

CRAVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL: LDF CORE STRATEGY, PREFERRED OPTIONS STAGE

EMERGING STRATEGIC OPTIONS

CONTENTS

Context

Purpose of the Report

Consultation Event: methodology

Consultation Event: the outcome

Theme 1: Spatial Portrait and Vision

Theme 2: Settlement Strategy

Theme 3: Housing

Theme 4: Employment and Transport

Theme 5: Environment

Conclusions

Appendix A: Discussion Papers for 26/1/07 Event

Appendix B: Event Responses

Appendix C: Visioning Exercise Results

Appendix D: Delegate List

Context

Envision have been engaged by Craven District Council (CDC) to prepare and write, in collaboration with CDC staff, the Core Strategy preferred options as part of the emerging Local Development Framework for the area outside the National Park.

Preparation of the Core Strategy commenced towards the end of 2004. A major consultation event was held in June 2005, the 'Shaping Places and Spaces' conference involving key stakeholders and a wide range of interest groups and individuals.

Consultation on the Core Strategy 'Issues and Options' continued in June/July 2006 with papers issued for comment setting out, where possible, options for the following themes/issues identified at the 2005 conference:

- Vision
- Settlement Strategy
- Housing Strategy
- Economic Strategy
- Environment and Design
- Transport

Envision responded to the Consultants brief issued by the Council in November 2006. This set out a timetable for the following key areas of work:

1. Facilitation of a consultation event on the emerging Core Strategy preferred options (to be held in January 2007) and feedback to the Council's Management Team and officers;
2. Formulation and write up of responses to the Issues and options consultation held in June/July 2006 working collaboratively with CDC staff (ongoing January/February);
3. Production of a Core Strategy Preferred Options paper in conjunction with CDC staff based on the existing Issues and Options work and the outcome from the consultation event (February/March);
4. Initial presentation of the above paper to the Council's 'Management Team' and other Council Officers as appropriate and, following feedback, preparation of a final draft for consultation with Council members (March/April).

In accordance with the brief, the consultation event (1 above) was held on Friday 26th January 2007 involving some 38 delegates.

Purpose of the Report

This report provides a summary of the results of the January consultation event together with the emerging strategic options based on this and the work previously undertaken.

Consultation Event: methodology

Following the Issues and Options work conducted in June/July 2006 information received has been entered by CDC staff into the LDF database. This records each response by providing a unique reference number for each respondent and sets them against the individual questions raised in the papers. Where general comments are made these are recorded separately but within the main database.

Summary papers covering the main issues were prepared by CDC staff in January and circulated to CMT in addition to them being posted on the Council's website.

So as to promote further discussion at the consultation event, Envision prepared a series of discussion papers, based around the options presented at the Issues and Options stage, setting out areas of consensus, options which could be discarded, areas where further debate and discussion was required either due to changing circumstances or where the consultation responses were inconclusive. The event format also allowed for new issues to be raised and discussed.

The Consultation event was structured to allow group discussion, facilitated by Envision staff on the following themes:

- The LDF Vision
- Settlement Strategy
- Housing
- Economy and Transport
- Environment and Design

The discussion papers used are located on the Council's website and are attached to this report in **Appendix A**.

During the workshop sessions, all comments were recorded by CDC staff and are included in **Appendix B**. The full delegate list is contained in **Appendix D**.

Consultation Event: the outcome

The five themes used in the Issues and Options papers are again used as the framework, although some additional concerns, which may be considered as sub-sets of the key issues, have emerged and are considered under sub-headings.

Theme 1: Spatial Portrait and Vision

The distinctive characteristics of Craven have been identified for inclusion in the spatial portrait for the Core Strategy and should include some or all of the following terms:

- Countryside, open space, green space, hills;

- Outstanding natural landscape, limestone fields, River Ribble floodplain;
- Ecology, wildlife;
- Protect as existing, tranquillity, safety;
- Scenery, panoramas/vistas, excellent views;
- Individual character, market town and rural identity, thriving economy;
- Vibrant working communities, friendly.

For discussion purposes, as the Core Strategy process moves forward, the following draft Composite Vision draws together many of the phrases and words used above, together with some of the words generated by delegates when considering the draft 'Vision' for the revised Community Strategy. The vision also makes reference to the main points made in the responses to the I&O work from 2006. This draft vision has not been formally approved by Craven District Council and further work is needed to align this spatial vision with the wider vision within the emerging sustainable community strategy.

The Vision for Craven in 2021 is to rekindle the 'community spirit' of its friendly rural settlements and thriving market towns by encouraging self-sufficient, vibrant and dynamic communities with a mix of people and a range of local shops and services, social facilities and employment opportunities. The people of Craven will be proud of the distinctive character and environmental assets of their area and will seek to protect them, whilst providing for the social and economic needs of present and future generations.

Craven will continue to place value on its outstanding natural environment - its complex and varied geology and landscapes, open views and native wildlife - and will preserve its tranquillity and scenic beauty as the most important assets that make the area stand out. The viable and well-managed agricultural landscape will continue to provide an attractive setting for thriving market towns, villages and rural settlements. The special qualities of the existing built environment will have been conserved and improved by well-designed and progressive forms of development that display creativity, innovation and sensitivity.

The economy of Craven will continue to prosper and grow, so that local residents will have a wider choice of employment opportunities, working either from home, in small business premises and managed workspaces in the rural areas, in larger employment sites in the key service centres or in business parks within the Airedale Corridor. Craven will also have a viable and vibrant retail economy with a greater range of goods on offer, in the key centres, from individually designed outlets rather than 'cloned' shopping centres and retail warehouses.

Local people, including young people, will be able to afford to live locally in a variety of homes that include well-planned safe and affordable housing for rent and for sale. The regeneration of the neglected parts of the district's towns and villages will have been encouraged, although 'suburban' development will be resisted so that Craven does not become a 'dormitory' for the rest of Yorkshire.

New developments will have achieved high standards of urban design and architecture, and will reflect the individual character and visual quality of each of the traditional towns and villages in the district. Regeneration and development schemes throughout Craven will have helped to reduce traffic and improve the safety, convenience and enjoyment of

walking and cycling. All new developments will have achieved a high standard of sustainable construction including energy efficiency, water conservation and building materials.

In 2021 Craven will be recognised as a friendly and attractive choice for work, home and leisure and visitors will continue to be welcomed. Connectivity between all aspects of life in Craven will have been achieved by means of an accessible, frequent, integrated and affordable public transport system throughout the district. All residents will have ready access to the open spaces, local services and social support that they need, without always having to travel by private car.

Theme 2: Settlement Strategy

The Issues and Options Consultation papers outlined a series of Options for a Settlement Strategy; these were based on five main options presented to the 'Shaping Spaces and Places' Conference in June 2005.

They set out a 'do nothing' approach that maintains the existing Local Plan strategy (Option 1); three approaches giving greater emphasis to one element of sustainability, either economic, social or environmental objectives (Option 2); and one option that balances these sustainability objectives equally (Option 3).

The first four options were not widely supported by the I&O consultation responses. There was stronger support for a combined approach (Option B3) that equally promotes the three elements of sustainability. This option proposes equal emphasis should be placed on all three pillars of sustainability: economic; environmental and social. This would:

- focus most growth towards market towns and larger service centres and maintain their vitality and viability (economic objectives);
- distribute some growth to other settlements along the A65 and A629 public transport corridors, where previously developed land exists (environmental objectives); and
- identify clusters of smaller settlements that provide complementary support and services, enhancing their roles where possible (social objectives)

The workshop delegates recognised that the growth of the Leeds City Region and the targets set in the RSS should be the starting point, which predetermines certain things such as the emphasis on the Airedale Corridor. A considerable amount of information was gathered as to the services and facilities available in each settlement and the interrelationships between them. Delegates would like the LDF to promote greater choice within settlements in terms of employment, health care, education and local shopping.

The combined approach includes the 'potential grouping of settlements'. The consultation event raised doubts about this approach as a realistic concept. There was a strong feeling that the key to maintaining complementary settlement functions was accessible, affordable and frequent public transport and the provision of 'mobile' community services, home deliveries and broadband connections.

There was a firm feeling that this option fails to give sufficient emphasis to Bentham as an important service centre in the north of the district, which, it is suggested, should be

elevated in the settlement hierarchy, possibly in conjunction with Ingleton. The consensus was that a critical mass of development is needed to sustain key service centres, and that a hierarchy of settlements could be identified as follows:

- Skipton;
- South Craven and Settle;
- Bentham with Ingleton;
- More restricted development in smaller settlements to sustain local services.

Measures to secure the long term viability of smaller settlements are supported although there is an acceptance that some can only be seen as dormitory villages. Proposals for the expansion of settlements, including those in south Craven, need to be based on a thorough appraisal of the constraints to development, such as flooding and environmental quality. There tends to be an inbuilt resistance to change; but the LDF should encourage farm diversification and innovative schemes for employment growth in the rural areas.

Settle has an important role to play as the service centre for the central part of the district.

Skipton's function as a principal service centre is accepted as a given.

There are questions of deliverability because of existing physical constraints in South Craven and the general inadequacy of infrastructure elsewhere in Craven.

In terms of the role of Skipton, tourism is seen as important but it depends on the distinctive rural character of the area. The character and townscape of Skipton must not be damaged by parking and 'cloned' developments. Skipton attracts a 'niche' market and needs to cater principally for residents' needs. There is limited support for 'shed' type retail units, which the workshops felt should not be encouraged. Delegates suggested that Craven should look at the potential to redevelop existing sites for mixed use.

Theme 3: Housing

Issue A: Location of New Housing Development

The Issues and Options Consultation paper for Housing Strategy and Distribution outlined a series of options as follows: doing nothing, responding to housing needs through an up to date Housing Needs Assessment, determining by the need to minimise impact on the environment, determining according to the principles of sustainable development, an integrated approach and a different approach.

The overwhelming preference of those responding to the Issues and Options consultation was for an integrated approach (Option A5), wherein weight is given equally to the market, housing needs, the environment and sustainability.

The consultation event considered that this integrated approach should be the preferred option so that the principles of sustainable development (giving priority to the redevelopment of previously developed land/redundant or underused spaces, employment opportunities and transport links) and the need to minimise impact on the environment (eg. land not liable to flooding or affecting the historic character, setting or environment of a settlement) should all be taken into account. This approach should however, be

adapted to different locations, to promote the redevelopment of existing sites for mixed development and identify different needs in different areas.

Issue B: Achieving a Mix of New Housing

In terms of achieving a mix of new housing, the choice was between: doing nothing (Option 1); requiring a mix of types, sizes and tenures of housing and a mix of market and affordable housing, on development sites (Option 2); facilitating the release of more sites for 100% affordable housing for local people through an Exceptions Policy (Option 3); a combination of requiring a mix and an exceptions policy (Option 4); and a different approach (B5). The I&O responses favoured Option 4.

