CONTENTS	Page
Glossary of terms	3
I. Introduction	4
2. Summary of key issues from the assessment report	5
2.1 Sports halls and climbing walls	5
2.2 Village halls	6
3. A strategic framework for built facilities improvements	7
3.1 Introduction	7
3.2 Aim	7
3.3 National context	7
3.4 Strategic context	10
3.5 Strategic objectives	12
3.6 Management objectives	13
4. Targets	15
4.1 Introduction	15
4.2 Development route of built facility provision	15
4.3 Community building/management committee standards	18
4.4 Generic targets	20
4.5 Village hall specific targets	21
4.6 Scoring criteria based assessment of facility priorities	23
4.7 Key issues and recommendations	24
4.8 Sports hall specific targets	34
5. Funding	36
5.1 Planning agreements	38
6. Action plan 2004-2009	43
6.1 Criteria to justify the inclusions of sites within the action plan	43

6.2 Hierarchy of priorities	43
6.3 Actions for sports halls	45
6.4 Actions for network of village halls	45
Appendix 1: Disability Discrimination Act	50
Appendix 2: 'VISIBLE' standards	51
Appendix 3: Scoring criteria	57
Appendix 4: Sport England village and community halls guidance notes	63

List of tables

Table	Title	Page	Table	Title	Page
no.			no.		
I	Development route of provision	16	4	Sources of funding 2	38
2	Scoring criteria	23	5	Contributions	40
3	Sources of funding I	36	6	Hierarchy of priorities	43

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

- CDC Craven District Council
- YRCC Yorkshire Rural Community Council
- DDA Disability Discrimination Act
- NYCC North Yorkshire County Council
- YDNP Yorkshire Dales National Park
- CCSC Coulthurst Craven Sports Centre
- ACRE Action with Communities in Rural England
- Defra Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- RDA Regional Development Agency
- RMTI Renaissance Market Town Initiative

I. INTRODUCTION

This report sets out the strategy and action plan for built facilities in Craven which includes village halls and indoor sports facilities, e.g. sports halls. This Strategy has been developed from research and analysis of the provision and use of built facilities for sport and active recreation within Craven. It follows an Assessment Report, which details provision, quality and usage levels.

Craven District Council (CDC) commissioned the study in December 2003. The principal research was carried out by KKP between December 2003 and March 2004.

The Strategy sets out a vision for the next five years in relation to the provision and improvement of built facilities for sport and active recreation. The Action Plan recommends a number of high priority projects for the District, which should be worked towards between 2004-2009. It should be recognised that the Strategy and Action Plan is outlined to provide a framework for improvement of facilities.

2. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FROM THE ASSESSMENT REPORT

2.1 Sports halls and climbing wall

There are currently three, four-badminton court sports halls in Craven and one additional facility, which is close to securing full funding for the project (for the purposes of this report it has been included as part of the assessment).

- □ Coulthurst Craven Sports Centre.
- □ South Craven School.
- □ Malsis School.
- □ Upper Wharfedale School (funding package almost secured).

All four of the facilities are located on the east side of the District and, mapping the facility, using a 16km (10-mile radius), show that there is need for another such facility in the north of Craven. This need has also been reinforced through the consultation that has been undertaken with local sports clubs and groups and various governing bodies of sport (NGBs).

There are, however, a number of proposed developments in the north, which if constructed, would cater for this need. It is vital that where new facilities are developed, they are properly marketed and promoted in order to attract usage from as wide a catchment as possible. This will ensure that facilities are economically viable and sustainable. In addition to this, facilities need to be carefully managed so as to have a minimal negative impact as possible on the smaller village halls. As well as developments in the north, a feasibility study has taken place into an eight badminton court sports hall at Aireville School in partnership with Craven College. It is unlikely that such a large facility would be sustainable in Skipton, particularly given its close proximity to Coulthurst Craven Sports Centre.

In addition to the four-court facilities there is a number of one-badminton court sports halls situated at schools and village halls. All, except one at Ermystead's Grammar School, are available for community use. These facilities, however, are limited in the scope of activities that can be accommodated.

All of the facilities are generally in good condition and are well used by the local community.

The Assessment Report highlights the need for a climbing wall facility to be located specifically in Skipton in conjunction with Aireville School, Craven College and the Skipton Renaissance Initiative. One major club, Craven Mountaineering Club, currently utilises facilities in Leeds and Ingleton at least once a week during the winter months. If a facility were built in Skipton it would be a well located facility for the Club as well as providing an additional tourist attraction and resource for local residents to take advantage of.

2.2 Village halls

58 (out of a total number of 60) village halls were surveyed as part of the Assessment Report. 42% of the population is within 1km of a facility and an additional 27% of the population is within 5km of a facility.

The mapping exercise highlights that there is generally a good strategic spread of village halls in the District, with the majority catering for the immediate locality as well as some attracting users from a wider catchment. There are some facilities that are in close proximity to each other. In the majority of these cases, the halls are catering for different user groups and therefore are not in direct competition with each other. There are, however, a few cases of over provision and in such cases the smaller facilities are struggling to meet the revenue costs of the building. It may be more economically viable to close such facilities and displace users to other village halls. As the village halls within Craven are not owned by the District Council, such recommendations would have to be supported by the individual management committees of the buildings.

Management of buildings is generally effective with some applying for external funding resources to upgrade the facilities. Generally the halls in the District are in good condition with some requiring renovation or additional assistance in attracting users. Throughout the consultation process, representatives have highlighted aspirations to upgrade and refurbish the facilities.

A number of village halls are struggling with the ongoing revenue costs and recruiting volunteers to assist with the running of the buildings.

3. A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR BUILT FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS

3.1 Introduction

The following section provides a framework for Craven District Council and partners to maintain and improve the built sport and recreation facilities within the District.

3.2 Aim

'CDC, partners and stakeholders to work with community groups and partner agencies to develop a network of community buildings which are vibrant, sustainable and accessible.'

3.3 National context

3.3.1 The importance of community buildings

Community buildings have the potential to play an increasingly important role in both rural and urban areas. This may be in terms of providing a physical focus or 'hub' for the regeneration of communities, but it may also arise where, especially in rural areas and isolated neighbourhoods, community buildings provide the only local meeting place. The Building Civil Renewal paper (outlined below) highlights the fact that the government is beginning to recognise the importance and potential of a community's physical infrastructure.

Despite this national interest, however, little research has been carried out into community buildings. It seems that little is known about community buildings and evidence about their purpose and challenges they face are either somewhat dated or is only just emerging.

2.3.2 The policy research and context for community buildings

The evidence base surrounding community buildings is not well developed, or widely known about. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation study, published in 1997 in conjunction with Community Matters, the national association of community organisations, indicated that there were some 18,809 community buildings in England and Wales, with an aggregate turnover of almost £250 million. The average turnover was £14,000. Action with Communities in Rural England (ACRE) suggests that in England, in rural areas, there are estimated to be some 8,900 village halls (ACRE, 1998).

Evidence from England's 38 rural community councils in their annual reports of rural services provided for the Countryside Agency suggests that considerable refurbishment work has been undertaken to village halls on the basis of new funding streams in the middle to late 1990s (Moseley 2000). Although village hall committees

face difficulties (such as retaining users where a hall remains un-modernised, and retaining volunteers for task such as raising funds and managing complex and changing regulations in relation to village halls), Moseley concludes that village halls, when viewed from a national perspective in the late 1990s, were 'flourishing' (2000).

An altogether different perspective on the state of village halls is highlighted in more recent reports on village services (Countryside Agency 2002a, 2002b, 2003). They identify a range of particular problems facing village halls, including:

- □ A decline in funding available for capital projects, refurbishments and maintenance of village halls, leading to 'pent-up demand'.
- □ Funders showing an interest in funding specific services or new activities in village halls, rather than the halls themselves more generally.
- □ Increasing demands and responsibilities made on volunteer trustees, including developing complex funding proposals and complying with new obligations and regulations, such as the Disability Discrimination Act.
- □ Increasing difficulties attracting and retaining trustees, alongside declining morale.
- □ Rising expectations being placed on village halls, by potential users and statutory service providers alike, such that "a widening gap is perceived between what is expected of village halls and their capacity to meet those expectations in the current and anticipated financial climate" (Countryside Agency 2002b: 6).

This apparent change in the fortunes of community buildings and the issue of the sustainable funding for village halls has risen up the policy (and political) agenda. ACRE's report into the status of funding for village halls noted the decline or shifting priorities of funders and indicated a potential funding gap of £50m for the unmet demand for capital funding for village halls (ACRE 2002).

The Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) has the lead responsibility for village halls and, in Autumn 2003, developed a draft policy paper in part as a response to the debates around funding. The paper argues that the most important aspect of village halls is how they, and the services and facilities on offer, are actually used by the community, rather than simply issues of bricks and mortar. It argues that although the total figure for funding from the National Lottery (Community Fund and Awards for All) has declined from the peak of 1999-2000 (£31.9m and £3.1m respectively), the proportion of its income directed towards village halls has remained the same, at around 7%. The implication is that village halls and community centres are just as much a priority as before, but that the total funds available was in decline.

Outlining the broad range of potential funding sources available to village halls, the paper concludes that "The lead responsibility for ensuring that rural communities have the facilities they need, and that these facilities are well used, lies with the community itself, supported by the local authority, the town or parish council, and the local voluntary sector infrastructure provider (commonly the Rural Community Council)" (DEFRA 2003: 3-4).

The paper also suggests that the 'evidence base' for village halls is somewhat limited, so that much of the policy debate is conducted on the basis of anecdote. In particular, little is known about the wider role and contribution of community buildings in relation to local communities.

However, new research is being developed which can fill some of the gaps. An independent qualitative evaluation of the Community Fund's grants programme for the development or refurbishment of village halls and community centres found that major grants enabled groups running community buildings to maintain and develop activities which, led to wider community benefits (Community Fund 2003). Grants led to increased use of buildings as more of a community focal point, reducing social isolation and providing better support for education, training and healthier living. However, particular barriers to the wider use of buildings include poor advertising, hostility to some user groups, lack of resources within management committees to organise activities and confusion about who is responsible for involving more people in community activities.

Separately ACRE (2003) has undertaken an exploratory research project with ten village halls in North East England (including three in County Durham, with the assistance of Durham Rural Community Council). The study aimed to develop a methodology to examine the viability of community buildings in relation to the local community context, considering issues such as the local demographic profile and the range of alternative facilities. A rolling programme of research is planned across England, through the research will be refined to enable a greater understanding of the contribution made by buildings as community assets which can underpin community activity.

The lack of strategic work surrounding village halls means it has been difficult to identify examples of best practice. As part of this study ACRE and the Yorkshire Rural Community Council have been consulted, both providing basic ways forward for strategic action planning. This is detailed within the Strategy and Action Plan.

