW from renewable energy sources by 2010. Renewable energy resources assessment have indicated that 17MW could come from wind energy but this is only an indicative figure and is not a target for the District.</i></p> <p>Option 1 (Large-scale wind sites): One large-scale windfarm would be sufficient to produce 17.6MW of energy. This will be the most cost-effective and land efficient means of reaching the District's renewable energy target. Depending upon the location and design of wind farms, this option may be a significant negative impact on the landscape and particularly on designated landscapes.</p> <p>Option 2 (Small – medium scale wind sites): Similar impacts as outlined for option 1. However the cumulative impact of several small-medium wind sites may potentially have a greater landscape impact and would also require a greater land-take than one large-scale windfarm.</p> <p>Option 3 (Micro-generation): Micro-renewables will reduce the consumption of natural resources with minimal land-take and consequential effects on the environment e.g. pollution. This option is not however sufficient to meet the District's renewable energy target. The potential for micro technology generation in 2010 is 4.6MW; less than a third of the District's⁸ target for 2010.</p>											

⁷ Data comes from 'Delivering Sustainable Energy in North Yorkshire: Recommended Planning Guidance, October 2005

⁸ note that the study considered District boundaries rather than planning authority boundaries.

Option 4 (Upgrade existing technologies): Upgrading existing technologies will increase their capacity through efficiency gains. This will increase generation with minimal additional land-take or impact on the natural or built environment. Given the current low level of energy generation from the District, this option is unlikely to be sufficient to meet the District's renewable energy targets.

Option 5 (Market): This option is likely to support wind energy developments since wind technology is the most advanced and competitive. This option scores the same as Options 1 and 2.

Option 6 (Combination:) This option combines the assessment of Options 1-5 above.

Option 7 (A new approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.

Conclusion: Option 6 appears to be both the most sustainable and also the most realistic option to meet the District's renewable energy target. Given the current market interest in wind energy, it is likely that a range of windfarm proposals will come forward. Protecting the district's built and natural environment will require the Council to take a proactive approach to methods of assessing renewable energy applications.

Table 4d Analysis of renewable energy technology options⁹ against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible ¹⁰	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – Reduce consumption in new and existing households by introducing energy efficiency measures and incorporating micro-renewable technologies	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	?	✓	✓	0	0	0
Option 2 – Develop renewable energy sources such as biomass and hydro	?/x	?/x	✓✓	✓	?/x	?	?	0	0	0	0
Option 3 – A combination of the above	?/✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	?/✓	?	✓	0	0	0	0
Option 4 – 'Do nothing' – follow the market	?	xx	xx	xx	?	?	?/x	0	0	0	0
Option 5 – A new approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (Household efficiency plus micro-renewables): This option will reduce the consumption of natural resources and respond to climate change without additional land-take and with minimal impact on the natural and built environment. Good quality, energy efficient housing will lead to energy cost savings and will therefore improve health and well-being and reduce fuel deprivation and inequalities. However, as noted above (Table 4c, option 3), micro-renewables can contribute to, but cannot on their own meet the District's renewable energy target.</p> <p>Option 2 (Biomass and hydro): Assuming that this option includes medium and large scale sites, then this option has a greater potential to meet the District's energy targets. The potential to generate energy from large scale sites in the District is considerably greater than the potential from micro-renewables (17.48MW in 2010 and 46.3MW in 2021 from large scale compared to 4.6MW in 2010 and 32.25MW in 2021 from micro technologies). This option may require considerable land-takes resulting in negative impacts on the natural and built environment and possible conflicts with nearby communities. Hydro can also have a negative impact on hydrology and ecosystems.</p> <p>Option 3 (Combination): Although large scale technologies will be sufficient to meet the 2010 sustainable energy target for the District, a combination of technologies including micro-renewables will reduce pressure to</p>											

⁹ Data comes from 'Delivering Sustainable Energy in North Yorkshire: Recommended Planning Guidance, October 2005

develop large schemes in the more sensitive areas in the District, thus reducing the impacts on the natural and built environment and on communities. Improving energy efficiency should be a large part of this option as it is low cost and has no negative impacts.

Option 4 (Do nothing): Without national, county or district intervention, energy will continue to be generated mainly from the conventional sources such as coal and gas. This option has strong environmental disbenefits of increasing the consumption of natural resources and pollution and will not address climate change. Energy from conventional sources is currently cheaper than energy from renewable energy sources, but prices are rising and will lead to fuel deprivation and increase inequalities.

Option 5 (New approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.

Conclusion: A combination of measures (Option 3) is most sustainable and is necessary to meet the renewable energy targets with least land-take and impact on local communities. Measurable improvements in energy efficiency and the integration of micro-renewables into new development will only become a reality if the District enforces such measures through future planning applications relating to housing, public services and business developments.

¹⁰ The targets set for planning policy are for domestic energy use and do not include energy used in transport. It is however possible that the district could also support the use of public transport that runs off renewable energy.