The workshop delegates also reached the conclusion that the most practicable and acceptable option would be to achieve a mix of types, sizes and tenures of housing and a mix of market and affordable housing, linked where appropriate to the release of land for 100% affordable housing for local people through an Exceptions Policy (Option 4). This could only be achieved if the LPA is willing to facilitate the release of land by means of S.106 agreements. Similarly, because of the financial limits set by the Housing Corporation, allocations for Exception sites may not be achievable unless the Council uses CPO powers to acquire the land. The consultation event favoured the early involvement of Housing Associations and other Registered Social Landlords (RSL) in the future provision of affordable housing.

In order to establish when a mix of open market and affordable housing is to be provided and how much affordable housing is to be provided, it is possible to set a minimum size threshold for eligible sites and a minimum percentage of affordable provision on those sites. A number of options were discussed and the clear preference was for a combination approach, namely different thresholds and percentages for settlements (or groups of settlements) taking account of both their population size and their level of need, as established by an up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment.

The delegates addressed the question as to whether, with an identified need for 213 affordable dwellings per year, and a RSS projected total of 250 dwellings per year provision, the existing housing stock can be expected to meet some of the affordable housing need. The conclusion was that only a very limited number of shared equity affordable housing could be provided through intervention in the existing housing stock; a number of small Key Worker schemes are being financed by building societies. Housing associations are frustrated by the lack of greenfield sites throughout the plan area and feel that Craven should adopt the issue of affordable housing as a top corporate priority.

The general conclusion was that the affordable housing requirement of 213 dwellings per year is unachievable; the most that Craven can do is require 40% provision on development sites, in accordance with the RSS threshold. The group was concerned that in some cases the development may not be financially viable with a minimum of 40% affordable. The RSS thresholds may not be appropriate for Craven and a more flexible approach may be necessary, with 40% as a starting point for a negotiated agreement either above or below the threshold, to achieve 40% overall.

Other approaches were discussed; Harrogate has a 50% affordable requirement; YDNP refuses permission for all market housing and will only allow sites with affordable provision. The group was concerned that the same approach in Craven could stifle development, and the district does have a need for market housing too. The workshop

group felt that the maximum percentage of total housing on any one site that can reasonably be sought as affordable would have to be less than 50% and probably less than 40% on most sites, so as not to discourage the developers; on site provision is supported rather than commuted sums, with a mix of tenures in order to achieve 'tenure blind' developments.

It is worth noting that that under the developing LDF, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on affordable housing is being prepared in parallel with the Core Strategy, but within the context of current Local Plan Policy H11. Once the Core Strategy policy on affordable housing is produced and adopted by the Council this SPD may require review.

Further discussion concluded that housing associations are willing and able to provide rented accommodation to meet local need, in partnership with the Council, particularly where the local authority requires affordable housing to be provided on site as part of a larger development by means of a S.106 agreement. Concern was expressed that the LDF may not be able to ensure that affordable housing remains so in the future; this certainty can only be secured by shared equity schemes and legal agreements to ensure the housing associations retain partial ownership and responsibility for management of the properties in perpetuity.

The group considered that a significant opportunity to provide affordable housing could be made available by requiring mixed use schemes, with small scale employment uses, particularly on brownfield sites in the key centres.

Theme 4: Employment and Transport

Issue A: Location of Employment Development

The broad direction and distribution of growth within the plan area, including new employment sites, will be determined by the settlement strategy. However, the Issues and Options paper asked for consultees' preferences as to the factors that should influence location of new employment sites. Based on the comments received, the overall preferred option is for an integrated approach (Option 5), in which equal weight is given to the market, the needs of businesses, the environment and sustainability.

Rejected options were (in order of preference): minimising impact on the environment (Option 3); according with the principles of sustainable development (Option 4); responding to the needs of businesses within the plan area, identified through an up-to-date Employment Needs Study (Option 2); a market-led approach responding to market forces (Option 1); and a different approach (Option 6).

Issue B: Types of Employment Development

Respondents to the I&O consultation asking them to indicate their preferred employment type and also to indicate the preferred location for each, showed that the LDF Core Strategy needs to:

- support and attract employment from a range of employment types;
- give emphasis to live-work units, tourism, and farm diversification;
- encourage high tech development, office development, retail development and mixed use development.

In terms of location, Skipton, Bentham, Settle and Cross Hills should be the preferred locations for new employment development (excluding rural and home based employment which are district wide). The Settlement Strategy will establish the broad locations for new employment development.

Issue C: Supporting Local Economic Regeneration

In terms of the direction which the Core Strategy should take in supporting the local economy and bringing forward opportunities for regeneration in key settlements such as Skipton, the response to the consultation felt that there should be a combination of approaches based on market influences, influences of existing and emerging strategies to encourage regeneration, and the influence of existing and emerging funding regimes.

One of the key issues identified has been the need to allow existing businesses to modernise and expand, and to provide opportunities for new employers. Comments have been made that, given the shortage of suitable sites within the existing settlements, additional employment land should be identified adjacent to existing urban areas. This view was supported by those at the consultation event.

Other issues addressed at the consultation event, and the responses to them, were:

If the biggest employers decide to leave the District, what could be done through the LDF to promote new employment opportunities? - The general consensus was that policies to promote the provision of a range of businesses premises would be most appropriate.

If key settlements are to expand to accommodate employment growth, in which general directions should this growth be located? - Taking each Key settlement in turn the group identified general areas of search which could be used for new employment. In each case the group raised the point that these sites in addition to potentially attracting new employment would more especially enable existing businesses to restructure as well as enabling constrained centres or existing central business areas to physically restructure, facilitating regeneration and environmental improvement.

Why do you suggest this direction? - This was generally influenced by obvious physical limits to development, such as main roads, and environmental constraints such as topography and known flood risk areas.

What types of development could be allowed? - There was general agreement that any new land allocated on the periphery of settlements should generally be used for high quality office type development.

Which options are less well served by public transport? Is there anyway way of making them more accessible? - Generally considered that accessibility was not a major issue.

What major constraints are you aware of, in terms of environment and infrastructure, to employment growth within these settlements? - Flood risk and existing residential land uses were the main constraints identified for Skipton, whilst highway constraints including the existing railway crossing were identified within Cross Hills.

If new economic development is to take place on the edge of existing settlements, it will potentially release existing brownfield sites. What should happen to these brownfield sites? - It was generally considered that strategic employment brownfield sites should be retained, whilst other sites could be redeveloped for high quality mixed use development.

Transport

We have to work within the Regional and County Transport strategies and the LDF will have a limited influence on these.

Priorities for investment in transportation that the LDF should support to achieve economic growth are:

- Resolve the level crossing problem at Cross Hills;
- Provide a railway station at Cross Hills;
- Extend the Metro ticketing scheme into Craven.

Theme 5: Environment

Issue A: Protection of Rural Landscape (includes air, water, soil quality and biodiversity)

There is strong feeling amongst those living and working in Craven that the rural landscape is one of the most important assets within the district. Protection should therefore be a priority and reflected through policy in the LDF.

There was broad consensus for adopting a new approach to protection, away from the current local plan approach, where policy development is informed by the landscape character as set out in the landscape appraisal (Option A2).

The Landscape Character Assessment produced in 2002 provides an assessment of the Plan Area's landscape character types together with strategies for their management. It provides evidence to inform landscape associated planning policies and guide where certain types of development may be accommodated without undue detriment. It sets out where improvements to landscape character could be secured via the development control process. In addition to the appraisal the draft 'Biodiversity Action Plan' for the area will look at areas and species for protection and important areas for protection/enhancement. This is produced nationally to be interpreted at a local level.

The event highlighted the reality that the loss of some of our rural landscape is inevitable if we are to achieve the level of transport/housing/infrastructure needed in the District. For example it was suggested that the land within the bypass around Skipton could be developed first in preference to other greenfield sites. We need to find a balance on what is protected and policies should protect the 'best bits' and give clear direction of what to do with the rest. The lack of brownfield sites in the district was also highlighted.

Issue B: Flooding

In the light of current national and regional policy development the location of new development within the district will be tightly controlled where there is a potential risk of flooding. There is a consensus that the Core Strategy should concentrate new development in areas free from flooding, while allowing development on some areas with flood risk but with appropriate flood risk measures (Option B4). Development should not

take place where flood risk is high. Proposals must take particular account of the need to ensure protection from, and not worsen the potential for, flooding.

Issue C: Renewable Energy

Scale of Provision From Wind

The RSS sets out District level renewable energy generation targets to 2010. The District target set for Craven is 17.6MW per year, 17MW of which should be derived from wind. This would broadly equate to 8 no. 2 mega watt wind turbines being located within the district. There is a strong feeling that the encouragement of micro systems should be given strongest emphasis in meeting the wind requirement (Option 3).

The Core Strategy should facilitate the development of wind energy of varying scales within the District to fulfil the Regional Targets in RSS on sites which satisfy environmental criteria including effects on landscape, residential amenity, nature conservation and communications and other infrastructure.

Scale of Provision from Other Technologies

In terms of other technologies, a balanced approach is preferred (Option 3), with reduction of consumption in households and businesses through the implementation of energy efficiency measures (Option 1) together with the development of other renewable energy sources (Option 2) - placing requirements on all developments through the development control process.

Responses to Additional Questions Raised

Issues addressed at the consultation event, and the response to them, were:

Are micro systems capable of delivering the 17MW wind power requirement? - The general feeling was that micro systems, although to be supported, would not meet the RSS requirements. Furthermore, opportunities for large scale wind farms are limited in the district outside the national park and there is no possibility of wind farms being permitted within the national park.

If the District were to say 'no' to large scale wind turbines, as has been suggested, how and in what way will it meet the RSS targets? - Generally felt that the targets could not be met, but the district needs to be positive about other technologies.

Should Craven seek to set standards for other technologies which are higher than those of neighbouring authorities? And if so, what will be the potential effects of such a policy? - It was agreed that other technologies should be pursued, the example of Langcliffe was cited where electricity is generated from waste food which also provides central heating and compost. The District is geographically in a good position for solar panels and these are invisible compared to wind farms and less environmentally damaging.

By what criteria/indicators will the Authority measure and monitor performance against this option? - The group agreed that we can often get overwhelmed by targets and we use it as an excuse to do nothing but we shouldn't. We should try and meet and deliver other targets such as achieving affordable warmth and using different building materials. There is currently lots of fuel poverty in the District. We are presently building affordable houses with no affordable, sustainable energy.

Can Craven afford to be sustainable? - The general feeling was 'Yes', but as above the targets set need to be realistic and achievable.