Comparator local authorities (according to the Census 2001) such as Ribble valley, Caradon in Cornwall, and West Dorset were consulted by KKP but have carried out little strategic assessment with relation to the village halls. The following basic information was ascertained via consultation with the appropriate Rural Community Councils:

- Ribble Valley (population of 53,960) 17 village halls. A simple database has been completed detailing the contact details of the management committee representatives.
- West Dorset (population of 92,360) 74 village halls. The Council has not undertaken any assessment of the facilities. There is basic information about the village halls so as representatives can be contacted if rooms need to be booked.
- Caradon (population of 79,649) 38 village halls. Cornwall Rural Community Council (CRCC) has undertaken a simple survey detailing the number of village

halls it has, the physical condition of the buildings and what the buildings are used for. From this report the CRCC identified the acute need for financial investment in the area.

Consultation highlighted that there is very little national investment to undertake strategic work with village halls. District Councils are responding to enquiries rather than proactively undertaking development work. This needs to be recognised on a national level.

3.4 Strategic context

This Strategy supports a number of statutory, corporate and wider objectives. These include:

3.4.1 National strategies

- Building Civil Renewal December 2003
 - This consultation document sets out proposals on how community groups and community capacity building can be better supported at community or neighbourhood level. Community capacity building contributes to different types of activity, which result in outcomes such as – action to build social capital, the delivery of services, involvement in governance, social inclusion and cohesion. These in turn support the achievement of a wide range of social outcomes that are both the objectives of central and local government, and together help build sustainable and effective communities. One of the four key components for support or infrastructure at community level is "at least one physical 'hub' or base for individual and collective community activity (e.g. a community centre or village hall, community flat, shop, development trust premises)"..

3.4.2 Regional context

- Yorkshire Plan for Sport (2004-2008) was created after wide-ranging consultation with stakeholders throughout the region. Seven regional outcomes have been identified to be achieved by 2008;
- Increase participation
- Improve levels of performance
- Widen access
- Improve health and well-being
- Creating safer and stronger communities
- Improving education 75% of school children receiving two hours of high quality physical education and school sport within and beyond the curriculum each week.
- Benefit the economy maintain sport's contribution to the regional economy at 1.6%.

3.4.3 Local context

- □ CDC's Corporate Plan (2003-2007) highlights the Council's aim to conserve the environment and work with the communities and partners to create a prosperous future, deliver excellent services and improve the quality of life for all.
- CDC Priority 4 of supporting community well-being and promoting cultural and leisure opportunities across the District.
- Craven's Community Strategy sets out a common vision of the needs of Craven for the next 10 years. These are arranged under five themes, three of which relate this strategy;
- Sustainable communities to develop and support sustainable and vibrant local communities through community based services, improved access for isolated communities and an increased capacity for community self-help and participation within all sections of the community. Within this there is the aim to seek to increase the use of community buildings/facilities by 2013.
- Good health and social well-being to enhance the general well-being of the community, through the achievement of improved health, social care and affordable housing, a reduction in crime, and support for quality of life initiatives through culture, leisure and sport.
- A quality environment to conserve and enhance Craven's environment for present and future residents and visitors to enjoy, to find effective solutions to waste and pollution, and develop sustainable transport.
- □ CDC (outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park) Local Plan sets out a development strategy for the plan area and contains all the land use policies and proposals needed for the future development of the plan area for the period up to 2006.
- Policy SRC9 refers to the retention of existing services and facilities. It highlights that any proposals for the development of buildings which are deemed to have a functional use for the purpose of recreation will not be permitted unless the premises are no longer required for their existing use, the proposals accord with all other relevant local plan policies and the proposed development is acceptable in terms of access, visual amenity, scale, design and layout.
- Policy SRC10 states that planning permission will be granted for new and improved community facilities within the development limits of Craven settlements providing the proposal does not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, the needs of the disabled and elderly are taken into account in terms of design, is located close to public transport services and has adequate access and parking arrangement.

3.5 Strategic objectives

The following objectives have been produced as a result of the key issues within the Assessment Report:

Key issues include:

- Lack of volunteers to continue development of certain facilities.
- □ A number of facilities are in close proximity to each other hence planned developments would have negative impact of usage levels.
- □ Management concerns regarding ongoing revenue costs.
- □ A number of facilities require renovating to meet DDA legislation.

In addition to the above, objectives have been outlined, which relate to the general access and quality issues surrounding village halls. As CDC does not own all the buildings within the District, the Council will have more of a facilitative role in the implementation of the following objectives:

- 1. Residents should have access to facilities which meet the current industry good practice guidelines. This should support the implementation of related policies and strategies.
 - Ensure that residents have access to a good quality 4-court sports hall and community building within at least a 15 minute drive time (Sport England guidelines) catchment of the settlement area.
 - □ Larger sites such as sports halls should be accessible by public transport.
- 2. Increase access to built facilities.
 - □ Locate new sites near public transport hubs.
 - □ Increase public transport links to larger sites, especially at weekends and throughout the summer.
 - Increase the quality of signs advertising larger facilities to increase public awareness.
- 3. Increase the quality of life and health of Craven residents by developing facilities that function as a catalyst for community participation in a range of activities that contribute to the social life and well being of the community.
- 4. Rationalise over provision within an analysis area.
- 5. Improve communications and marketing regarding community buildings and any new developments.
- 6. Provide support to those facilities that have yet to meet DDA (particularly from October 1st 2004 see Appendix 1) requirements.

- □ Facilities to be fully accessible to meet with DDA requirements.
- □ Larger sites should cater for people with decreased mobility.
- 7. Encourage, support and develop partnerships, where appropriate, with local schools, which do not have formal community use agreements to develop structured use of existing and in particular of new facilities.
- 8. The quality of provision in the District should be sustained.
- 9. Investigate the feasibility of offering 100% non-domestic rate relief to those organisations providing facilities which meet industry approved accreditation mark.

3.6 Management objectives

A number of management objectives should be implemented to enable the above strategic objectives to be delivered. They include:

- 1. Within a phased programme, improve the quality, and security of built facilities including their ancillary facilities such as car parking. (See Appendix Three for Sport England Village and Community Halls guidance notes).
- 2. Use development opportunities and consult with the sporting community, local residents, parish councils and management committees to identify facility need and increase and/or improve the existing in line with the findings of the Assessment Report.
- 3. Develop a general framework to enable specific management committees and parish councils, where needs have been identified, to implement development proposals.
- 4. Strive to ensure that, where sites may be lost, through development or closure, that facilities of the same or improved standard are provided to meet the continued needs of residents, dependent on demand.
- 5. Work with and assist partner agencies (such as YRCC, NYCC) to provide usable, accessible and viable community buildings and sports halls.
- 6. Identify community buildings/sports halls that are under used and have the potential to increase community and sports participation levels and develop such sites to either meet shortfall or provide additional facilities.
- 7. Provide assistance and support to those facilities that have yet to meet DDA (1st October 2004) requirements and seek to ensure that facilities are accessible to all residents.

- 8. Strive to ensure that there is a clearly identified community and sporting need for development of new facilities with minimal displacement of usage from other sites.
- 9. Ensure that all new or replacement sports halls developed meet minimum contemporary specifications in the context of length, breadth, lighting, floor spaces etc. as set out by Sport England.

4. TARGETS

4.1 Introduction

A number of targets have been produced and should be implemented to enable the policy objectives to be delivered. It is recommended that CDC adopt these to enable it to achieve the Strategy's aims and objectives.

4.2 Development route of built facility provision

4.2.1 Development route model

CDC should consider a 'development route built facility provision model' that can be applied to all types of sites in the District. This approach should facilitate the delivery of appropriately specified provision, servicing all levels of demand. It must recognise demand and supply issues within specific catchment areas.

TARGET I

Outline a development route of provision, which enables resources to be targeted at sites of strategic importance on a local and district-wide level.

A number of characteristics for each development route are identified. These apply either to site elements that are already in place or, in some instances, are not in place but have the potential to be developed:

Table 1: Development route of provision

	Development route l	Development route 2	Development route 3
Strategic relevance	Strategically placed in the District context.	Strategically placed in the local analysis area and District context.	Strategically placed in the local context
Type of facility	Four badminton court sports hall. (Including those located at schools)	One badminton court sports hall and larger village halls.	Village halls.
Ancillary facilities	High quality ancillary facilities with changing room/showers/toilet/officials room/car parking.	Good quality ancillary facilities with changing rooms/shower/toilets/ kitchen facilities.	Good quality ancillary facilities with changing rooms/showers/toilets/ kitchen facilities.
Accessibility	Fully accessible to all members of the community.	Fully accessible to all members of the community.	Fully accessible to all members of the community.
Class of use	Cater for 5 or more sports.	Larger village halls – cater for all five of the ACRE classes.	Average sized village halls – caters for at least 3 of ACRE classes.
			Small village halls – cater for at least two ACRE classes.
Specialisation	Could have one or two sport specialisation i.e. climbing wall.	The need for larger facilities to specialise and become the recognised area facility for Stage/Dance/Art performances.	N/a
Standards	Must meet Sport England and Sport Governing Body facility standards/	Should meet the 'VISIBLE' model of standards.	Should meet the 'VISIBLE' model of standards.

4.2.2 Development route 1 and 2

Development route I sites are the largest providers of sports hall provision in Craven with four badminton sports halls. CDC and its partners should secure and commit resources to their improvement and development. This will relieve pressure on those sites that are smaller as well as providing continuing revenue to the larger facilities. CDC should also support those proposed developments that will cater for an identified need in the District.

Development route 2 sites are smaller than development route 1 sites. Generally these sites are used by a local catchment and hence provide a local service. Some of the facilities, in particular the larger village halls, have the infrastructure in place to support themselves, whereas schools may require more support in ongoing investment. Development route 2 (i.e. large or very large in accordance with the Assessment Report) facilities should also provide activities from the five classes identified by ACRE:

- Governance and participation community events, fetes, and festivals.
- □ Social benefit delivery of advice aid and services or support to individuals.
- Social support youth clubs, luncheon clubs, elderly persons' club, and mother and toddler group.
- Social interest bowls, drama, uniformed youth groups, and structured social groups such as WI.
- Private events events run for private benefit and other events not open to the public.

The larger facilities are able to do this as they have a wider range of facilities and in most cases a stronger management committee which can support the scale of such activities.

4.2.3 Development route 3

Development route 3 sites are classified as such, as they are physically smaller (i.e. village halls), are limited in the activities they can accommodate and have smaller catchment areas. A majority have a 'local' management infrastructure in place or have the potential for one to be developed. Many of these sites will require capital investment particularly to meet with DDA legislation.

Average sized facilities (i.e. those with 2 rooms and a kitchen) should provide services that are in at least three of the ACRE classes and smaller facilities (i.e. those with one room and a kitchen) should provide services that are in two of the ACRE classes.

Conclusion

It should be recognised that this model is intended to be flexible to assist with funding priorities. Through investment, sites can be reclassified. It should also be noted that although development route 2 sites would generally be considered as local priorities in some instances they may become district-wide priorities. This is likely to be the case in areas which have a particularly low level of provision.