Table 4e Analysis of options for the historic built environment and open spaces within settlements against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Option 1 – High priority is given to protecting historic built environment and all existing areas of open space within settlements	✓✓	?	?	✓	?/X	?/X	?	?/X	?	?	0
Option 2 – Protection guided by the Assessment of Open Spaces for Craven	✓/X	?	?	✓	✓	?	?	?/✓	?	?	0
Option 3 – ‘do nothing’ - low priority to protecting the historic built environment and open spaces	X	?	?	X	X	✓	X	✓	?	?	0
Option 4 - A new approach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<p>Option 1 (High priority): This option will strongly support protecting the natural and built environment but may also restrict development and have a negative impact on the economy and provision of housing to meet local need.</p> <p>Option 2 (Guided by Assessment of Open Spaces for Craven): It is assumed that this assessment will determine the value, purpose and future of such open spaces identifying which could be more usefully used as employment or housing developments. This option may therefore make more efficient use of land and offer spaces for developing the economy and providing housing for local need, but the level of protection it affords to the natural and built environment will depend upon the criteria and prioritisation in this assessment.</p> <p>Option 3 (Do nothing): While this option has the greatest potential to enable development, particularly addressing housing for local need, it is likely to have a strongly negative impact on the natural and built environment within the settlements. The loss of open space including informal and formal recreation/sports facilities, could result in the deterioration in people’s quality of life and health. It may also lead to a deterioration in environmental quality and have a negative “knock on effect” on tourism and associated businesses.</p> <p>Option 4 (New approach): This approach will be informed by this public consultation exercise and therefore can not be assessed at this stage.</p> <p>Conclusion: Options 1 and 2 have the greatest sustainability benefits, and their impacts will depend upon the level of need for development and the quality of the current historic environment and open spaces. Option 2 is a practical and pragmatic approach which, if tailored to protecting those historic sites and open spaces that are of</p>											

11: Promote good governance
10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible
9: To safeguard and improve accessibility
8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs
7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities
6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base
5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development
4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change
3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources
2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution
1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment
high quality, will be the most sustainable option.

4F – Conservation and Design

The questions presented under this section are open questions rather than options and have not therefore been appraised.

Consultation Document 5: Transport

Table 5a Analysis of questions relating to the spatial strategy and transport against the 11 Sustainability Criteria (listed across the columns).

	1: To maintain and enhance the natural & built environment	2: To protect and improve air, water and soil quality and minimise noise pollution	3: To minimise the consumption of natural resources	4: To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change	5: To achieve and promote sustainable land use and built development	6: To develop a strong, diverse economic base	7: To improve health and well being and reduce inequalities	8: To provide sufficient good quality housing to meet all local needs	9: To safeguard and improve accessibility	10: To achieve and promote high level provision and use of sustainable transport modes where possible	11: Promote good governance
Qn 1a – New growth should be directed to where adequate existing transport infrastructure is in place	✓	?	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	?	0
Qn 1b – New growth should be directed to where transport improvements can be secured	?/X	?	?/X	?	?/X	✓	?/✓	0	✓	?/✓	0
Qn 1c – Spatial strategy should seek to balance the distribution of growth to existing transport accessibility and securing needed investments	✓	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	0
Qn 2a – Greater use of public transport should be encouraged universally	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓/!	✓	0	✓	✓	0
Qn 2b – Greater use of public transport should be secured in the main centres and less so in the more sparsely population areas	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?/X	0	✓	✓	0
<p><i>Note that the final question in this section is an open question rather than option and has not therefore been appraised.</i></p> <p>Question 1: Options a and c presented under this question are similar in that they steer development to the current or future, more accessible locations. The use of existing infrastructure will make more efficient use of land and resources and will reduce the need for additional land-take which will therefore help to protect the natural and built environment.</p> <p>The environmental effects of Option b will depend on the nature of transport improvements and whether it will result in additional land. Since this option will direct growth to where transport improvement can be secured</p>											

rather than where transport infrastructure can accommodate further growth it could result in an increase in traffic congestion and the consumption of additional resources.

Option c is considered to be the most sustainable option since this option, through investment will seek to improve, where needed existing infrastructure and overcome potential issues associated with traffic congestion, health and air quality.

Question 2: This question relates to increased public transport use which will have wide-reaching environmental and social benefits, including reducing land-take, resource use and improving accessibility for all. In effect (DELETE)it should reduce inequalities and improve health and well being.

Whilst Option a seeks to encourage public transport across the whole of the District, it is unlikely to be an economically viable option. Although this option appears to be more sustainable it is less viable. If this option was carried forward, it may jeopardise future investment and the quality of public transport provided in the larger settlements.

Option b takes a differentiated approach and places more emphasis on supporting public transport in the more densely populated areas and less in the rural areas. This will be more economically viable, but will cause accessibility inequalities between rural and urban areas especially in those rural areas where car ownership is low.

The most sustainable option would be a combination of options a and b which would focus on improved public transport provision on the most well-used transport routes and in identified smaller settlements where there is low car ownership and access deprivation. Alternative more innovative solutions also need to be explored to reduce vehicular trips.

5B – Growth, Accessibility and Health

The questions presented under this section are open questions rather than options and have not therefore been appraised.