Issue E: Townscape and Design - the historic built environment and open space within settlements

The historic environment makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character of Craven and there is no doubt that the LDF should contain a sufficiently robust framework for the protection and where appropriate enhancement of its listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and archaeological sites.

Support is given to an approach which protects the historic built environment and open space within settlements therefore accepting the need for some greenfield development (Option 1). In relation to open space within settlements, support is given to an option guided by the Craven Open Space Assessment, which may result in some areas of existing open space being released for development and also accepts some greenfield development (Option 2).

The event highlighted the density issue within the district's towns and villages. The historic character is one of high density and yet there seems to be a move towards lower densities. Schemes such as 'Living Over the Shop' could be effectively used in towns like Skipton ensuring a more vibrant High Street and greater evening use.

Issue F: Conservation and Design

In response to a series of questions aimed at assessing views on listed buildings, conservation areas, improved quality of design and the encouragement of a safe and secure environment, a variety of responses were received, many similar to those expressed on Townscape and Design.

Other Issues Raised

Other policies for inclusion in the Core Strategy might include:

Policies to encourage energy efficiency and sustainable construction in new developments.

A requirement for high quality and inclusive design for all development, in order to raise standards and gain community support as a beneficial addition to the local environment. A robust design process with the use of skilled designers and appropriate pre-application discussions should be promoted so that proposals can be based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context for development.

Conclusions

The January 2007 consultation event provided a useful follow up the issues and options work undertaken in 2006.

The vision and spatial portrait is being developed in line with the community strategy.

Consensus has been reached on a number of key strategic options and a number of options can now be discarded.

Envision

Regeneration and Planning Solutions

This process has also highlighted a number of new issues. These will be further tested as we progress the work on the preferred options report.

APPENDIX A

Discussion Papers - 26th January Event

- 1) Settlement Strategy
- 2) Housing
- 3) Economic Strategy and Transportation
- 4) Environment and Design

Craven District Council: LDF Core Strategy - Preferred Options

Emerging Strategic Options - Settlement Strategy

The Issues and Options Consultation papers outlined a series of Options for a Settlement Strategy; these were based on five main options presented to the 'Shaping Spaces and Places' Conference in 2004.

These set out a 'do nothing' approach that maintains the existing Local Plan strategy; three approaches giving greater emphasis to one element of sustainability, either economic, social or environmental objectives; and one option that balances these sustainability objectives equally.

(copies of the diagrams of Settlement Options are in the handouts for today's workshop)

OPTION 1: Retain Existing Local Plan Strategy

OPTION 2: Emphasis on Developing Existing Economic Strengths

OPTION 3: Emphasis on Protecting and Enhancing the Environment

We have recorded the responses to the first three Options as being generally not supportive -

OPTION 1: Retain Existing Local Plan Strategy

Option 1 would be 'no change' - to carry on with the local plan approach and to adopt the existing settlement strategy and resulting settlement hierarchy (see Fig.1).

Consultation Responses to Question B1 - Should the settlement strategy remain as in the existing adopted Local Plan?

The responses were Yes = 4; No = 22; Don't Know = 2

OPTION 2: Emphasis on Developing Existing Economic Strengths

This option would:

- prioritise market needs and make them the dominant factor in creating and sustaining communities;
- support economic prosperity by providing access to a range of employment opportunities where it is economically advantageous to do so.
- Skipton and the Airedale Corridor would be the key locations for growth, with Settle as a larger service centre (see Fig.2).

Consultation Responses to Question B2 - Should a significant emphasis be given to one specific pillar of sustainability?

Only one person supported the Economy emphasis.

APPENDIX A

OPTION 3: Emphasis on Protecting and Enhancing the Environment

This option would focus the majority of new growth in locations that are accessible by a choice of transport modes, offer a range of services and have a supply of previously developed land to bring forward for regeneration, enhance local distinctiveness and prioritise the protection of existing environmental assets over and above social and economic considerations. The majority of growth would be focussed in Skipton and the A65 road/rail corridor (see Fig 3).

Consultation Responses to Question B2 - Should a significant emphasis be given to one specific pillar of sustainability?

Four people supported the Environment emphasis.

OPTION 4: Emphasis on Sustainable Communities (Social Objectives)

Option 4 would:

- prioritise the needs of all sections of communities in Craven and
- match those needs with opportunities, creating and sustaining mixed and balanced communities across the area, restraining the role of the market.
- growth would be focussed in the market towns of Skipton and Settle.
- Clusters of smaller settlements would be identified to support their complementary roles;
- such clusters should be spatially as well as functionally realistic, therefore a variety of possible options could exist.

Consultation Responses to Question B2 - Should a significant emphasis be given to one specific pillar of sustainability?

Eight responses favoured the emphasis on the social objectives of sustainable communities.

Q1: These first four options were not supported by the I+O consultation responses; does the group agree that they should not be progressed to 'Preferred Option' stage?

OPTION 5 - A Combined Approach

This Option proposes equal emphasis should be placed on all three pillars of sustainability, economic, environmental and social. This would:

- focus most growth towards market towns and larger service centres and maintain their vitality and viability (economic objectives);
- distribute some growth to other settlements along the A65 and A629 public transport corridors, where previously developed land exists (environmental objectives); and

APPENDIX A

- identify clusters of smaller settlements that provide complementary support and services, enhancing their roles where possible (social objectives) (see Fig.5)

There is stronger support for a combined approach that equally promotes the three elements of sustainability.

Consultation Responses to Question B3 - Should a Combined Approach be used to form a settlement strategy?

Yes 16 No 6 Don't Know 0

Measures to secure the long term viability of smaller settlements are also supported.

Consultation Responses to Question C3 - Should directing growth towards settlements where long term viability may be an issue e.g. Cross Hills and Settle be an appropriate response to achieving long term viability?

Yes 13 No 4 Don't Know 3

Q2: Does the group agree that a settlement strategy that gives equal emphasis to environmental, social and economic considerations should be the 'preferred strategic option'?

Should any one of these elements of the strategy be given greater emphasis? Can you explain why?

Matters for Discussion

Some of the responses to the consultation papers raise questions of emphasis or suggest different approaches; we would like to discuss the main points with you to see if we can reach consensus.

If there are unresolved issues or differences then we will ask the Panel to discuss the questions later in the afternoon.

Q3: In the villages, where do local people tend to go for daily shopping, schools, healthcare, community meetings, local play areas, leisure activities?

(Delegates are asked to indicate linkages with arrows on map)

Q4: The Combined Approach includes the "potential grouping of settlements".

Are there any logical clusters that could, together, accommodate new development to make them more sustainable?

(Delegates are asked to indicate possible clusters on maps)

Would this actually work in practice and will it be necessary to create new public transport links to make these clusters function?

APPENDIX A

Envision

Regeneration and Planning Solutions

Q5: In order to make the smaller rural settlements more self contained and sustainable and to reduce the need to travel into Settle, Crosshills and/or Skipton, which services and facilities should, and more importantly could, be provided there?

Can any general conclusions be drawn or do local needs differ from place to place?

Q6: Skipton has avoided the harmful impacts of large out of town retail warehouses and national chain stores in the town centre but it also loses out to the comparison goods retailers in neighbouring towns and cities such as Leeds.

Should Skipton seek to maintain its local character and distinctiveness, or should parts of the town centre be redeveloped to provide large shop units for national stores?

Should we identify sites for out of centre retail parks? If so, where could these be located?

APPENDIX A

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy - Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

Craven District Council: LDF Core Strategy - Preferred Options

Questions for Discussion - Housing

The Issues and Options Consultation paper for Housing Strategy and Distribution outlined a series of options as follows:

A. The Location of New Housing Development:

The options below relate to the location of individual housing developments within the overall settlement strategy and the primary determining factors in site selection:

- Option 1. Doing nothing - 0 responses;
- Option 2. Respond to housing needs in the plan area through an up to date Housing Needs Assessment - 2 responses;
- Option 3. Determine by the need to minimise impact on the environment - 2 responses;
- Option 4. Determined according to the principles of sustainable development - 6 responses;
- Option 5. Integrated Approach - 22 responses;
- Option 6. Different Approach - 4 responses.

Q1: Does the group agree that the location of individual housing developments within the overall Settlement Strategy should follow Option 5, namely an integrated approach wherein weight is given equally to the market, housing needs, the environment and sustainability?

Within this integrated approach the principles of sustainable development (e.g. the availability of previously developed land / redundant or underused spaces, employment opportunities and transport links) and the need to minimise impact on the environment (e.g. on land not liable to flooding or affecting the historic character, setting or environment of a settlement) should also be taken into account.

*Q2: Should these factors be given equal weight?
Or does this balance vary between different settlements and for different types of housing development? If so, how?*

B. Achieving a Mix of New Housing

- Option 1. Doing nothing - 1 response;
- Option 2. Requiring a mix of types, sizes and tenures of housing and a mix of market and affordable housing, on development sites - 8 responses
- Option 3. Facilitating the release of more sites for 100% affordable housing for local people through an Exceptions Policy - 2 responses
- Option 4. A combination of Options 2 and 3 above - 13 responses
- Option 5. A different approach - 6 responses

APPENDIX A

Q3: Does the group agree that there is a need for a combined response?

Should this include some or all of the following?

- *an exceptions policy providing 100% affordable housing for local people (Option 3)*
- *a requirement for new development to provide a mix of types, sizes and tenures of housing and a mix of market and affordable housing (Option 2)*
- *a required mix based on an up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment*
- *a size threshold for eligible sites (RSS suggests 15 units/0.5ha and above)*
- *a percentage of affordable units to be provided (RSS sets minimum of 40%)*
- *the involvement of Housing Associations*

Q4: The need for affordable housing in the LDF area is 213 dwellings per annum, but the projected total provision of new housing (including conversions) in accordance with the RSS is only 250 per annum. To what extent, and how, can the existing stock be expected to meet some of the 213 affordable housing need?

If the existing stock can only make a very limited contribution, should Craven seek to accept more than the 250 houses in draft RSS figures in order that enough affordable units can be provided as part of the total?

C. Requiring the Provision of Affordable Housing

In order to establish when a mix of open market and affordable housing is to be provided and how much affordable housing is to be provided, it is possible to set a minimum size threshold for eligible sites and a minimum percentage of affordable provision on those sites. The responses to options are:

- Option 1. 'Doing nothing' - allowing the market to determine the level of affordable housing on development sites - 1 response
- Option 2. A single threshold and percentage (RSS threshold or other) applied universally across the plan area - 2 responses
- Option 3. Different thresholds and percentages for settlements or groups of settlements, according to their population size - 0 responses
- Option 4. Different thresholds and percentages for settlements or groups of settlements, according to their level of need - 2 responses
- Option 5. A combination of Options 3 and 4 above, based on both settlement size and local need - 18 responses
- Option 6. "Zero" Threshold; setting a site-size threshold at "zero" so that all housing development sites are required to make a contribution towards affordable housing irrespective of their size - amends Options 2 to 5 - 6 responses
- Option 7. A different approach - 4 responses

Q5: Does the group agree that Option 5 should be preferred, namely different thresholds and percentages for settlements (or groups of settlements) taking account

APPENDIX A

of both their population size and their level of need, as established by an up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment?