4.3 Community building/management committee standards

Community buildings are pivotal to provision in Craven. Activity and opportunity offered ranges through the full cultural spectrum. There are aspirations in many areas to improve facilities. It is important, however, to provide some level of standard for the community buildings in the District in terms of management committee skills, volunteer recruitment, levels of use and whether the facility is responding to community needs and engaging with the local community.

There are many reasons as to why CDC should consider setting standards for built facilities, in particular the village halls, including the following:

- Enables management committees to continually improve the services and facilities on offer.
- □ Allows management committee to demonstrate the quality of their operation.
- Provides some form of security to funders and statutory services that the management committee is working to a nationally recognised framework and standard.

Community Matters is the national federation for community associations and similar organisations. It has played a key role in promoting and supporting action by ordinary people in response to social, educational and recreational needs in their neighbourhood and communities. The organisation has developed quality standards for community associations which were produced through consultation with a wide range of its members and associates. These standards primarily stem from the "VISIBLE" model of seven principles for community associations. Although the work on the VISIBLE model was mainly undertaken for community associations it could be equally applied to other kinds of community organisations covering communities of place or communities of interest, hence it has been used in this strategy for management committees of community buildings. The model has been adapted in order for it to be relevant to the present study and a set of standards describing the sort of practice that would uphold the VISIBLE principles have been outlined.

The VISIBLE model consists of the following seven principles:

- □ A **V**oice to represent issues of local concern.
- An Independent and politically neutral organisation.
- □ A Service provider for local people.
- □ An Initiator of projects to meet locally identified needs.
- A strong Local network of people and organisations.
- □ A way to Engage local people to become active in their communities.

TARGET 2

CDC should adopt the use of the 'VISIBLE' model of seven principles for management committees. Those community buildings and management committees that meet the principles and standards outlined below should be given priority in terms of allocating funding and resources in line with the action plan. (See Appendix Two for a more detailed outline of standards.)

4.4 Generic targets

A number of generic targets have been identified through consultation and the findings of the Assessment Report.

TARGET 3

Support the management committees/schools/sports centres in ensuring that all new built facilities must meet DDA guidelines, and existing facilities to make reasonable adjustments to meet with DDA legislation and are accessible to all residents. Support those village halls, in gaining funding, if required, to upgrade buildings to meet with DDA requirements (see Appendix One).

TARGET 4

Strive to ensure that, where new facilities are built, they are situated in close proximity to public transport and/or public highways as well as serving the needs of the local population within the drive time catchment of such facilities and do not duplicate and compete with other similar facilities.

In addition to this providers need to be aware of the run off space at the side of sports courts pitches to be in line with Health and Safety regulations.

4.5 Village hall specific targets

Street survey

The street survey carried out as part of this study identified that 80% of respondents feel that village halls are either very important or important. This would suggest, therefore, that the long term future of the halls is relatively secure. This also indicates the considerable significance that residents place on these facilities. It is therefore paramount that CDC strives to ensure that facilities are of good quality, accessible to all residents and provide services and programmes that are relevant.

The survey also highlighted that 29% of 16-24 year olds stated that village halls are not very important to them and conversely 48% stated that they are either very important or important and 44% of residents over 60 felt that they are very important. These figures emphasise the fact that as Craven is a District with an ageing population. This sector of the community finds the village halls to be particularly important to them. The majority of activities at village halls are geared towards the over 50 age group i.e. WI, coffee morning, indoor bowling, arts groups, whist etc., although there are village halls that hold youth clubs and mother and toddler groups.

TARGET 5

CDC needs to continue to invest in, and look at innovative partnership working options to ensure that local residents, both young people and the older generation, continue to gain maximum benefit from village hall facilities.

TARGET 6

Where feasible, CDC should work with the management committees of community buildings, particularly where there is a high concentration of young people (i.e. Skipton), to provide activities and services that are more relevant to younger people.

Survey work

The survey work that was carried out with the representatives of the management committees has not provided as much detail on the levels of use of buildings and is for the most part based around the physical assessment of buildings. This was primarily due to the fact that not all of the management committee representatives were able to supply KKP with accurate records of users of the buildings. This information was available for some of the buildings.

The lack of quality usage and programming information means that it is not possible to fully assess the need for the buildings, their spare capacity and the need for additional facilities. As a result the majority of this report outlines the need for financial investment in the improvement of physical attributes of the facilities. To

support some of the strategic recommendations detailed in this report, it is advised that CDC works with all the village halls in the area to compile a comprehensive database of users.

TARGET 7

CDC should monitor usage of buildings to ensure that programmes of use reflect community need and priorities identified in the Community Plan. Programmes should be reviewed annually.

4.6 Scoring criteria based assessment of facility priorities

The development of the Strategy and Action Plan has necessitated the development of scoring criteria for all community buildings and sports halls in Craven (see appendix two for complete tables for each analysis area). It has been developed as a mathematical tool to underpin the qualitative work completed during the course of the study. It has been referred to in each of the section 4.6 for each analysis area. The model includes the following categories:

Category	Justification
Under 16 population living within 1km of facility.	Importance placed on the provision of (potentially) 'walk-to' facility for people, particularly young people.
Under 16 population living between1 and 5km of facility.	Importance placed on the availability of public/private transport facility for people, particularly young people.
Over 55 population living within 1km of facility.	Importance placed on 'walk-to' accessibility of facility for older people.
Over 55 population living between 1 and 5km of facility.	Importance placed upon accessibility of facility via public/private transport for older people.
Indices of Multiple Deprivation	Importance placed on the role community sports and leisure facilities and opportunities can play in addressing social inequalities in Craven.
Access to services/transport networks	Addressing the issue of rurality in the District.
Condition survey	Addressing the issue of the condition of the building and the immediacy of the maintenance.
Proximity to other facilities	Addressing the issue of proximity of one facility to another.
Conforming to DDA	Addressing the issue of conforms to DDA requirements.
Size	Addressing the issue of the size of facilities in relation to the number of rooms of each building.

It is important to note that the scoring criteria model is quantitative and does not take into account the qualitative information gathered independently through consultation. The scoring criteria model is not, therefore, at any time used in isolation. It does, however, add further verification to the research undertaken.

4.7 Key issues and recommendations

This section of the report refers to the village halls within Craven District Council. Each section includes the individual score for the facilities which has been designated using the scoring matrix. In some cases a relatively self-supporting hall has a high score and thus appears to be a high priority but this may not necessarily be the case. It may have achieved a high score due to its proximity to other facilities, or due to the indices of deprivation. Conversely other halls may actually be a high priority but have a low score and again this is due to the criteria that have been selected for use in the matrix. It is therefore paramount that the quantitative information is not used in isolation when determining priority sites.

4.7.1 North Craven sub area

There are nine village halls in the area of which three are large, five are average sized and one is small. Out of a total population of (within 1km catchment for all facilities) of 15,393 in the area:

- □ 46% have access to a large facility within 1 km.
- □ 48% have access to an average sized facility within 1km.
- 42% have access to a large facility within 5km (out of a total population of up to 5km).

Summary of key issues

- Lack of volunteers to continue the development of certain facilities.
- □ A number of facilities are in close proximity to each other hence planned developments could have a negative impact on usage levels.
- □ Management concerns regarding ongoing revenue costs.

Using the scoring criteria outlined in section 4.5 each of the facilities in the analysis area has been given a priority ranking in which I = highest priority and 58 = lowest priority (see appendix for full scoring breakdown). These scores have then been used to supplement the qualitative information gathered through consultation and sight visits in order to inform the recommendations below.

- □ 13 Ingleton Community Centre
- 22 Clapham Village Hall
- 25 Eldroth Parish Hall
- □ 30 Austwick Parish Hall
- 31 Westhouse Village Hall
- **33 Bentham Community Centre**
- □ 35 Bentham Town Hall
- 42 Low Bentham Victoria Institute
- □ 46 Burton in Lonsdale

Low Bentham Victoria Institute is one of the lowest priority buildings in the area particularly given its close proximity to other facilities. Eldroth Parish Hall and Clapham Village Hall are towards the top of the list of priorities for the North Craven area, although improvements are already taking place at Eldroth Parish Hall and a need for support has not been identified at Clapham. Ingleton Community Centre highlighted at the top of the list has identified a need for additional facilities as it is operating at capacity but could cater for more groups if it had larger facilities. The high score of the facility indicates its importance of local residents.

Recommendations

- □ Consideration should be given to rationalising the provision at Low Bentham Victoria Institute. As Bentham Town Hall is being improved it could cater for the existing users at the Institute. In addition to this some users could be transferred to Bentham Community Centre; increased usage at the Community Centre could also provide extra income to contribute to the revenue costs of the building.
- □ Consideration should also be given to supporting the management committees of the community buildings (i.e. Ingleton Community Centre) that have received a higher score to ensure that local residents get the best use out of the facilities provided. This support should consist of assistance with funding applications to improve or develop facilities, increasing volunteer recruitment and improved marketing of the halls.

4.7.2 Settle sub area

There are eight halls in the area of which two are large and six are average sized. Out of a total population of (up to 1km for all facilities) of 14,918 in the area:

- □ 42% have access to a large facility within 1 km.
- □ 58% have access to an average sized facility within 1km.
- I 6% have access to a large facility within 5km (out of a total population of up to 5km).

Summary of key issues

- There are a number of larger facilities in the Settle analysis area but only three (Settle Drill Hall, Victoria Hall and Long Preston Village Hall) which have a clear community function.
- A number of facilities require upgrade to meet DDA legislation.

Using the scoring criteria outlined in section 4.5 each of the facilities in the analysis area has been given a priority ranking in which I = highest priority and 58 = lowest priority (see appendix for full scoring breakdown). These scores have then been used to supplement the qualitative information gathered through consultation and sight visits in order to inform the recommendations below.

- □ 15 Rathmell Reading Rooms
- □ 16 Victoria Hall
- □ 26 Long Preston Village Hall
- 27 Hellifield Institute
- □ 41 Settle Town Hall
- **51** Clarks Old School Wigglesworth
- □ 52 Giggleswick Parish Rooms
- □ 54 Settle Drill Hall

In addition to the above facilities there is a new build in Tosside, Wigglesworth, which will be opening in July 2004. This has not been included in the scoring criteria as it is a facility which is not currently operational. However it will be a priority for CDC in terms of providing support to ensure that residents are fully aware of the activities and services that are to be provided at the facility.

Settle Drill Hall is one of the main community facilities within the area and, although it is at the bottom of the list of priorities, it is an important building for Settle because the facility is in the process of renovation and does require some capital funding to complete the planned work. The remaining buildings in the area are relatively small (with exception of Victoria Hall and the Town Hall) and appear to be self-supporting with support required only to improve the facilities to meet with DDA legislation. The Victoria Hall has recently been refurbished to provide a venue

for community groups and it is important that this is well promoted so it is fully utilised.

The management committee of Giggleswick Parish Rooms has aspirations to renovate a barn area that could be used for young people.

Recommendations

There are a number of good quality facilities in the Settle area that appear to be well used. It is vital that CDC targets its resources to those that are in most need:

- □ Support Settle Drill Hall in identifying potential sources of funding to complete the renovation work. This support should consist of assistance with funding applications, increasing volunteer recruitment, and improved marketing of the hall.
- □ Work with the management committee of Victoria Hall to promote the recently refurbished facilities to local community groups.
- □ There is no ramped access or toilet for people with disabilities at Clarks Old School. CDC should support the management committee in making reasonable adjustments to enable improved access. Developing a toilet would possibly not be financially feasible but ramped access would ensure the building was at least accessible to all residents.
- □ Work closely with the management committee of Giggleswick Parish Rooms to investigate the feasibility of renovating the barn area into a young people's room, i.e. further investigation into whether there is a need, the structures of the building, and potential sources of funding? There is also no access for people with disabilities to the room upstairs but with the hall being a relatively small building it would be unlikely that funding would be received to incorporate a lift.

4.7.3 Skipton sub area

There are 13 village halls in the area of which six are large, three are average sized and four are small. Out of a total population of (up to 1km for all facilities) of 60 216 in the area:

- □ 71% have access to a large facility within 1km.
- 25% have access to an average sized facility within 1km.
- 53% have access to a large facility within 5km (out of a total population of up to 5km).

Summary of key issues

- Good spread of facilities within Skipton that are being well used.
- Lack of suitable car parking spaces surrounding some facilities.
- A number of facilities require renovating to meet DDA legislation.

Using the scoring criteria outlined in section 4.5 each of the facilities in the analysis area has been given a priority ranking in which I = highest priority and 58 = lowest priority (see appendix for full scoring breakdown). These scores have then been used to supplement the qualitative information gathered through consultation and sight visits in order to inform the recommendations below.

- □ I -Skipton Youth and Community Centre
- □ 2 St Andrews Church Hall
- □ 4 Skipton Little Theatre
- 5 Skipton Town Hall
- □ 6 Carleton Village Hall
- □ 7 Embsay with Eastby Village Hall
- □ 12 Broughton Hall
- □ 14 Draughton Village Hall
- □ 37 Gargrave Village Hall
- 43 Richard Tottie Memorial Hall
- **50** Greatwood and Horseclose Community Centre
- □ 57 Thornton in Craven Village Hall
- □ 57 West Marton Village Hall

The highest priority facility is the Skipton Youth and Community Centre along with the St Andrews Church Hall – as well as the highest in the area they are also the top priorities for the District as a whole. This is an indication of the concentration of population surrounding the two facilities, (both young and older people), as well as the relative importance of the facilities.

Skipton Little Theatre, although primarily used for drama productions, is an important focal point for the community and does require some investment to improve the facilities.

There is a number of facilities that have been given a high score but are relatively self-supporting and require little additional assistance. This applies to Carleton Village Hall, Embsay with Eastby Village Hall and Broughton Hall.

Recommendations

Skipton sub area has the highest density population overall in the District and there is a good spread of facilities for all residents in the area. The majority of these are being well used with no additional village halls required.

- Usage levels of Broughton Hall should be monitored once the facility opens in August 2004. This is to ensure that it does not have any negative displacement effect on other facilities within Skipton.
- Provide support to Skipton Youth and Community Centre in improving the car parking facilities.
- □ Support the Management Committee of Skipton Little Theatre in improving the facilities at the building particularly refurbish the leaking roof and develop the facility to meet with DDA requirements.
- □ Where feasible, support should be given to Draughton Village Hall to drive its programmes and services available into the heart of the community.
- □ Thornton in Craven Village Hall and West Marton Village Hall were identified as buildings requiring improvements to meet with DDA legislation. The hall in Thornton does have ramped access and so is reasonable in terms of accessibility. To develop toilets for people with disabilities would mean an extension to the building, as the existing toilets are on the ground floor with stairs leading to them. This would not be financially viable for such a small hall. West Marton, however, does need to make reasonable adjustments to the building to make it accessible. CDC should support and enable the management committee in developing some form of ramped access.

4.7.4 South Craven sub area

There are eight village halls in the area of which three are large, four are average sized and one is small. Out of a total population of (up to 1km for all facilities) of 27,696 in the area:

- 64% have access to a large facility within 1 km.
- 27% have access to an average sized facility within 1km.
- 28% have access to a large facility within 5km (out of a total population of up to 5km).

Summary of key issues

- Possibility of amalgamating Lothersdale Village and Lothersdale Village Clubhouse as the two facilities both have issues which could be resolved if this occurred.
- Cowling Village Hall is currently in poor condition and hence under used. A buildings audit is being undertaken, which will decide the future of the Hall.
- Glusburn Institute has employed a development officer to increase the awareness of the services available.

Using the scoring criteria outlined in section 4.5 each of the facilities in the analysis area has been given a priority ranking in which I = highest priority and 58 = lowest priority (see appendix for full scoring breakdown). These scores have then been used to supplement the qualitative information gathered through consultation and sight visits in order to inform the recommendations below.

- □ 3 Cononley Institute
- **a** 8 Glusburn Institute
- **9** Kildwick and Farnhill Institute
- □ 10 The Parish Rooms
- □ II Sutton Village Hall
- □ 20 Cowling Village Hall
- 40 Lothersdale Village Clubhouse
- □ 48 Lothersdale Village Hall

Although Cononley Institute has been identified as the highest priority in the area it is apparent from the Assessment Report that little additional support is required as it is self-supporting. Similarly, The Parish Rooms appears to require little additional assistance.

The Glusburn and Kildwick and Farnhill Institutes both have a high score in the analysis area and in the District as a whole. This is in line with the findings from the Assessment Report and it is recommended that CDC target these sites for support.

Cowling Village Hall has been given a low score for the analysis area but is quite high overall in the District. There is a need for some form of community facility in the

Village which needs to be taken into account when the conclusion of the audit is published.

It is interesting to note that the two facilities in Lothersdale have been given a low score. Even though a community facility is required in the village there is little need for two.

Recommendations

South Craven sub area has a good strategic spread of facilities although there is overprovision in Lothersdale.

- □ Work closely with the development officer at Glusburn Institute to increase the awareness of the facility and develop it as an arts centre but with a clear community focus.
- □ Where feasible, support should be given to the management committee of Kildwick and Farnhill Institute to advertise their programmes and services into the heart of the community, particularly as the facility has recently been refurbished.
- □ Provide support and resources to Sutton Village Hall to improve the heating at the building.
- Further investigation into the feasibility of merging the two facilities at Lothersdale to form one average sized facility to cater for the residents in the Village.
- □ Once the audit in Cowling has been completed CDC should accordingly work towards providing a suitable community facility for the residents of the village.

4.7.5 Yorkshire Dales National Park

There are 20 village halls in the area of which two are large, ten are average sized and eight are small. Out of a total population of (up to 1km for all facilities) of 14,289 in the area:

- □ 28% have access to a large facility within 1 km.
- 24% have access to an average sized facility within 1km.
- I7% have access to a large facility within 5km (out of a total population of up to 5km).

Summary of key issues

- □ The majority of facilities in the area are either small or average sized reflecting the sparseness of the population they are catering for.
- □ A number of facilities require renovation to comply with DDA legislation.
- □ A small number of facilities are struggling to meet the revenue costs of the buildings.

Using the overall village hall mathematical prioritisation model (in which I = highest priority, 58 = lowest priority) for the District – which is intended for use as a supplement for qualitative local assessment and evaluation the priority attached to the facilities in the Yorkshire Dales National Park (YDNP) sub area is as follows, (please see Appendix document to view the whole table):

- □ 17 Cracoe Village Hall
- **I8** Grassington Devonshire Institute
- □ 19 Kettlewell Hall
- □ 21 Buckden Village Institute
- 23 Conistone with Kilnsey Village Hall
- □ 24 Kirby Malham Hall
- □ 28 Bolton Abbey Village Hall
- □ 29 Langcliffe Village Institute
- □ 32 Anderton Memorial Institute
- □ 34 Methodist Church Hall Hetton
- **36** Horton-in-Ribblesdale Village Hall
- □ 38 Amerdale Hall
- □ 39 Malham Village Hall
- □ 44 Airton Methodist Church
- □ 45 Halton Gill Reading Room
- 47 Burnsall Village Hall
- 49 Threshfield Village Institute
- □ 53 Stainforth Village Hall
- 55 The Ibbotson Institute
- **56** Appletreewick Village Hall

The YDNP area has a sparse population in comparison to the other areas of Craven, which is reflective of the size of the facilities in that they are quite small with only a few larger facilities. There is a small number of community buildings that are struggling to meet the revenue costs of running the facilities. One such example is Airton Methodist Church, which has experienced decreased usage over the last twenty years and requires improvements to the heating and to meet with DDA legislation. It has quite a low score for the overall area in terms of scoring, which supports the argument for the rationalisation of this facility. It may be more economical to close the hall area of the building and convert it to other use than to continue struggling to meet costs. Airton is close to Kirby Malham Hall, which also requires additional fundraising for its upkeep. The displacement of users from Airton to Kirby Malham would help with the running costs of the village hall at Kirby Malham (which has quite a high score).

Another facility in a similar situation is the lbbotson Institute (also a low priority for the area), which has experienced decreased usage and on occasions is vacant. The building also requires upgrading to conform to statutory guidelines. The hall is in close proximity to Burnsall Village Hall and the larger Grassington Devonshire Institute as well as Anderton Memorial Intitute. Consequently there are accessible facilities for residents local to Ibbotson. Consideration should, therefore, be given to the possibility of rationalising the provision at this site as it would be more economical rather than attempt to revive the building.

Although Cracoe Village Hall has been designated a high score, using the scoring criteria, little support is required to either improve or develop the hall as it is relatively new and in good condition. As highlighted earlier it is important to take into account both the qualitative and quantitative information when prioritising sites for action.

Recommendations

Generally the facilities are in good condition within the YDNP and are relatively self-supporting, however certain recommendations are suggested to improve the capacity and statutory requirements:

- □ Consideration should be given to rationalising the facilities at Airton and at Ibbotson as they are experiencing difficulties in the revenue costs and attracting users.
- □ Support the management committee of Ammerdale Hall in its plans to incorporate toilets for people with disabilities and improved access to the building.
- □ Appletreewick Village Hall is a small, local facility which requires primarily improved access. CDC should support the Hall in identifying possible ways of working towards this. Although there is no toilet for people with disabilities, the size of the facility makes this financially difficult to achieve.
- Malham Village Hall is also in a similar situation as it has unsuitable access to the building. CDC should work with the management committee in identifying possible ways of developing ramped access.

4.8 Sports hall specific targets

The sports halls within Craven currently are generally of good quality. The key issue is whether there are sufficient facilities and the location of proposed facilities. It is paramount that where facilities are developed, they should have a minimum displacement effect on the smaller village halls and other sports halls (although generally they do cater for a different market).