Are the RSS suggested thresholds appropriate for Craven?

What is the maximum percentage of total housing on any one site that can reasonably be sought as affordable?

Other Matters for Discussion

Some of the responses to the consultation papers did not result in a clear preference for particular options. We would like to discuss the main points with you to see if we can reach consensus.

Bear in mind that if there is any major outstanding issue we can't resolve, we can ask the Panel to address it later this afternoon.

The Location of New Housing Development

Other comments have been made by consultees that could be addressed in the Core Strategy. It may be that some of these questions can be resolved by group discussion.

Q6: Achieving a mix of type, size and tenure of housing:

Could shared equity affordable housing be provided through intervention in the existing housing stock rather than through new build?

Is there any way the LDF could support retention of Council housing and restrict second home ownership?

What emphasis should be placed on rented and leasehold properties in providing a mix of housing?

Q7: Role of Housing Associations / Registered Social Landlords:

To what extent should and could housing associations provide rented accommodation to meet local need, especially in relation to young people and/or the elderly?

How can the LDF ensure that affordable housing remains so in the future?

To what additional extent, if any, should the location of affordable housing be chosen specifically to reduce commuting, i.e. be close to existing services?

Key Question

Q8: Can we agree a key question to address to the panel?

Perhaps one of the issues raised today or something else which you think is important but has not been dealt with so far?

APPENDIX A

Craven District Council - LDF Core Strategy

Preferred Options

Emerging Strategic Options - Economic Strategy & Distribution

The Issues and Options Consultation paper on Economic Strategy and Distribution outlined a series of options for:

Location of Economic Development (Section A);
Types of Employment Development (Section B)
Supporting Local Economic Regeneration Section C)

Issues of Consensus

Section A. The Location of Economic Development

The broad direction and distribution growth within the plan area, including new employment sites, will be determined by the settlement strategy. However, the I&O paper asked for consultees preferences as to the factors that should influence location of new employment sites.

Consultation Responses to Questions A1 to A6:

Based on the comments received, the overall preferred option is Option 5; ie

An integrated approach, in which equal weight is given to the market, the needs of businesses, the environment and sustainability in determining the location of new employment development. (score 97)

Other options included (in order of ranking) were:

Option 3: minimise impact on the environment (score 45);

Option 4: accord with the principles of sustainable development (score 41);

Option 2: respond to the needs of businesses within the plan area, identified through an up-to-date Employment Needs Study (score 28)

Option 1: Market Led - determine in response to market forces (Score 9)

Option 6: A different approach (score 5)

Q1: Options 1, 2, 3, 4 & 6 received significantly less support in the I+O consultation responses; does the group agree that they should not be progressed to 'Preferred Option' stage?

Section B. Types of Employment Development

This section asked for respondents to indicate their preferred employment type (a range of options were given as set out below) and also asked them to indicate the preferred location for each.

Consultation Responses to Questions B1 to B9:

APPENDIX A

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy - Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Employment Type Preference</i>	<i>Preferred Location</i>
1	<i>Live/Work Units and Enhanced Broadband (Option 1) Score 155</i>	<i>All locations</i>
2	<i>Tourism based enterprises (option 3) Score 129</i>	<i>Slightly higher preference for Skipton and villages but also support for Local Service Centres and open countryside - all appropriate locations</i>
3	<i>Farm diversification (option 2) Score 103</i>	<i>Open countryside and villages</i>
4	<i>High Tech based development (option 4) Score 98</i>	<i>Equal preference for Skipton and Local Service Centres</i>
5	<i>Development of offices (option 7) Score 84</i>	<i>Equal support for Skipton and Local Service centres</i>
6	<i>Retail development (option 6) Score 82</i>	<i>Slightly higher preference for Skipton, followed by local service centres. Villages also supported as a location.</i>
7	<i>Mix of employment uses on new sites (option 8) Score 81</i>	<i>Slightly higher preference for Skipton, followed by local service centres. Villages also supported as a location.</i>
8	<i>Development of Warehouse / distribution units (option 5) Score 41</i>	
9	<i>Do nothing (option 9) Score 17</i>	

Q2: Does the group agree with the conclusions that the LDF Core Strategy needs to:

- support and attract employment from a range of employment types;*
- give emphasis to Live Work Units, Tourism, and Farm Diversification;*
- encourage High Tech development, Office Development, Retail development and Mixed use development;*

In terms of location, does the group agree that Skipton, Bentham, Settle and Cross Hills should be the preferred locations for new employment development? (excluding rural and home based employment which are district wide).

Section C- Supporting Local Economic Regeneration

This section dealt with the direction the Core Strategy should take in term of supporting the local economy and asked four questions:

C1: What approach should be adopted in order to bring forward opportunities for regeneration in key settlements such as Skipton, should the approach be:

APPENDIX A

- Option 1. Influenced by the market (2 responses)
- Option 2. Influenced by existing and emerging strategies to encourage regeneration(2 responses)
- Option 3. Influenced by existing and emerging funding regimes, which provide opportunities for regeneration (2 responses)
- Option 4. A combination of the above (20 Responses)

Q3: Does the group agree that the approach to be adopted in the LDF Core Strategy to bring forward opportunities for regeneration in key settlements such as Skipton, should be influenced by a combination of:

- *Market forces*
- *Proposals of existing and emerging strategies to encourage regeneration; and*
- *existing and emerging funding regimes, which provide opportunities for regeneration*

Matters for Discussion

Some of the responses to the consultation papers did not result in clear preference for particular options. We would like to discuss the main points with you to see if we can reach consensus.

Bear in mind that if there is any major outstanding issue we can't resolve, we can ask the Panel to address it later this afternoon.

Retention of Existing and Attraction of New Employers

Q4: One of the key issues identified has been the need to allow existing businesses to modernise and expand, and to provide opportunities for new employers. Comments have been made that, given the shortage of suitable sites within the existing settlements, additional employment land should be identified adjacent to existing urban areas.

Do you agree with this view?

Q5: If the biggest employers decide to leave the District, what could be done through the LDF to promote new employment opportunities?

The Location of New Employment Land

Q6: If key settlements are to expand to accommodate employment growth, using the map on the table, in which general directions should this growth be located?

- *Skipton*
- *Settle*
- *Bentham*

APPENDIX A

- *Crosshills*

Why do you suggest this direction?

What types of development could be allowed?

Which options are less well served by public transport? Is there anyway way of making them more accessible?

What major constraints are you aware of, in terms of environment and infrastructure, to employment growth within these settlements?

Should Existing Employment Sites be Protected

Q7: If new economic development is to take place on the edge of existing settlements, it will potentially release existing brownfield sites.

What should happen to these brownfield sites?

Could they be re-used for alternative employment uses, such as shared business space?

Would they provide opportunities for new retail development?

Should they be converted or redeveloped for housing?

Transport

Q8: We have to work within the Regional and County Transport strategies and the LDF will have a limited influence on these.

What are the key transportation constraints to economic development and prosperity?

What would be your one priority for investment in transportation that the LDF should support to achieve economic growth?

Key Question

Q9: Can we agree a key question to address to the panel?

Perhaps one of the issues raised today or something else which you think is important but has not been dealt with so far?

Craven District Council: LDF Core Strategy - Preferred Options

Questions for Discussion - Environment and Design

A. Protection of Rural Landscape (includes air, water, soil quality and biodiversity within this definition)

Following the options exercise in July 2006, there was broad consensus for **Option 2**, adopting a new approach to protection, away from the current local plan approach, where policy development is informed by the landscape character as set out in the landscape appraisal.

Q1: Is everyone aware of what the landscape appraisal is and how it would be used?

In addition to Option 5, Option 1, continuation of the existing local plan approach of protection, received some support but there was little or no support for Option 3 (do nothing) or suggestions under Option 4 for a different way of doing things.

Q2: Should Options 3 (do nothing) and 4 (alternative approach) be discarded at this stage?

There is no doubt that there is strong feeling amongst those living and working in Craven that the rural landscape is one of the most important assets within the district. Protection should therefore be a priority and reflected through policy in the LDF.

Q3: Are their other options that should be considered at this stage?

B. Flooding

Option 2, concentrating on areas free from flooding for new development and **Option 3**, allowing development on some areas with flood risk but with appropriate flood risk measures received responses, however, **Option 4**, a combination of Options 2 and 3, received the most comments on this issue.

In the light of current national and regional policy development the location of new development within the district will be tightly controlled where there is a potential risk of flooding. This begins to set out a spatial strategy for where development should not take place ie where flood risk is high. Additionally, by informing the site allocations process through more detailed site specific information therefore:

Q4: Should more detailed policies in relation to the development of areas where there is a risk of flooding be contained in the Allocations DPD? And do you agree that a sequential approach is adopted?

Q5: based on the above is the following wording appropriate for inclusion in the Core Strategy?

In accordance with national and regional guidance, all development and service provision must seek to ensure that communities and the environment are not adversely affected by the actions of natural or other forces. Proposals must take particular account of the need to ensure protection from, and not worsen the potential for, flooding.

APPENDIX A

C. Renewable Energy - scale of provision from wind

D. Renewable Energy - scale and provision of other technologies

The RSS addresses the need to promote renewable energy through encouraging the more efficient use of land, reducing waste, improving energy efficiency and reducing the need to travel, particularly by car. In terms of the promotion of renewable energy, the RSS sets out District level renewable energy generation targets to 2010. The District target set for Craven is 17.6MW per year, 17MW of which should be derived from wind. This would broadly equate to 8 no. 2 mega watt wind turbines being located within the district, when taking account of existing provision.

In terms of the RSS requirements for 17MW to come from wind energy, there was a strong feeling that the emphasis should be placed on **Option 3**, the encouragement of micro systems.

Q6: Are micro systems capable of delivering the 17MW requirement?

Q7: If the District were to say 'no' to large scale wind turbines, as has been suggested, how and in what way will it meet the RSS targets?

Q8: Would the following Option be appropriate?:

Facilitate the development of wind energy of varying scales within the District to fulfil the Regional Targets in RSS on sites which satisfy environmental criteria including effects on landscape, residential amenity, nature conservation and communications and other infrastructure.