It is also important that a new sports hall in Skipton should have as little impact as possible on usage levels at Coulthurst Craven Sports Centre (CCSC). One possible way of achieving this would be to advocate that the hall at CCSC is primarily a 'pay and play' facility and conversely any new facility at Aireville School should be considered as having more of a club development role.

Where new/proposed facilities are being developed CDC needs to ensure that there is a clear community use agreement attached to them. This is to enable access to the sports halls by the local community and a wider catchment. In addition to this, to make facilities economically sustainable, they need to be marketed and promoted appropriately both to local residents and the wider area to ensure they will attract as many users as possible.

TARGET 8

Strive to ensure that where new/proposed facilities, which are not solely for local community use i.e. at Aireville School and Giggleswick School, there is a clear partnership understanding and community use agreement where there is an identified need for such a facility within the local community. The Council should negotiate for a community use agreement through a Section 106 agreement.

TARGET 9

CDC to continue in engaging with key stakeholders, i.e. Aireville School, Craven College, Skipton RMTI over the needs and aspirations to develop further built facilities such as a climbing wall, in Skipton.

TARGET 10

Where feasible, CDC should adopt a policy, to promote a new facility at Aireville School as a club development centre and the existing sports hall at CCSC as a 'pay and play' facility.

TARGET II

Actively promote new facilities both to local residents and the wider area to attract as many users as possible. Adopt Sport England guidelines and good practice principles to ensure that new facilities cater for wide community need and are socially and economically viable.

5. FUNDING

The role of village halls is primarily one of providing a resource for the local community. The activity that takes places at the halls is more important than the 'bricks and mortar'. There is, however, a balance that needs to be struck between providing good facilities and ensuring that they support a diverse range of activities available to the whole community, although clearly the two are linked – good facilities have the potential to attract a wider range of uses. Encouragement needs to be given to more village halls to be multi-purpose venues supporting a wide range of activities and services for the benefit of the whole community.

Experience suggests that most village halls are reasonably self-sufficient in terms of revenue finance, sometimes helped by grants as well as the various fundraising activities that are organised. On the other hand, finding the money for major capital works can present serious issues. Funders are also increasingly concerned to ensure that any new grants that they make for capital projects are considered in parallel with the viability of the hall in revenue terms.

The scope for funding village halls is diverse and complex. Currently there is a widespread view that there is little joined up funding and the application process is difficult for the management committees. However there is a number of relevant sources of funding that are available to resource capital and revenue costs:

Funding organisation	Description	Maximum grant
Community Fund	The Community Fund is the major Lottery funder of village halls and has, since its launch, given a major boost to village hall capital funding.	Medium grants programme - £500 - £60, 000
	In Summer 2003 the Community Fund published guidelines for village hall/community space applicants to help them make better applications.	Large grants - £60, 000+
	The Fund is unlikely to make grants solely to comply with statutory requirements such as facilities for people with disabilities.	
Awards for All	This is supported by the Arts Council of England, Community Fund, the Heritage Lottery Fund, New Opportunities Fund and Sport England.	£500 -£5000
	The main aim of the Awards for All programme is to support projects which are open and accessible to the community, allowing people to enjoy a wide range of activities. They can fund projects which enable people to take part in art, sport,	
	heritage and community activities as well as projects that promote education, the	

Table 3: Sources of funding 1

	environment and health in the local community.	
Big Lottery Fund	This was created by merging the New Opportunities Fund and the Community Fund. It will distribute half the money for good causes from the National Lottery. Launched on June 2004, the Big Lottery Fund will build on the experience and best practice of both organisations to simplify funding in those areas where the two bodies overlap, and to ensure Lottery funding provides the best value for money.	Grants are available for large, medium sized and small projects.
Village Hall Loans Fund	This fund is administered by ACRE on behalf of the Countryside Agency. It is under subscribed despite the lenient terms of the loans as many village hall committees view the loan fund as a last resort.	Loans of up to $£20,000$ are available. Larger loans may be available at the discretion of the Countryside Agency.
	A minimum contribution of £1 per head of population or 10% of the total project cost must be made by the local community. Committees which are responsible for village halls held on charitable trusts and serving rural communities are eligible.	The interest rate is set by the Treasury and no charge is made against the property.
Rural Enterprise Scheme	Defra's Rural Development Service is responsible for implementation of the Rural Enterprise Scheme.	Around £2m, rising to £4m has been set aside for this project.
	Funds can help to renovate and develop village halls – one priority is renovation of buildings for use as for example multi- functional village halls.	
	The Scheme is competitive, and there is no guarantee that individual bids will succeed. Co-ordinated bids, bringing together a range of smaller projects in areas with a particular need for community facilities, are likely to be successful.	
Regional Development Agency – Yorkshire Forward	RDAs have a potentially significant role in funding village halls, which can make a substantial contribution to local social and economic regeneration. In reality, however, funding from this source is thought to be very small.	Dependent on amount of funding set aside for village halls at Yorkshire Forward.
Lloyds TSB Foundation	Grant making Foundation giving grants to registered charities mainly to improve the quality of life in local communities. Lloyds TSB has funded tables, chairs, kitchen equipment, staging etc. They have also	Successful village halls generally receive a maximum of £2, 500.
	funded accessible toilets, but when making an application to show the need, they will be looking at how well the hall is used, not at DDA regulations.	
Local fundraising	Village halls raise money through fundraising	Dependent on scope of

activities to support either revenue needs or for specific improvements. This can be done	activity.
through various events such as coffee mornings, concerts, festivals, and fetes.	
Local fundraising has been an essential aspect of the funding package for major work where the project can often take years to develop.	

Parish/town council involvement

Work by ACRE (Village Halls In England, 1999) shows that 35% of respondents received financial help from local government with the majority of this coming from Parish Councils (parish councils provided funding for 30% of village halls). Ownership of the hall is an important issue when considering sources of funding:

Source of funding	Available to Parish Council	Available to charity
Local fundraising	\checkmark	\checkmark
Lottery: Community Fund	x	\checkmark
Lottery: Heritage Fund (only available to listed buildings and buildings with conservation areas)	\checkmark	\checkmark
Lottery: Awards for All	\checkmark	\checkmark
Rural Enterprise Scheme (Defra)	x	\checkmark
Charitable trusts	x	\checkmark
Gift Aid	x	\checkmark

Table 4: Sources of funding 2

5.1 Planning agreements

Contributions by developers have, on occasion, been used as a means of supporting community facilities where the community benefit relates closely to the nature of the development. This source of income is less widely available in rural areas where development is largely small scale and incremental. Care needs to be taken to insure that both capital costs and revenue expenditure are considered in any planning agreement.

Methodology for calculating contributions and their application to development proposals

Where development proposals will result in the loss of an existing community facility, they will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Any assessment will be informed by both the Assessment Report and Strategy and Action Plan for Built Facilities.

The Council will negotiate for contributions to improve, maintain or provide new community facilities, through planning agreements linked to new residential development.. These negotiations will be based around an assessment of:

- Scale of the proposed residential development.
- □ Level of deficiency or improvements required to community facilities within the locality.
- □ Whether the need for new or improvements to existing community facilities directly relate to the proposal.

Framework for expenditure of contributions

It is intended to focus the use of community development contributions towards identified projects within the same sub area as the proposed residential development in order to ease the impact of new residents from these developments on the local community facilities. The options below provide Craven District Council with a number of choices for use of commuted sums and provide details on how they can be used strategically to decrease shortfalls in provision or enhance the quality of existing sites.

a) Provision of a new community facility

Provision of a new facility would be an option in areas where:

- **u** There is a deficiency in terms of built facilities within the analysis area.
- Developments are large enough to create their own demand for facilities.

Developers will be required to contribute to the maintenance of the facility provided for a period of ten years from satisfactory completion. Such contributions would be secured via a planning agreement between the developer and the Council. Craven District Council will then proceed to distribute this funding to a group or organisation to carry out site maintenance, e.g. parish council, grounds maintenance company.

b) Contributions to Improve or Maintain Existing Community Facilities Via an Area Development Pot Approach

Due to the overall scale of residential development within Craven District outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park, it is unlikely that the provision of a new community facility by a developer could be achieved with any regularity. Negotiations between developers and the Council would be carried out to establish whether developer contributions should be paid to the Council in order to contribute to the improvement or maintenance of existing facilities. These negotiations will be based around an assessment of:

- □ Scale of the proposed residential development.
- □ Level of deficiency or improvements required to community facilities within the locality.
- □ Whether the need for new or improvements to existing community facilities directly relate to the proposal.

Where it is established by the Council that developers should contribute towards the improvement or maintenance of existing facilities it is proposed that all new dwellings are required to mitigate their impact by contributing as follows: [Further justification is required for levels of contribution listed below]

	Size of dwelling	Development route	Contribution
	I or 2 bedroomed	I	£1500
Improvement or	dwelling		
provision of	3 bedroomed dwelling	I	£2000
community	or above		
facilities.	I or 2 bedroomed	2	£1000
	dwelling		
	3 bedroom dwelling or	2	£1500
	above		
	I or 2 bedroomed	3	£750
	dwelling		
	3 bedroomed dwelling	3	£1000
	or above		

Table 5: Contributions

Commuted sums would then be paid into an area development pot for each sub area. The pots will allow commuted sums to be spent strategically at a local level. Therefore deficiencies in provision can be addressed according to community needs.

If the development is small and the commuted sum collected does not total the amount needed to meet minimum site sizes (what are these?), contributions should be used to create an area development pot. In areas of deficiency the 'area development pot' will be used to create new provision at strategic sites. In areas of surplus the pot will be used to improve, maintain and enhance current sites.

Five percent (of what?) will be set aside for the development/partnership work needed for built facilities development. When a developer contributes to the area development pot they will not be liable to pay the revenue costs of 10 years maintenance. They will therefore pay the capital costs only of the commuted sum.

Centrally located facilities

In some cases it may be appropriate to use contributions for the improvement of facilities which are centrally located and are used by residents from different parts of the District including new developments. Where there is a significant need for new

or improvements to centrally located facilities that serve the whole District, contributions will be directed towards such facilities.

Future recommendations

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that CDC set a minimum standard for the maintenance and condition of built facility provision. Information supplied by ACRE, and Community Matters and legal legislation will support this process.

- A full audit of CDC sites using this standard will bring attention to specific problems. CDC sites must be enhanced and created in line with this standard.
- □ The standard should be made available to parish councils and other building owners so that they can develop their sites accordingly. CDC could link the provision of funding to owners that meet this standard.

Recommendation 2

An implementation arm is created within CDC in order to administer and develop built facilities strategically. Implementation arms currently exist within the leisure departments at Birmingham City Council and Wolverhampton City Council. 'Arms' have been created in order to ensure specific funds are ring fenced for leisure and open space development/enhancement rather than being combined in a general community fund. A small percentage of funding from the area leisure development pots could be used to support the employment of a part time officer responsible for open space, sport and recreation development.