In terms of other technologies, a balanced approach was preferred, **Option 4**, with reduction of consumption in households and businesses through the implementation of energy efficiency measures together with the development of other renewable energy sources - placing requirements on all developments through the development control process.

Q9: Should Craven seek to set standards which are higher than those of neighbouring authorities? And if so, what will be the potential effects of such a policy?

Q10: By what criteria/indicators will the Authority measure and monitor performance against this option?

Q11: Can Craven afford to be sustainable?

E. Townscape and Design - the historic built environment and open space within settlements

The historic environment makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character of Craven and there is no doubt that the LDF should contain a sufficiently robust framework for the protection and where appropriate enhancement of its listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and archaeological sites.

Options 1 and 2 were given the greatest support. Option 1 protects the historic built environment and open space therefore accepting the need for some greenfield

APPENDIX A

development, whereas Option 2, in relation to open space, seeks to be guided by the 'open space assessment' and hence this may result in some areas of existing open space being released for development and accepts some greenfield development.

Q12: Are the two options mutually exclusive?

Q13: Can Option 1 be supported in the case of the historic built environment ie a high priority given to protection?

Q14: Is Option 2 more appropriate for the protection of open space as it will be guided by the evidence base on open space provision within the District?

F. Conservation and Design

The options exercise in July 2006 did not seek to set out options for conservation and design but instead posed a series of questions aimed at assessing views on listed buildings, conservation areas, improved quality of design and the encouragement of a safe and secure environment. There are strong links to Section E, Townscape and Design and similar views were expressed.

A variety of responses were received.

Q15: Conservation Area Appraisals could assist in promoting appropriate new development in their areas of designation. Should the Council support such appraisals?

Q16: Should the Council consider the production of SPD relating to design of new buildings (detailing the requirements that the Council expects in terms of the quality of development proposals in various parts of its area), alterations and extensions to existing buildings and design in the public realm?

Q17: Should policies in the Core Strategy should encourage energy efficiency and sustainable construction in new developments?

Q18: are Options E1 - E4 (Townscape and Design) sufficient?

Additional design option:

Option: High quality and inclusive design for all development in the District will be required in order to raise standards and gain community support as a beneficial addition to the local environment. A robust design process with the use of skilled designers and appropriate pre-application discussions will be promoted so that proposals can be based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context for development.

Q19: Do you agree that the above option should be reflected in the Core Strategy?

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Protection of Rural Landscape

The Landscape Character Assessment for Craven District outside the National Park and AONB was prepared in 2002 and provides an assessment of the landscape character types together with strategies for their management. It also provides evidence to inform the preparation of landscape associated planning policies, and will be used as evidence to guide where certain types of development may be accommodated within the landscape without undue detriment to overall form and character and sets out where improvements to landscape character could be secured via the development control process.

In terms of strategic guidance, the principles of the LDF in relation to these assets reflects Government Policy and Guidance (for example PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, and PPG2 - Green Belts), and the policies of the RSS (YH3 and Env8-10).

B. Flooding

Flooding is a national issue. Planning Policy Guidance Note 25: Development and Flood Risk, sets out the Government's policy to reduce the risk to people and the natural and built environment due to flooding. It acknowledges that river flooding problems are getting worse in frequency and scale and, in relation to the production of LDFs, advises that:

- Flood risk be properly taken into account in the planning and design of developments to reduce the risk of flooding and the damage which floods cause.
- In looking for potential development sites a risk-based sequential test should be followed giving priority to areas of lower risk.
- The use of sustainable drainage systems to control run off from new development be encouraged.
- Flood resistant construction techniques be used where appropriate.

Within this context specific policies also exist within the RSS (YH2: Climate change and resource use, and Env1: floods and flood risk) and a new SFRA affecting Craven is underway.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2006: A partnership of the four local authorities in Northwest Yorkshire (i.e. Craven, Harrogate, Richmondshire and the Yorkshire Dales National Park) has commissioned consultants to undertake a sub regional Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as recommended in PPG25: Development and Flood Risk. The aim of the study is to assess the different levels of flood risk (high, medium or low) in Northwest Yorkshire and map these for statutory land use planning purposes. This will inform the production of the Local Development Framework, the determination and contents of planning applications and make recommendations on the effect of land management on flooding. Amongst other things the production of an SFRA can:

- Reduce the risk of the Environment Agency objecting to the LDF or planning applications;
- Identify high-risk areas unsuitable for development;
- Inform the site allocation process;
- Identify infrastructure weak spots;
- Help with emergency planning for the area; and
- Speed up with development control process

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

Consultation Event - 26th January 2007

Record of Responses

- 1) Settlement Strategy (3 separate groups - A, B, C)
- 2) Housing Group
- 3) Economic Strategy and Transportation
- 4) Environment and Design

Core Strategy Preferred Options Workshop: 26th January 2007
Settlement Strategy Workshop
Group A

Question	Workshop Answers/Comments
Q1	Yes
Q2	<p>Yes: A policy based on Option 5 would be flexible, balanced and have a wide scope. However, the following points should be taken on board.</p> <p>Attention should be given to smaller settlements and villages – allow some growth.</p> <p>Attention should be given to the role of High Bentham – promote its status in the hierarchy.</p> <p>The influence of Leeds/Bradford is not acknowledged. Government policy is directing growth towards this corridor. Can the LDF do anything but follow this lead?</p> <p>Smaller villages must be allowed to grow, as necessary, to support communities. Option 5 may not prevent “big sheds”, which may result from the growth corridor approach.</p> <p>The Option is flexible, allowing details to be developed further. (Flexibility in the formulation of development control policies, for example.)</p> <p>Give more attention to High Bentham: it is bigger than is given credit for; it is in a rail corridor; it is similar to “Larger Local Service Centres”.</p>
Q3	<p>People do a big supermarket shop – those from Settle or beyond may go to Kendal or Lancaster – and do top-up shopping at the village shop.</p> <p>Settle market day is a big draw for the hinterland.</p> <p>Village schools are well used. Secondary schools are at Settle, Skipton, South Craven. There is in-migration to schools and cross-boundary attendance.</p> <p>Leisure: mainly Skipton. Ingleton and Settle have their own community run/owned swimming pools. Agricultural and village shows are significant. Local sports clubs.</p> <p>Village halls – activities come to them. Village halls seem particularly good in Craven. Rural areas are “boring” for young people who naturally want to move to somewhere more exciting.</p>
Q4	<p>Clustering may lead to greater centralisation and, therefore, reduced accessibility. Could work well for Post Offices where a central main Post Office operates an outreach service to smaller settlements.</p> <p>If you have to drive to a neighbouring village in the cluster, why not just keep driving to the nearest town or city?</p> <p>Don't forget that services can go to people – mobile services.</p> <p>Clustering may work depending on the sector (e.g. may work in public sector services like health).</p> <p>If clustering is not adopted, villages and smaller settlements should not be left out of the strategy – they need something!</p>
Q5	<p>There is Tesco home delivery for example, but this has impacted on village shops.</p> <p>Farms could deliver food – some already deliver meat for example.</p> <p>The ability to work from home – a design issue.</p> <p>Good quality village halls exist.</p> <p>Broadband is there.</p> <p>Maybe we cannot reduce travel much more in this area.</p>

APPENDIX B

Question	Workshop Answers/Comments
	<p>Encourage small local initiatives – food (including delivery), abattoirs, energy generation (including from waste). Lifestyle change? Is this the role of the LDF? There could be a sense of being trapped in your own home, if everything is available in the home or at home.</p>
Q6	<p>Tourism is important to Skipton and depends on the character of the town. People would still go to Leeds. Bring big investors into the town – there’s plenty of land around. Skipton’s rural character is distinctive and an asset. Parking provision would require a huge land-take and would devastate the townscape. Town centre development wouldn’t work because there is no capacity in the infrastructure. Skipton couldn’t compete with bigger centres and needs to develop niches instead. The discussion is all car-based. Surely that can’t be right. Cloning: Skipton shouldn’t become another victim. Residents must be catered for not just tourists. Locals don’t shop in Skipton because of all the tourists and the tourists don’t shop! Too many charity shops. The issue for Skipton is far more complex. The suggestion that large retailers should move in is too simplistic and is likely to cause damage.</p>

APPENDIX B

Core Strategy Preferred Options Workshop: 26th January 2007
Settlement Strategy Workshop
Group B

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	SETTLEMENT STRATEGY
ISSUE and/or OPTION	OPTION 1
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Sustainable Strategy. Restraining policy – restrictive Impact on Settle and South Craven
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	
ISSUE and/or OPTION	OPTION 2 – no comments recorded.
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	
ISSUE and/or OPTION	OPTION 3 - Environment
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	Precludes growth in rural areas - impact on rural transport improvements. South Craven – constrained in terms of transport issues. Too much emphasis on the environment
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	

APPENDIX B

Craven District Council LDF
 Core Strategy – Emerging Strategic Options
 February 2007

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	SETTLEMENT STRATEGY
ISSUE and/or OPTION	OPTION 4 – Sustainable Communities
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Good balance on environment and development locations.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
ISSUE and/or OPTION	OPTION 5
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	Can South Craven accommodate significant future development. No scope for dealing for dormitory communities. Role of Bentham in hierarchy – good range of services – should rise up settlement hierarchy.
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Potential to increase services in centres. Investment for residents and tourism e.g. Gargrave to reduce impact on other settlements e.g. Grassington.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	

Skipton and Settle)
Larger Local Service Centres) Support for option 4.

Option 5 – Impacts of existing constraints in South Craven and ability to accommodate new development e.g. flooding issues.

Environmental constraints.

Impact of draft RSS in terms of settlement hierarchy –role of Settle and Bentham.

Combined approach – support for but in terms of local settlement strategy need to address needs of Settle and Bentham.

Combined approach (Option 5) likely to be sound and in conformity to draft RSS.

Possible amendment of Option 5 suggested –
South Craven)

APPENDIX B

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy – Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

Skipton, Hellifield, Gargrave and Embsay) Groupings.
Settle)

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	Settlement Strategy
ISSUE and/or OPTION	General Comments
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Support for option 5. Need to re look at role of Bentham. Role of South Craven – deliverability issues due to existing physical constraints. Skipton should have an enhanced role – 1 st tier of hierarchy. Settlement groupings - Hellifield has links with Settle in terms of functionality.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	Also support for option 4 but possible issues with conformity with RSS.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Question 3
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Supermarkets provide local employments and reduce community outside settlement.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	Impact of supermarkets on local shops.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Question 6
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Issue of internet shopping on shopping habits - comparison shopping. Craven as possible location for internet company headquarters. Impact of retail space at Belle Vue Mills on Skipton High Street. Limited support for 'shed' type units. This type of retail development should not be encouraged but should look at potential to redevelop existing sites for mix use e.g., Focus site etc

APPENDIX B

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy – Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	Settlement Strategy
	Support for small independent shops rather than large retailers – niche markets. Difficult for planning process to control type of retail locating in settlements.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Additional Comments
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parish Council attitudes – constraints to innovation. - Impact of Settlement Strategy on opportunities for farm diversification and locations like Broughton Hall – potential for development in open countryside. - Need critical mass to focus future development.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	Issue of role of Cowling and Cononley in Settlement Strategy.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	

Suggested Settlement Strategy:

- 1) Skipton
- 2) South Craven, Settle (but deliverability issues in South Craven)
- 3) Bentham & Ingleton
- 4) How do we deal with other settlements e.g. Hellifield & Gargrave etc? More restricted level of growth?

Need critical mass to direct locations for future development.

APPENDIX B

Core Strategy Preferred Options Workshop: 26th January 2007

Settlement Strategy Workshop

Group C

Settlement Strategy – Is option 5 the right way to go?

- The vision is excellent but we now need to translate it into a SPATIAL strategy.
- The vision is not really locally distinctive
- The Airedale corridor has been identified for growth in RSS – How do we grow in South Craven?
- Infrastructure is needed to create an economy.
- Need to get the skeleton right to have a successful core strategy.
- Targets in RSS should be our starting point – predetermines some things like Airedale Corridor for growth.

Lack of Infrastructure in the District:

- Without additional infrastructure South Craven can't take any development – this lesson was learnt after the last major development at the Crossings Business Park.
- Infrastructure in South Craven is not supplied by Craven District Council.
- We need to negotiate with private investors and statutory undertakers to get the infrastructure.
- This limit in infrastructure is known about but has not been recognised or acknowledged in any policy.

Links to the Leeds City Region (LCR):

- Started to recognise facilities in (LCR) - Increase in use of electrical rail system in LCR by 18% over the past year – Leeds has major draw and is sucking people in.
- Need to benefit from major growth in Leeds – What is Skipton going to offer? Specialist shopping?
- The growth in Leeds is an economic driver – how does this district take the spin off from this?
- One major resource Craven has which could help us to benefit from the growth in Leeds is a well educated work force.
- Will working from home become more important?
- In London and the south east people will travel into London from 1 hour away, and those areas outside London where people commute from are still prosperous - BUT the commuters spend all their money in London – Is Leeds the London of the north?
- We have lost all primary industry/business in Craven.
- The only way to avoid all this commuting is to get Industry back into Craven.
- To do this we need all the other bits to go with industry – leisure, retail etc.
- People without a car are limited in their choices – not much retail/leisure choice in Skipton.

Links between settlements within and outside the district (*The links between settlements were illustrated using the map of the district*):

- The Yorkshire Dales National Park is our biggest asset and also our biggest problem because we have no control over it.

APPENDIX B

- Need to have a prosperous and well connected North Craven as well as South.
- Where does Bentham fit in? – More towards Lancaster.
- Bentham – just had new affordable houses built. Low and High Bentham are considered on place but there is quite a distance between them. They have links to Lancaster.
- Should we break Craven up? Each area of the district is so different we need to look outwards, not just see Craven as its own little world.
- What about places that are unsustainable/dormitory at present? Do we need to link them to each other or just let them look after themselves individually?
- There is nothing in Hellifield – no local economy – has Post Office and a couple of shops but no real infrastructure.
- People go to Skipton for shopping/working or to catch the train to Leeds/Bradford – Skipton is a stepping stone to areas outside the district.
- Is Settle more sustainable?
- Long Preston is half in the Yorkshire Dales National Park and has a draw to Settle.
- Ingleton looks in every direction – the Quarry, Kendal, Kirby Lonsdale – It is pretty self contained and has quite an inflow.
- Rathmell – no village hall and no public transport links.
- Rathmell, Halton West etc are all little satellite villages. There is a hidden population in these smaller villages.
- Yorkshire Dales National Park is a 'driver' – people spend money and play in the park and visit Settle and Ingleton for accommodation, restaurants etc.
- Cowling/South Craven – link to Lancashire and Colne. There are no public transport links between Skipton and Cowling so people go to Colne instead.
- Issue of how to deal with boundaries is difficult.
- Should there be a link between Yorkshire Dales National Park and Craven Core Strategies?

Community Facilities

Is there a sustainability issue?

- Glusburn – the village hall is 10 times larger than it needs to be – where do we get the revenue funding to maintain it? If facilities are not district council run then they are hard to maintain.
- Revenue is needed for smaller village halls but this would need to come from urban communities who wouldn't see the benefit from the hall so would be unwilling to provide.
- Which villages have pressures?
- Hellifield – Recently doubled in size following the development of the Auction Mart site for housing. The school is now just adequate; there are no Doctors so people go to Skipton/Settle (big draw to Skipton and Manchester).
- Can't call Cowling a village any more because it doesn't have any facilities
- Villages were all originally self contained, and historically they were founded around industries (mills etc) which are now being converted to housing.
- We are losing community facilities when people buy pubs and convert them to flats. People come to area to eat in pubs.
- Post offices are also closing.

Schools:

APPENDIX B

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy – Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

- There is a good choice of primary schools especially in Crosshills/Sutton/Glusburn - People pick and choose which one to send their children to.
- In South Craven people have a choice of where to live and which schools to use but not where they work.
- The largest secondary school in the district is on the border between Bradford Met and Craven – it gets a lot of pupils from Bradford Met.
- The school system in North Craven works well - Settle College, middle school and Ingleton School are the pot of North Yorkshire primary schools and work very well together.

Public Transport:

- Hellifield – no link was created to the train station from the auction mart housing site so people don't use public transport. Also the train service through Hellifield is poor.
- Public transport is poor in Craven but we have no funding/input.
- Craven has very little financial turnover so we can't put much back into public transport – high car ownership on Craven.
- Drive to live in Cononley is the public transport.
- Could the railway to Embsay Quarry from Skipton could be used for tourism?
- There is an argument in the district between the need for a new road or a new railway.

Health Care facilities:

- Not many facilities in North Craven – e.g. health care - if sick in Bentham/North Craven need to come to South Craven for care.
- We don't/can't have a partnership with PCT – they have 'Shot it'. North Yorkshire and York PCT – said recently that they are not listening to us because we are not doing what they want. They wanted do arrange a meeting to discuss the 'rules of engagement' – they are very powerful.

Employment:

- The major employment area in the district is Skipton
- Cononley has train station so people mostly go to Leeds – becoming a dormitory village.
- The major employees are Skipton Building Society in Skipton and Johnson's in Gargrave.
- Will there be a longer term desire to work from home so the spenders will be in the district? Disagreement with this – think people will still go outside the district even if they live and work here – will go out for shopping and social activities.
- Need to raise living standards for developers to see that there is a need for multiplex cinema etc.
- All mills/employment opportunities being lost – converted to housing – creating commuter villages.

Retail:

- South Craven – people mostly go to Keighley for retail.

APPENDIX B

- Dictated by market forces – can't make money in district so don't get developers. Money drives it all.
- Presently turning away larger retail/comparison shopping companies because we don't have the sites for them – do we change to accommodate them? Yes – if shop keepers think it is viable then we need to make provision for it.
- Some companies e.g. Next, have a policy of using out of town sites. If we have no Town Centre sites do we make a provision on edge of Town/Greenfield sites?
- DO WE WANT TO DEVELOP OUT OF TOWN/GREENFIELD SITES? This will take business away from Skipton town centre.
- Is there sufficient demand/catchment to justify building retail sheds?
- We need to get the balance right between travelling out and providing in the district.

Technology/broadband - Craven is no worse off than other areas.

Cultural facilities

- Are there enough links between the National Park and Craven?
- Farmers markets at Grassington (outside district) and Skipton
- Area is more diverse than we think.

What do settlements need that they don't have at the moment?

- Employment choices.
- Good public transport.
- Better health care - We have small hospital in Skipton but don't know for how much longer – the main ones are outside the district in Airedale and Kendal.
- Education in quite flexible but the 2 private schools in Skipton are pulling in from a wider catchment and refusing local children the opportunity.
- South Craven School is pulling from Bradford Met.
- Casinos? – We don't want one.
- Retail – retail centre in Skipton and Settle but mostly go out to Harrogate and Leeds.
- Look at our future needs –
- PUBLIC TRANSPORT
- What is the road infrastructure like? Going to get worse as the Government de-trunk the bypasses. All villages in the National Park rely on bypasses to get to Airedale Hospital.

Affordable Housing and Housing Supply:

- We are not physically building affordable homes because of land supply – are there too many restrictions on Greenfield land? Where should we put those 250 houses per year?
- Craven has the lowest number of rental Council Houses in the country – have ethos in Craven of owning own homes which has led to a gap in rental properties.
- We all want to own our own house but we can't all afford to.
- Do we need to release more land to meet housing targets? Developers will go where they can make more profit i.e. where the threshold for affordable houses is lower so some areas with high thresholds will miss out.
- Second homes are a problem.

APPENDIX B

- Holiday homes - people don't use community facilities BUT if we want to increase tourism then people will want second homes.
- Problem with the flexibility of affordable housing schemes – the provision of affordable housing in a recent development in Cowling was bought out of by the developer offering to provide of new village Hall
- How do we keep it affordable? - have mechanisms.

Tourism:

- Do we have more day trippers and walkers in Craven than overnight stays?
- What is the tourism in Skipton/Craven?
- Ingleton is very busy in summer with walkers, pot holers, and they stay over.
- The Yorkshire Dales should be used for walking/caving as the landscape lends itself to these activities. If we try and change this it could lead to urbanisation.
- Not much else in terms of tourism activities (little bit of hang gliding).
- North of Skipton – better chance of people stopping and using restaurants etc than in South Craven because South Craven is 'on the way home'. Pass through South Craven and Skipton to get to North Craven.
- Back to public transport links – can people get to the district?

Crime (raised at end of time period so not discussed properly):

- People will not go out in Skipton on a weekend evening.

Main point raised = The lack of infrastructure and transportation in the district.