Recommendation 3

The current structure of the Council is such that there is no existing function that could realistically and successfully implement this strategy. The delivery of commuted sums is achieved under the existing structure. It is recommended this existing structure be modified to ensure that the Council are provided with an opportunity for local groups to apply for a proportion of commuted sums for new or upgrading of existing provision, or for the maintenance of existing facilities. A community use agreement must be created between the local authority and the appropriate user group.

The strategy and action plan for built facilities would form the criteria for assessing such applications and directing sums to areas of deficiency through an "area leisure development pot" approach.

Resources will be needed within the community facilities and leisure department to manage the implementation of commuted sums effectively. It is recommended that the proposed Implementation Arm within the Council would be responsible for managing and implementing this funding process. The London Borough of Barnet is currently in a similar position and is therefore advertising for appropriate personnel.

6. Action plan 2004-2009

6.1 Criteria to justify the inclusion of sites within the action plan

The following criteria have been used to identify priorities and justify the inclusion of sites within the action plan.

- □ The analysis area is deficient in the development/enhancement of sites.
- □ The site has received a relatively high score via the scoring criteria from within the analysis area.
- □ The site requires some support to increase awareness of services and facilities available.
- The site suffers from access problems in terms of safety, poor quality facilities and poor disability provision.
- Evaluation of sites use is needed as the site is of poor quality and is underused due to a surplus of provision in the locality.

6.2 Hierarchy of priorities

A hierarchy of priorities has been developed to provide some guidance to CDC as to which facilities should be given high, medium or low priority for support, targeting resources and investment.

Table 6: Hierarchy of priorities

Priority	Criteria
High	High score from the matrix.
	Serving a large catchment.
	Is a development route 2 facility thereby attracting users from district wide as well as from within an analysis area.
	Facility requires some support to increase awareness.
	Requires improvements to meet DDA legislation.
Medium	Relatively high score form the matrix.
	Serving a local catchment.



	-	
		Is a development route 2 or 3 facility.
		Well-used facility.
	Relatively self-supporting	
		Requires substantial research or further investigation.
		Requires improvements to meet DDA legislation.
Low		Low score from the matrix.
		Serving a very local catchment.
		Is a development route 3 facility.
		Relatively well used facility.
		Self-supporting.

The facilities that have been targeted as high, medium, or low meet at least three of the criteria highlighted. The Action Plan details the priorities for CDC for the next five years.

6.3 Actions for sports halls

Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes
Ensure that any new sports halls meet DDA requirements, have a minimal displacement effect on facilities in close proximity, and meet the appropriate criteria particularly Health and Safety regulations.	Local providers, CDC	Ensuring facilities are of a particular standard. Facilities meet all necessary legislation.
CDC should negotiate for community use agreements for facilities where there is an identified need within the local community.	Local providers, CDC	Where facilities are built, they are made available for community use.
CDC to continue to engage with key stakeholders, i.e. Aireville School, Craven College, Skipton RMTI, over the needs and aspirations to develop further built facilities such as a sports hall and climbing wall in Skipton.	Aireville School, Craven College, Skipton RMTI, CDC	Effective and strong partnership working. All necessary partners are kept informed with developments.
CDC should investigate the possibility of promoting any new facility at Aireville School as a club development centre and the existing sports hall at Coulthurst Craven Sports Centre as a 'pay and play' facility.	Aireville School, Craven College, Coulthurst Craven Sports Centre, CDC	Facilities specialising in club development and 'pay and play' in Skipton.



|--|

6.4 Actions for network of village halls

A number of actions have been identified to benefit the network of village halls in the District as well as individual buildings. These are intended to provide some direction to CDC and the various partners as to the way forward for village halls in the area.

Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes
There is a need to ensure that the buildings are managed effectively and governed. CDC should set a minimum standard for the quality of buildings and the skills of the management committees.	CDC, Yorkshire Rural Community Council (YRCC), management committees.	District standard for community buildings which is relevant for existing facilities as well as providing some guidance for any new buildings.
All buildings are well publicised by producing a community buildings leaflet, detailing all the built facility provision in Craven, with a short description of services that are on offer. In addition to this the contact details of parish councils, relevant management committee members and booking secretaries should be provided so that new and existing residents are aware of whom to contact if, for example, they wished to book a village hall.	CDC, YRCC, Council for Voluntary Services (CVS), Tourist Board, management committees.	Residents, as well as tourists, are aware of the facilities that are available in the area.
Develop an agreed pricing policy for all community buildings.	CDC, YRCC, CVS, management committees.	Uniform pricing structure for buildings within Craven.
Work with the tourist board and the management committee of buildings to improve the quality of signage for major buildings.	CDC, Tourist Board, management committees.	Community buildings have clear and visible signs allowing for more 'passers-by' to be aware of them.
Agencies (such as the YRCC) should work with management committees to increase the number of volunteers involved with community buildings.	CDC, YRCC, local residents.	Increased human resource within a community building allowing for more scope to develop the buildings and assist with the day to day running of the facilities.



A range of accessible training opportunities should	CDC, YRCC, management committees.	Improved range of skills within the management
be actively promoted to members of the community		committees resulting in better operated facilities.
management boards.		

North Craven sub area

Site	Development route	Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes	Priority
Ingleton Community Centre	2	Provide support to the management committee in terms of funding applications to improve or develop facilities, increase volunteer recruitment, and improve marketing of the hall.	Community Centre,	Increasing the capacity of the management committee. A well run facility providing a good quality service to the local community.	High
Low Bentham Victoria Institute	3	Consider the possibility of rationalising this facility. Bentham Town Hall and the Community Centre could cater for exiting users of the Institute.	Victoria Institute	Providing facilities that are strategically spread in the area. Displacement of users to Bentham Community Centre would mean increased revenue income for the Centre.	Medium



Settle sub area

Site	Development route	Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes	Priority
Settle Drill Hall	3	Support Settle Drill Hall in identifying potential sources of funding to complete the renovation work. This support should consist of assistance with funding applications, increase volunteer recruitment, and improved marketing of the hall.		Increasing the capacity of the management committee. A well run facility providing a good quality service to the local community.	High
Clarks Old School	3	Support the management committee in making reasonable adjustments to enable improved access to the building.		Building conforms to DDA legislation.	Medium
Giggleswick Parish Rooms	3	Investigate the feasibility of renovating the barn area into a young people's room i.e. further investigation into whether there is a clear need for this, survey of the structures of the building, and identifying potential sources of funding.	parish Rooms, local	Cater for the needs of the community if such a facility required. Providing good quality facilities to local residents.	Low

Skipton sub area

Site	Development route	Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes	Priority
Skipton Youth and	2	Improve the car parking facilities.	CDC, Skipton Town Council,	Reduced street car parking in Skipton.	High
Community Centre			St Andrews Church Hall	Good quality facilities for users.	
Draughton Village Hall	3	Support the Management Committee to increase the awareness of services and activities available at the Hall, to local residents.		Increased awareness of the Village Hall to local residents. Increased usage of the facilities.	Medium



West Marton Village Hall	3	Support the Village Hall in making reasonable adjustments to the building to make it accessible for people with disabilities.		Site meets with DDA legislation.	Medium
Skipton Little Theatre	3	Facilitate the management committee of the theatre in applying for funding to improve the facilities, particularly the leaking roof and to meet with DDA legislation.		Good quality site. Site meets with DDA legislation.	Low
Broughton Hall	2	Usage levels of the hall should be monitored once it is fully operational.	CDC, Broughton Hall	Ensure that little displacement from other sites in Skipton.	Low

South Craven sub area

Site	Development route	Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes	Priority
Glusburn Institute	2	Liase closely with the development officer at Glusburn Institute to increase the awareness of the facility and the services available.	CDC, Glusburn Institute, Development Officer	Increased awareness of a good quality facility resulting in increased usage.	High
Kildwick and Farnhill Institute	2	Provide support to the management committee in terms of advertising the programmes and services available, particularly as the facility has recently been refurbished.	CDC, Kildwick and Farnhill Institute	Increased awareness of a good quality facility resulting in increased usage.	Medium
Sutton Village Hall	2	Work with the management committee to investigate potential sources of funding to improve the heating of the building.	CDC, Sutton Village Hall	Improved quality of a well used facility.	Medium
Cowling Village Hall	3	Once the audit in the village has been completed, CDC should work accordingly towards providing a suitable community facility for the residents.	CDC, Cowling Parish Council	Providing some form of community facility for the residents of Cowling.	Medium
Lothersdale Village Hall	3	Further investigation into the feasibility of merging the two facilities to form one	CDC, Lothersdale Village Hall, Lothersdale	One good quality facility for the residents instead of	Low



and Clubhouse	average sized facility to cater for the	Village Clubhouse attempting to run two
	residents of the village.	average quality facilities.

Yorkshire Dales National Park

Site	Development route	Recommended actions	Partnerships	Outcomes	Priority
Airton Methodist Church The Ibbotson Institute	3	Consideration should be given to rationalising the community facilities at these sites due to the decreased usage of them and the difficulty both sites are experiencing in meeting revenue costs.	CDC, Airton Methodist Church, The Ibbotson Institute.	Alleviation of pressure of meeting costs. Displacement of users to other larger sites.	High
Appletreewick Village Hall	3	CDC should provide support to the management committee to improve access to the building.	CDC, Appletreewick Village Hall	Facility conforms to statutory requirements.	Medium
Malham Village Hall	3	CDC should work with the management committee in identifying possible ways of developing ramped access to the building.	CDC, Malham Village Hall	Facility conforms to statutory requirements.	Medium
Ammerdale Hall	3	Support the management committee in its plans to incorporate toilets for people with disabilities and improved access to the building.	CDC, Ammerdale Hall	Facility conforms to statutory requirements.	Low.



Appendix I - Disability Discrimination Act

From I October 2004, service providers will be required to take reasonable steps to remove, alter or provide a reasonable means of avoiding physical features which make it impossible or unreasonably difficult for disabled people to access their services.

The Act makes it clear that service providers only have to take reasonable steps to make their services accessible taking into account all circumstances – including the costs of any adjustment, its practicality, and the resources available to the organisation. The Act's intention is to encourage a flexible response from service providers and what may be reasonable for a large and well-funded organisation may not be reasonable for a village hall run on a small budget.

The Act does not require unreasonable expenditure – such as would make the facility unviable – either on business, or on the voluntary sector. Reasonable adjustments in the case of village halls might include installing an induction loop to assist a hearing aid user, using proper signage or improved lighting to help a visually impaired person, or a ramp if access through steps is impossible or unreasonably difficult.

Appendix 2 – 'VISIBLE' standards

4.3.1 Voice

Management committee, as they are broadly representative of the local catchment, can give formal shape to concerns that may initially be aired informally at the school or during coffee morning. As community buildings are at the hub of the local area they are well placed to gather the views of local residents. They can conduct less formal and more participative consultation.

A VISIBLE management committee should be able to meet at least one criteria from each of the two sections below.

	VOICE - Standards
Section one	Responds to at least one local consultation every year on behalf of local people.
	Gives committee time to discussing which issues the management committee should respond to and forming a response.
	For each issue to which it responds to, the management committee samples the views of local people before making its response and then keeps local people informed of progress.
	Collaborates with another local organisation on responses to local issues (e.g. YRCC, CVS) ensuring that the management committee view is fed through.
Section two	 Encourages use of its facilities for local people/campaign groups to organise and develop their message.
	 Has ways for local people to air issues of concern to them (e.g. periodic public meetings, newsletters, surveys etc.)
	□ Facilitates debate on local issues by hosting meetings, surgeries etc. where each side can hear the concerns of the other.
	Encourages local councillors and the local MP to hold surgeries at their buildings.

4.3.2 Independent

Management committees are drawn from the local community and involve individuals and representatives of affiliated groups. They are intended to be independent democratic organisations.

A VISIBLE management committee should be able to meet the first six criteria and at least one of the others.

INDEPENDENT - Standards

- □ The organisation expresses no party political opinions and offers equal access to their resources to any/all legitimate political parties.
- □ Has a constitution and procedures which ensure democratic accountability to local people and independence.
- □ Has policies and practices for managing its activities and any resources (such as a building) under its control and is aware of its legal obligations.
- □ Has policies and practices for managing any staff employed by the management committee and is aware of its legal obligations.
- □ Has procedures and financial controls for managing its finances.
- □ Has open election of committee members.
- □ Has an appropriate and accessible place to meet and manages or seeks physical and financial resources to carry out its objectives.
- **D** The voluntary management committee sets strategic direction and takes key decisions.
- □ Has income from several sources (not just the local authority).
- Produces annual accounts independently verified by auditors or under the independent inspection framework.

4.3.3 Service

A community building successfully provides for the social welfare, leisure and recreation needs of the local people. The management committees develop and support a wide range of services in response to the particular needs of their communities. These are needs which are not met fully or affordably by statutory or private provision.

A VISIBLE management committee and community building should be able to meet the first three criteria and any one other.

SERVICE - Standards

- □ Has some services/activities which take place in at least two of the classes identified by ACRE; governance and participation, social benefit, social support, social interest and private events.
- Operates appropriate licenses and has policies to cover health and safety and other regulatory requirements.
- □ Has an equal opportunities policy which it reviews and implements.
- □ Has acted on the information from local needs surveys or requests from the local community and made space in its programme for new services appropriate to all sections of the community.
- □ Has a programme that is based on a wide range of local interests including leisure, sports, arts and cultural activities.
- □ Schedules services for harder to reach groups such as young people (teenagers) and minority groups.
- Offers its essential services affordably to local people.

4.3.4 Initiator

A management committee initiates projects at the community building that successfully respond to local need. The greatest challenge for management committees is to stay relevant to as many people and groups as possible while supporting their traditional members/users. Innovation is an essential requirement when considering new services. Committees have to be prepared to 'think outside the box' if their services are to have appeal in the 21st Century.

A VISIBLE management committee should be able to meet the first criteria and any three others.

INITIATOR – Standards

- □ Understands its role in developing new services to meet challenging need.
- □ Maintains an up-to-date profile of the communities in its catchment area based on age, culture, ethnicity.
- □ Has and periodically uses mechanisms to consult its local communities on needs and interest (e.g. survey).
- □ Has developed at least one new service in the last two years.
- □ Has and uses ways to assess the feasibility of new projects.
- □ Has procedures by which local people/users or committee members can at any time suggest new activities and where these can be considered by the committee.
- □ Has procedures for staying informed about new local initiatives and opportunities.
- □ Has business plans for any major projects.

4.3.5 Builder

Management committee should build strong and effective partnerships with other organisations and groups.. This may be to represent the interests of its community or to use its expertise to advance the project. In the same way the management committees can benefit from the expertise and experience of outside agencies.

A VISIBLE management committee should be able to meet any two criteria.

BUILDER – Standards

- □ Acts as a broker to help its user groups/affiliates/members to make useful contacts and partnerships.
- □ Is in membership of appropriate local forums/partnerships in order to influence local decisions and projects.
- □ Joins other partnerships or projects where it believes it has something to offer.
- □ Seeks partners for its projects and activities where it believes this will add value or for other reasons.
- □ Networks with other management committees and organisations in order to share practice, learn from what others are doing and act collectively.
- □ Has established at least four new contacts with local groups/agencies/organisations in the last two years.
- □ Has a named contact on the local CVS or other local development agency.

4.3.6 Local

Management committees provide a strong local network of people working together to improve a community building for the benefit of the residents in their catchment. The strength of such an organisation is its local focus.

A VISIBLE management committee should be able to meet any two criteria.

LOCAL – Standards

- □ Ensure that the management committee is representative of the groups, individuals, organisations and agencies in their local community through a range of means.
- □ Has good links with a wider network of local groups and individuals.
- □ Seeks feedback from members and groups on ways to improve support.
- □ Has external agency representation on its management committee (such as local authority, CVS etc.).

4.3.7 Engage

A community building provides ways of engaging and encouraging local people to become active in their communities. One way of doing this is to attract volunteers from all sections of the community. They are usually actively involved in running services and activities, sometimes with the support of paid workers.

A VISIBLE management committee should be able to meet the first criteria and any one other.

ENGAGE – Standards

- □ Publicises committee roles and responsibilities and has open and democratic election procedures.
- Has open policies for recruiting volunteers and actively markets opportunities to all sections of the community.
- □ Has procedures in place whereby volunteers can access training opportunities.
- □ Provides a range of ways in which people can become involved both formally and informally.

Appendix 3: Scoring criteria

North Craven sub area scoring criteria

			Catchment distance		Рори	Ilation	up to	l km			Рорі	ulation	l to 5	kms		Indic		Dista to ne	arest		orms	Site	size	Si cond			% Total score	Priority Rank
			Age group	Unde	er l6s	l6 to	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Unde	er 16s	l6 to	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Depri Acce Serv	ss to	Villa Ha (kn	all	to D	DA							
Craven			Weighting	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	1	0	I	0	I	0	I	0			
Village Halls	Analysis Area	Total Population	Ward	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actua	W Score	Actual	W Score			
Austwick Parish Hall	North Craven Sub Area	1,577	CLAPHAM	73	0.29	228	0.34	174	0.43	256	0.57	555	0.48	291	0.45	135	8 57	2 3 3	4 00	4 00	4 00	7.00	7 00	4 00	4 00	30.08	27.35%	30
Bentham Community	North	4,870	BENTHAM	/5	0.27	220	0.54	1/4	0.45	230	0.57	555	0.10	271	0.75	135	0.52	2.33	4.00	1.00	ч.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	ч.00	50.00	27.55/0	
Centre Bentham Town Hall	Sub Area North	3,851	BENTHAM	488	1.92	1,339	2.01	830	2.07	393	0.87	1,053	0.91	767	1.19	5,631	0.20	0.32	1.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	28.18	25.62%	33
Burton - in	Sub Area North	4,519	INGLEBOROUGH	376	1.48	1,045	1.57	639	1.60	347	0.77	885	0.76	559	0.87	5,631	0.20	0.90	1.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	26.25	23.87%	35
- Lonsdale Clapham	Craven Sub Area North	1,369	CLAPHAM	164	0.64	459	0.69	303	0.76	655	1.46	1,766	1.53	1,172	1.82	1,181	0.97	3.14	7.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	20.87	18.97%	46
Village Hall		1,507		175	0.69	435	0.65	258	0.64	94	0.21	245	0.21	162	0.25	135	8.52	2.33	4.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	33.18	30.16%	22
Eldroth Parish Hall	North Craven Sub Area	1,313	CLAPHAM	124	0.49	347	0.52	241	0.60	162	0.36	310	0.27	129	0.20	135	8 57	3.04	7.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	37 96	29.96%	25
Ingleton Community	North	4,529	INGLEBOROUGH	121																								
Centre Low Bentham	Sub Area North Craven	4,870	BENTHAM	421	1.65	1,106	1.66	822	2.05	373	0.83	1,076	0.93	731	1.14	1,181	0.97	0.36	1.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	37.24	33.85%	13
Victoria Institute Westhouse	Sub Area	5,168	INGLEBOROUGH	575	2.26	1,518	2.28	904	2.26	306	0.68	874	0.76	693	1.08	5,631	0.20	0.32	1.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	22.52	20.47%	42
Village Hall		-,		421	1.65	1,106	1.66	822	2.05	530	1.18	1,418	1.23	871	1.35	1,181	0.97	0.36	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	10.00	29.10	26.46%	31



Settle sub area scoring criteria

			Catchment distance		Po	pulation	up to I I	ĸm			Ро	pulation	l to 5 k	ms					arest	Sit confo	orms	Site s		Sit condi			% Total F score	
			Age group		er I6s	l6 to	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Unde	er lós	16 to	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Depriv Acce Serv	ss to	Villa Ha (kn	all	to D	DA							
Craven			Weighting	I	0	l.	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	l.	0	l	-	I	-	10		10	0			
Village Halls	Analysis Area	Total Population	Ward	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score		W Score	Actual	W / Score	Actual	W Score			
Clarks Old	Settle	1,843	RIBBLESIDE																									
School, Wigglesworth	Sub Area			66	0.26	175	0.26	110	0.27	273	0.61	742	0.64	477	0.74	339	3.39	3.46	7.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	19.18	17.44%	51
Giggleswick Parish Rooms		4,679	PENYGHENT	709	2.78	1,597	2.40	1,295	3.23	192	0.43	542	0.47	344	0.53	848	1.36	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	18.21	16.55%	52
Hellifield Institute	Settle Sub Area	2,525	HELLIFIELD	275	1.08	745	1.12	443	1.11	193	0.43	526	0.45	343	0.53	258	4.46										28.35%	
Long Preston Village Hall		2,417	RIBBLESIDE	182	0.71	503	0.76	344	0.86	249	0.55	659	0.57	480	0.75	339	3.39										29.63%	
Rathmell Reading	Settle Sub Area	5,127	RIBBLESIDE																									
Rooms	Sub Alea			146	0.57	414	0.62	368	0.92	824	1.83	1,946	1.68	1,429	2.22	339	3.39	3.46	7.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	36.24	32.95%	15
Settle Drill Hall	Settle Sub Area	4,808	SETTLE	742	2.91	1,773	2.66	1,448	3.62	170	0.38	425	0.37	250	0.39	5,281	0.22	0.20	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	17.55	15.95%	54
Settle Town Hall	Settle Sub Area	5,045	SETTLE	742	2.91	1,773	2.66	I,448	3.62	221	0.49	544	0.47	317	0.49	5,281	0.22	0.14	1.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	23.87	21.70%	41
Victoria Hall	Settle Sub Area	5,045	SETTLE	802	3.15	I,876	2.82	1,493	3.73	161	0.36	441	0.38	272	0.42	5,281	0.22	0.14	1.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	0.00	7.00	7.00	36.08	32.80%	16