Core Strategy Preferred Options Workshop: 26th January 2007

Workshop Group

Housing

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	HOUSING
ISSUE and/or OPTION	OPTION A – Location of Housing Development
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	Option 5 – most preferred – I & O Consultation.
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redevelopment of existing sites e.g. mixed use development in settlements – links to employment land provision. • Identifying different needs in different areas – not blanket approach. • Financial viability issues – site development. • Does Option 5 include development on Greenfield land? Cannot rule it out. Brownfield 1st then Greenfield development.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	Reuse of land and building as locations.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	
WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	HOUSING – Option B – Mix of Housing.
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Question 3
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	Settlement by settlement basis. Good argument for exceptions policy and for a mix of types, size and tenures, therefore option 5. Potential for exceptions and allocations linking sites together via S106 Agreement. Local Planning Authorities need to be willing to facilitate release of land.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	Option 3 – realistic – financial viability for development of exception sites – limited by Housing Corporation capped rate of £5k per plot. Allocations for exception sites – willingness of developers to sell. CDC would need to use Compulsory Purchasing Order powers to achieve planning permission.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	HOUSING
How should the policy be worked?	
Additional issue	scheme development standards – Housing Association Schemes.
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Question 4
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing requirement is unachievable. All we can do is required 40% provision on sites. Minimum requirement percentage on sites – Housing Association wants to work with developers. Needs to be realistic percentage for developers to develop in area – financial viability. Support flexible approach to percentage – 40% as a starting point but negotiated above and below.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> YDNP approach – all sites to provide affordable housing. Open market housing sites only to be refused planning permission. Approach has not stopped development YDNP approach in Craven would stifle development. Harrogate has 50% affordable housing target – potential knock on effect for increased development in Craven. Craven's market – requirement for affordable housing and general housing too.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	Percentage of affordable housing varies on a site by site basis e.g. conversion sites.
How should the policy be worked?	

Support for on site provision rather than commuted sums.

Planning Gain: –

Balancing needs in area e.g. affordable housing and education needs.

Requiring developers to provide employment land in addition to affordable housing (unsure if this was overall consensus).

Opportunities for mixed use schemes – has to be way of achieving affordable housing.

Location of Affordable Housing – historically Council Housing built on outskirts of settlement. Location should not be a significant issue. Ideal – mix of tenures on sites - 'tenure blind'.

Local businesses buying housing stock to become Affordable Housing e.g. SBS Key Worker Scheme – RSL's manage and maintain.

APPENDIX B

Open Space/play areas in Affordable Housing Schemes – density issues.
Viability issues for developer – ‘shopping list of requirements’.

Thresholds – PPS3 15 thresholds – developers get round it by building just below threshold.
Support for urban and rural area thresholds based on population size.
Threshold of 1 unit may result in unsustainable development.

Minimum Threshold – Scheme by scheme/ site by site basis. Rural – urban thresholds – based on population size. Also should be informed by the prices.

Issue of brownfield definition – intensification. Limited brownfield sites – current situation.

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	HOUSING
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Question 6
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	Empty properties and bringing them back into use – grants may be available to CDC.
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing empty properties back into use is only scratching the surface. Realistic answer to housing issues is to release Greenfield sites throughout the plan area. • Housing associations – frustrated as no sites. • Justify release of Greenfield requirements for Affordable Housing needs to be very high.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue of land owner expectation & release of sites – Compulsory Purchase Order powers of CDC need to be used. • CDC – Affordable Housing as top corporate priority. • LDF policy will lower land values over time. • Consistent application of Core Strategy Policy to achieve Affordable Housing. • Possible exception to policy would be provision of employment land.
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	

Housing is an economic driver.
Need for housing for people commuting within Leeds City Region.

WORKSHOP RECORD SHEET	HOUSING
ISSUE and/or OPTION	Question 8 – Key Question
Would a draft policy for this issue be compatible with the LDF vision?	
SUPPORTING COMMENTS	
Would you support a policy for this issue?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mix of tenures in every development – avoid creating Council estates/ ghettos.

APPENDIX B

Envision

Regeneration and Planning Solutions

Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Possible release of Greenfield development to realistically achieve Affordable Housing.• Threshold set in relation to population size.• Potential for missed use schemes – need for employment sites.
OBJECTION COMMENTS	
Would you object to a policy for this issue? Why?	
WHAT CHANGES ARE SUGGESTED? (deletions/alterations/additions)	
How should the policy be worked?	

APPENDIX B

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy – Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

Core Strategy Preferred Options Workshop: 26th January 2007

Workshop Group

Economic Strategy and Distribution

Q1	Yes. Obvious?
Q2	<p>“Conversions” not mentioned. Better to refer to “Rural” rather than “Farm” diversification. As Q6 was taken before Q2, the discussion about Q6 and the possible location of new employment sites may not properly reflect the ranking of preferred employment types and locations in the table provided.</p>
Q3	Question not discussed.
Q4	Yes.
Q5	Ensure that an alternative range of premises is available.
Q6	<p>Skipton: Settle: Shortage of small business units. Focus on the river – redevelop Sowarth Industrial Estate for mixed use and relocate businesses on the edge of town. High Bentham: Cross Hills: Infrastructure problems. Needs a railway station and a solution to congestion at the level crossing, including a new access road to the industrial estate. Flooding is a constraint.</p>
Q7	<p>Protect employment use of strategic brownfield sites. Potential for mixed use of employment sites. Allocation of new greenfield sites may affect ability to retain brownfield sites in employment or mixed use.</p>
Q8	<p>Resolve the level crossing problem at Cross Hills. Provide a railway station at Cross Hills. Extend the Metro ticketing scheme into Craven.</p>
Q9	Question not discussed.

APPENDIX B

Core Strategy Preferred Options Workshop: 26th January 2007

Workshop Group

Environment and Design

Protection of the Rural Landscape:

The clear option from the June/July consultation event was to use a criterion based measure based on the Landscape Appraisal. Do we go down this route?

- In the current Adopted Local plan a blanket approach is taken and every bit of green is covered by the same policy with no differentiation between urban fringe and more 'attractive' green space (which is mostly in North Craven).
- Do we have a grading system to classify green space? – The Landscape Appraisal does this to some extent.
- How do we decide which is more attractive?
- Need to consider flora and fauna – Craven is more than just a landscape, it has things in it.
- The Biodiversity Action Plan for the area will look at areas and species for protection and important areas for protection/enhancement. It is produced nationally to be interpreted at a local level. The Biodiversity Action Plan for Craven is still in draft form (this information was supplied by Phil Eckerlsey of Natural England)
- The options given in July were simplistic.
- The loss of some of our rural landscape is inevitable if we are to achieve the level of transport/housing/infrastructure needed - how do we decide what areas and what percentage of the land to lose?
- Could any land within a constrained built-up area be acceptably developed even though it is greenfield e.g. the land within the bypass around Skipton?
- We traditionally protect the most 'valuable' land e.g. National Parks. However, for most people it is the parts that they see everyday around where they live that need protecting regardless of their value. We need to find a balance on what is protected.
- Policies should protect the 'best bits' and give clear direction of what to do with the rest – what is the overarching policy going to be?
- Who should we consider when making policies? The needs of people who live here, the supposed needs of people who want to move here? How much weight do we give to the opinions of people who don't want to live here?
- The Core Strategy should be nothing to do with the people who want to live here – It should concentrate on the people who are already here.
- Consensus on an approach based on Landscape Appraisal and Biodiversity Action Plan?
- We don't have any brownfield sites in Skipton but there are loads in Keighley – why not build there? – This is where RSS comes in to distribute growth. Need some scope for development in Craven.

Compensation schemes:

- The loss of open countryside should be accompanied by a contribution to enhance quality of the countryside that is left. Section 106 agreements and Development Control conditions could be used to secure this.
- Management of the landscape could become an economic activity in itself.
- A good knowledge of the district and a spot-on up-to-date evidence base would be needed to achieve this.

APPENDIX B

The Future Role of Parish Councils:

- Parish Councils are grass-roots people who have a good knowledge of the local area. Should modern Parish Councils have an increased role in plan making?
- This would involve Parish Plans and Community Plans (we don't have any of these at the moment).
- Should we encourage Parish Councils to write in links to the LDF in their Parish Plans and filter Planning Policies down to Parish Plan level?

Strategic Environmental Assessments:

- There is an European Directive relating to Strategic Environmental Assessments which states that all LDF documents should be assessed to see what the effects of the plans on the environment is likely to be. This work is being done by Land Use Consultants on behalf of Craven District Council. This is a requirement and will be checked at the examination stage.
- Sustainability Appraisals are different to Strategic Environmental Assessments but at present they are being undertaken together – why? There are lots of overlaps in the assessment criteria which is why they are done together.
- Strategic Environmental Assessments and Sustainability Appraisals will be undertaken throughout the production of the Core Strategy and all LDF documents.

Flooding:

- So much policy regarding flooding is written at national and regional level, what can Craven do that is particular to Craven? We are being dictated to and don't have much flexibility but just act on regional policy.
- Is flooding going to make much difference to the Core Strategy in a strategic sense? – Yes
- We need to decide if we allow some building in flood zones with special measures.
- Identify where development is going to cause flooding/drainage problems and have mitigation measures included in plans.
- Need to consider that if we build on land liable to flooding we will push the problem down river.
- We are not clear on which area the river authorities are trying to protect in terms of flood management – we need to understand this.
- Could changing the heights of weirs help?
- The Environment Agency work on a River Catchment basis, not by Parish Boundaries.
- We could manage floodplains to create an opportunity to attract people into Craven and not just pass through e.g. Long Preston has a wide floodplain which could be used to attract wildlife with viewing stations set up for visitors.
- Have information on habitats – can use this as a measure.
- Can create nature reserves and use to promote economy e.g. the Nature Reserve at Kings Cross Station in London.
- The Airedale Drainage Board also comes into it – need to look at as a totality.
- Could the Preferred Option be to 'use environment we have in a positive way'. This is quite bland but could be developed. We should make our policies unique, not let everyone dictate to us.
- Flooding issues – need to live and work in the environment as well as protecting it for wildlife.

APPENDIX B

Modern Farming Practices:

- Farming of upland areas and intensifying of use encourages quicker run off – we need to communicate with farmers to make partnerships on better/proactive land management.
- Land management is generally becoming more extensive anyway.
- What is the timescale for change in the LDF? Tens of years - maybe this first core strategy should set up the infrastructure/base for future Strategies? – The Core Strategy will be flexible and continually reviewed so it can account for changes and progress. We will not need to wait for the next one to make the next step.
- There is so much in National and Regional guidance that we need to pick up on that at this stage we can't have much more than a bland policy.
- Look at enabling development whilst protecting the landscape.

Renewable Energy:

- There is a significant requirement to supply energy from renewable sources set out in RSS. The general feeling is against big wind farms – prefer micro generation, but micro generation projects cannot deliver the targets set out in RSS. Do we say 'no' to RSS?
- Government targets are a minimum so even if we could meet targets through micro generation it would be no reason to refuse an application for a wind farm.
- Should Craven be ahead of the game and exceed targets?
- Opportunities for wind farms are limited in Craven because all the 'hilly' bits are in the National Park – not fair that we should have all the problems and the National Park be excluded.
- Huge requirement based on district. Difficult to tackle
- Wind farms generate huge amount of electricity which is why a high percentage of the renewable electricity required is to be provided by them. They are successful.
- Wind turbines will be at cost of environment.
- Put wind farms on industrial land.
- Alternatives -
- Example – Langcliffe – create electricity from waste food – place in food in underground vats. This also provides central heating and compost.
- Geographically in good position for solar panels.
- Solar panels are invisible compared to wind farms – wind turbines have detrimental effect on the landscape - Do we put them in less 'valuable' landscape areas e.g. enlarge the one that is already there which is owned by Yorkshire Water on an Industrial Estate?
- Look at effectiveness of the existing Yorkshire Water wind farm – apparently it is currently only used by Yorkshire Water.
- Affordable warmth and fuel poverty in Craven - We are presently building affordable houses with no affordable, sustainable energy.
- Lots of fuel poverty in Craven
- Get so overwhelmed by targets that we use it as an excuse to do nothing but we shouldn't – should try and meet and deliver other targets such as achieving affordable warmth and using different building materials – more achievable targets.

APPENDIX B

- Need basis to act on applications that come forward which is in line with RSS. Can't set unrealistic policies which set too high standards that cannot be met anywhere in Craven – this would not be accepted.

Dealing with waste:

- Not covered on handout
- Can't keep using landfill – does Core Strategy need to identify policy/sites for sustainable waste management? E.g. MIRTH sites – can turn waste into fuel.
- Community Strategy – people in Craven felt renewable energy use and waste were very important.
- The LDF has to be positive and recognise problems.
- Consider the cost of sustainability – loss of open space etc. Can Craven afford to be sustainable?
- Craven is only the collection authority, it doesn't control disposal
- We need a uniform waste/recycling policy – need to discuss with other authorities
- Use waste to make fuel

Historic/Conservation areas character:

- We must support the historical character of our villages and towns.
- A lot of built form is good because of the open space next to it.
- Density of development – There is an argument against high density development but the historic character of our villages is high density – contradiction.
- Living over shops – good use of space and keeps towns like Skipton and the High Street vibrant in the evenings.
- Not always happy to have people living over shop – security etc

Main issues – Balance between development in rural landscape for jobs and housing and the protection of the quality landscape – the tension between the countryside and development.

- How do we resolve tension? Find criteria for higher quality areas
- There must be some sacrifice. Develop green areas within the urban fringe?
- Could be argues to have higher value because people look out onto it, but equally it is in a more sustainable location.

APPENDIX B

Appendix C

A VISION FOR CRAVEN IN 2016

The 'visioning' exercise carried out at the consultation workshop in Craven on 26 January 2007 led to the composition of the draft Vision described below. It generated a range of ideas for the Craven Vision as participants were asked to indicate their thoughts about positive and negative aspects of Craven at present. They were then asked to envisage the changes that could be achieved in Craven in the plan period, and to consider whether the LDF vision could be aligned with that for the Community Strategy.

One of the most salient points made on the day about the task of drawing together a Vision for Craven is to 'ensure that the residents of Craven are proud of, supportive of and positively engaged in the Vision'.

The responses to four questions were collated using post-it notes and the delegates were then asked to consider the wording of a Vision based on the adopted Community Strategy and the first draft of the review. The contributions were as follows:

Hot down one positive thing that you think is unique about Craven, the one thing that you want to see maintained and not damaged or lost in future;

Countryside, open space, green space, hills;
Outstanding natural landscape, limestone fields, River Ribble floodplain;
Ecology, wildlife;

Protect as existing, tranquillity, safety;
Scenery, panoramas/vistas, excellent views;

Individual character, market town and rural identity, thriving economy;
Vibrant working communities, friendly;

Hot down one negative thing that you feel strongly about, the one burning issue that you think needs to be dealt with soon?

Overall lack of vision in Craven;

Transport and access, improvements in the rural areas;
Poor public transport;
Traffic on roads, limited use of rail stations;
Vehicle and pedestrian conflict;

Development pressures from W. Yorkshire, over-development;
'Honey-pot tourism' in wilderness areas;

Work and leisure opportunities; constraints to business development;

Local people priced out of housing market, second homes and commuters;
Affordable housing for locals, range of prices;

APPENDIX C

social care, home support, accessible day activities for disabled and elderly;

Untidy farmers and proliferation of large sheds;
Improve environmental quality of agricultural land;
Countryside not allowed to go to rack and ruin;

Regeneration needed in Skipton and Settle;
Quality and maintenance of urban fabric in Skipton;

jot down the one thing that you would like the Council to have achieved by 2021 that would make yours and everyone else's lives better.

Good communities, thriving villages, mix of people, community spirit;
Strong community cohesion, sustainable communities with facilities and employment;
Self sufficient, small-scale, vibrant, dynamic communities;
Innovative, welcoming change;
Thriving local economies without environmental damage;

Thriving/vibrant towns with better range of shops, services and businesses;
Busy small businesses, prosperous economy, wider economic base;
Craven as a place of choice for work rest and play;
Viable agriculture, diversified farms, managed countryside;
Work space available throughout Craven including villages;

Well planned affordable housing, both rent and sale, for local people;
Young people able to afford to live locally;
Second homes reduced;
Dwellings with renewable/green energy sources, energy efficiency;
Sustainable building construction and materials;

Skipton as acknowledged example of high quality urban design;
Individual character, 'special' qualities retained, avoiding 'cloned' shopping centre;
Prevent urban sprawl, urbanisation, less poor building, ugly and cheap architecture;
People treasure their area;

Integrated affordable transport system; connectivity within the community;
Reduced traffic, less need for cars; rail travel improvement;
Choice of ready transport into the rural areas;

Countryside improved, access into the landscape;
Maintaining the natural environment;
More wildlife outside protected areas and on floodplains, water storage;

The delegates were then prompted to review the key sustainability issues arising from the 'Shaping Places and Spaces' Conference in 2005 and the Aims of the adopted Community Strategy for Craven before being asked the same question again.

jot down one more thing that you want to add to your personal Vision for Craven in 2021; what do you wish for that the Council should work to achieve?

APPENDIX C

Viable businesses, healthy communities;
Prosperous economy with opportunities for all;
Deliver a vibrancy to key settlements including jobs;
Thriving local communities providing housing, resources, work etc for everyone;
Develop sustainable communities;
Communities that have access to the services and opportunities they need to thrive;
Effective retail economy, greater range than at present;
Growing vibrant market towns meeting their potential;

Sustainable high quality environment for local residents, conservation;
Landscape and environment at the forefront of planning via SA/SEA;
Retain, enhance and improve local character, what is special to Craven's towns and landscape;
Quality environment, the one thing that makes the area stand out from others;
More quality greenspace, accessible wildlife for public enjoyment;
Welcome for visitors, signs, toilets, better public transport;

Effective provision of affordable housing for local people without major developments for in-migration;
Enable local people to afford to live in the area if they choose to stay;
Warm, safe, affordable housing in the countryside;
Better communication; mobility through access to transport as the lifeline connecting all aspects of life in Craven;
Resource sustainability, energy efficiency

APPENDIX D

Delegate List

Craven District Council Local Development Framework Preparation of Core Strategy- Issues and Options

Emerging Strategic Issues and Options Consultation/Feedback Event:

Council Chamber, Council Offices, Granville Street, 26 January 2007

	Delegate Name	Organisation	Workshop Group Attended	Attended
1	Councillor Carl Lis	Craven District Council/ LSP	Economy/Transport	Y
2	1 Delegate (contact Mark Johnson)	Dacre, Son and Hartley		N
3	Hilary Fenten	CPRE Craven Branch	Environment	Y
4	Gina Bourne	Home Builders Federation		N
5	Paul Shorter	Craven College		N
6	Mr Ian Fulton		Environment	
7	Mrs J Burton	Bentham Town Council		N
8	Representative	Bentham Town Council		N
9	Chris Howson	Craven Housing	Housing	Y
10	Malcolm Spittle	North Yorkshire County Council Planning and Countryside Unit	Environment	Y
11	Alison Fawcett	StART	Economy/Transport	Y
12	Jonathan Kerr	Director of Community Services Craven District Council	Housing	Y
13	Martin Parker	North Yorkshire County Council Transport	Economy/Transport	Y
14	Mr Jay Everett	CB Richard Ellis	Economy/Transport	Y
15	John Hunter	CB Richard Ellis	Environment	Y
16	Mr Lugee	Cononley Parish Council	Housing	Y
17	David Carter	Natural England (NE)	Environment	Y
18	Phil Eckersley	Natural England	Economy/Transport	Y
19	Sarah Close	Yorkshire Rural Community Council	Housing	Y
20	Rima Berry	North Yorkshire Parish Plan Development Officer, Yorkshire Rural Community Council	Environment	Y
21	Cathrine Aylott	Planning Assistant for David Wilson Homes Northern		N
22	Kate Senior	Craven District Council	Environment	Y
23	Councillor Philip Barrett	Craven District Council	Environment	Y
24	Peter Stockton	YDNP Strategic Planning Officer	Economy/Transport	Y

APPENDIX D

Craven District Council LDF
Core Strategy – Emerging Strategic Options
February 2007

	Delegate Name	Organisation	Workshop Group Attended	Attended
25	Heather Thomas Smith	LOPRA	Housing	Y
26	Jackie Hunt	LOPRA	Environment	Y
27	Mr Lupton	Settle Resident	Housing	Y
28	Mrs Lupton	Craven Conservation Trust/ Settle Resident	Economy/Transport	Y
29	Mr Stone	Ribblebanks Parish Council	Economy/Transport	Y
30	Mrs Gill Dixon	Chief Executive, Craven District Council	Housing	Y
31	Mr Colin Walker	Director of Environmental and Planning Services, Craven District Council	Environment	Y
32	Ruth Parker	Planning Policy Officer, Craven District Council	Scribe	Y
33	Roy Banks	Planning Policy Assistant, Craven District Council	Scribe	Y
34	Laura Kennedy	Planning Policy Assistant, Craven District Council	Scribe	Y
35	Councillor Roger Nicholson	Craven District Council Member	Economy/Transport	Y
36	David Smurthwaite	Head of Economic and Community Development Craven District Council	Economy/Transport	Y
37	Councillor Stephen Butcher	Craven District Council Member	Housing	Y
38	Kath Rayner	Craven District Council – Environmental Health	Environment	Y
39	Councillor David Heather	Craven District Council Member		Y
40	Peter Craven	LESRUG		Y
41	Keith Reed	Envision		Y
42	David Williams	Envision	Environment	Y
43	Keith Keeley	Envision	Economy/Transport	Y
44	Kate Bailey	Envision	Housing	Y

Total Attendees: 38

APPENDIX D