Skipton sub area scoring criteria

			Catchment distance		Po	pulation	up to l k	m			Po	pulation	l to 5 kn	ns		Depriv	vation	to nea	rest c		rms	Site	size	Sit condi		Total % score		Priority Rank
			Age group	Unde	er I6s	l6 to	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Unde	er l6s	16 to	55s	Ove	r 55s	Acce Serv	ss to vices	Villa; Hall (k	-	to D	DA							
Craven			Weighting	1	0	I	0	1	0	1	0		0	1	0	I.		10		10)	10	0	10	D			
Village Halls	Analysis Area	Total Population	Ward	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual S	W A		W Score	Actual	W Score		W Score			
	Skipton		WEST																									
Hall	Sub Area	,	CRAVEN	89	0.35	254	0.38	163	0.41	2,262	5.03	5,848	5.05	3,491	5.43	2,375	0.48	3.15	7.00 (0.00	0.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	38.143	84.67%	12
	Skipton	,	WEST																							1		
Village Hall			CRAVEN	250	0.98	623	0.94	442	1.10	3,560	7.92	9,263	8.00	5,506	8.56	2,375	0.48	2.12 4	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	10.00	49.994	15.45%	6
Draughton			BOLTON																									
Village Hall			ABBEY	108	0.42	312	0.47	263	0.66	1,762	3.92	4,697	4.06	3,180	4.94	328	3.51	2.76 4	4.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	36.983	33.62%	14
	Skipton	,	EMBSAY-																									
with Eastby			WITH-	211	0.00	101	0.01	447	1.42	2 (0)	F 00	(052	F 02	2 005	(20	2 5 2 4	0.45	2.74	4 00 -	7 00	7 00	7 00	7 00	10.00	10.00	40.70	15 20%	-
Village Hall			EASTBY GARGRAVE	211	0.83	604	0.91	647	1.62	2,606	5.80	6,852	5.92	3,985	6.20	2,536	0.45	2.76	4.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	49.724	15.20%	7
Gargarve Village Hall		2,550	GARGRAVE	335	1.32	855	1.29	845	2.11	95	0.21	252	0.22	168	0.26	2159	053	0.64	1 00 3	7 00	7 00	7 00	7 00	4 00	4 00	24 93 2	02 67%	37
Greatwood		2,872	GARGRAVE	333	1.52	000	1.27	645	2.11	75	0.21	232	0.22	100	0.20	2,137	0.55	0.01	1.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	т.00	т.00	27.752	22.07 /0	- 37
&	Sub Area	2,072	GARGINATE																									
Horseclose																												
Community																												
Centre				333	1.31	832	1.25	813	2.03	177	0.39	450	0.39	267	0.42	2,159	0.53	0.64	1.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	19.321	7.56%	50
Richard	Skipton	2,987	HELLIFIELD																							1		
Tottie	Sub Area																											
Memorial																												
Hall				114	0.45	355	0.53	208	0.52	405	0.90	1,014	0.88	891	1.39	258	4.46	3.43	7.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	22.122	20.11%	43
Skipton	Skipton		SKIPTON																									
Little	Sub Area		SOUTH	2.244	0.02	F 0//	0.02	2 4 7 0	0.40	1,491	2 22	2 0 2 1	2.40	2 (0)	4.05	4 200	0.27	0.45		1 00	1 00	10.00	10.00	1.70	1.70		14 22%	
Theatre Skipton	Skipton	19,052	SKIPTON	2,246	8.82	5,866	8.82	3,478	8.68	1,471	3.32	3,931	3.40	2,606	4.05	4,377	0.26	0.45	1.00	1.00	1.00	10.00	10.00	1.60	1.60	50.954	10.32%	4
	Sub Area		NORTH	2,366	9.29	6,319	9.50	3,865	9.65	1,262	2.81	3,162	2.73	2,078	3.23	5 787	0.20	0.14	1 00	1 00	1 00	7 00	7 00	4 00	4 00	50414	15 83%	5
Skipton	Skipton		SKIPTON	2,300	7.27	0,517	7.50	3,005	7.05	1,202	2.01	5,102	2.75	2,070	5.25	3,707	0.20	0.11	1.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	50.11	13.0370	
	Sub Area		NORTH																									
Community																												
, Centre				2,426	9.53	6,590	9.91	4,005	10.00	1,227	2.73	2,955	2.55	1,958	3.04	5,787	0.20	0.14	1.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	7.00	7.00	62.96 5	57.24%	1
St Andrews	Skipton	19,457	SKIPTON																							1		
Church Ha			CENTRAL	2,546	10.00	6,653	10.00	3,950	9.86	1,164	2.59	3,053	2.64	2,091	3.25	8,354	0.14	0.22	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	54.484	19 .53%	2
Thornton i			WEST																									
	Sub Area		CRAVEN							_																		
Village Hall				109	0.43	270	0.41	246	0.61	86	0.19	223	0.19	190	0.30	2,375	0.48	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	12.611	1.47%	57
West	Skipton		WEST																									
	Sub Area		CRAVEN	100	0.42	270	0.41	244	0.41	07	0.10	222	0.0	100	0.20	2 275	0.40	0.00			1.00	4.00	4 00	4 00	4 00		1 470/	_,
Village Hall				109	0.43	270	0.41	246	0.61	86	0.19	223	0.19	190	0.30	2,375	0.48	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	12.61	1.4/%	57



South Craven sub area scoring criteria

			Catchment distance		Po	pulation	up to I k	m			Po	pulation	l to 5 kr	ns		Depriv	es of vation ss to		rest	Site confor to DE	ms	Site	size	Sit condi			% Total score	Priority Rank
			Age group	Und	er I6s	16 t	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Unde	er l6s	16 t	o 55s	Ove	r 55s	Serv		Hall (k	<u> </u>									
Craven			Weighting		10	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	I	0	L.	0	10		10		10	0	1	0			
Village Halls	Analysis Area	Total Population	Ward	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual g	W / Score		W icore		W Score		W Score			
Cononley	South	24,239	AIRE VALLEY																									
Institute	Craven Sub Area			321	1.26	821	1.23	597	1.49	4,494	10.00	11,574	10.00	6,432	10.00	3,011	0.38	1.97	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	53.37 [,]	48.52%	3
Cowling	South	11,329	COWLING							,		,		,		,												
Village Hal																												
- · ·	Sub Area			467	1.83	1,136	1.71	493	1.23	1,806	4.02	4,694	4.06	2,733	4.25	2,042	0.56	3.18	7.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	33.66	30.60%	20
Glusburn	South	12,461	GLUSBURN																									
Institute	Craven Sub Area			1,459	5.73	3,804	5.72	2,297	5.74	1,036	2.31	2,510	2.17	1,355	2.11	5 846	0.20	0.85	1 00	7 00 7	7 00	10.00	10.00	7 00	7 00	48 96	44.51%	8
Kildwick &		14.176	AIRE VALLEY	1,137	5.75	5,001	5.72	2,277	5.74	1,050	2.51	2,510	2.17	1,555	2.11	3,010	0.20	0.05	1.00	7.00 /	/.00	10.00	10.00	7.00	7.00	10.70	11.3176	
Farnhill	Craven	,																										
Institute	Sub Area			509	2.00	1,378	2.07	806	2.01	2,431	5.41	5,793	5.01	3,259	5.07	3,011	0.38	0.36	1.00	7.00 7	7.00	7.00	7.00	10.00	10.00	46.95 [,]	42.68%	9
Lothersdal		6,492	GLUSBURN																									
Village	Craven						o / 7	104					0.47										1.00	0.50	0.50			
Clubhouse Lothersdal		10,800	GLUSBURN	205	0.81	446	0.67	184	0.46	1,149	2.56	2,861	2.47	I,647	2.56	5,846	0.20	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	8.50	8.50	24.22	22.02%	40
Village Hal		10,800	GLUSBURIN																									
v mage i tai	Sub Area			366	1.44	874	1.31	400	1.00	1,750	3.89	4,465	3.86	2,945	4.58	5.846	0.20	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	20.28	18.43%	48
Sutton	South	12,126	sutton							.,		.,		_,		-,												
Village Hal	l Craven																											
	Sub Area			1,422	5.59	3,734	5.61	2,233	5.58	991	2.21	2,405	2.08	1,341	2.08	5,369	0.21	0.85	1.00	7.00 7	7.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	42.36	38.50%	11
The Parish		12,719	AIRE VALLEY																									1
Rooms	Craven Sub Area			668	2.62	1,850	2.78	1,226	3.06	1,894	4.21	4,601	3.98	2,480	3.86	3 011	0.30	0.34	1 00	7 00 -	7 00	4 00	4 00	10.00	10.00	42 00	38.99%	10
	Sub Area			000	2.02	1,050	2.70	1,220	3.06	1,074	4.21	4,001	3.70	2,400	3.00	3,011	0.30	0.30	1.00	7.00	00.7	4 .00	4.00	10.00	10.00	72.07	50.77%	IV



Yorkshire Dales National Park scoring criteria

			Catchment distance		Ροι	oulation	up to l	km			Ρο	pulation	l to 5 k	ms		Indic		Dista to nea	arest	Sit confo	rms	Site		Site conditi	·		% Total score	Priority Rank
			Age group													Depriv Acce		Villa Ha	<u> </u>	to D	DA							
				Und	e <mark>r I6s</mark>	l6 to		Ove	r 55s	Unde	er I6s	16 to		Ove	r 55s	Serv	vices	(kn	ns)									
C	A		Weighting		0		0		0		0	I			0		0	10		10		1		10				
Craven Village Halls	Analysis Area	Total Population	Ward	Actual	W Score	Actual	vv Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	w Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	W Score	Actual	vv Score		Score		vv Score	Actual So	core			
Airton Methodist Church	Yorkshire Dales National Park	•	CALTON	114	0.45	315	0.47	215	0.54	100	0.22	228	0.20	132	0.21	115	10.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00 4		22.00	20.00%	44
Amerdale Hall		460	upper Wharfedale	32	0.43	59	0.47	47	0.34	39	0.22	172	0.20		0.21	235								7.00 7				
Anderton Memorial Institute	Yorkshire Dales National	3,024	GRASSINGTON																									
Appletreewick Village Hall	Dales National	589	BOLTON ABBEY	247	0.97	627	0.94	616	1.54	235	0.52	639	0.55	660	1.03	1,021	1.13							10.00				
Bolton Abbey Village Hall	Dales National	857	BOLTON ABBEY	97	0.38	202	0.30	129	0.32	27	0.06	89	0.08	45	0.07									4.00 4				
Buckden Village Institute	Park Yorkshire Dales National Park	322	upper Wharfedale	24	0.45	237 82	0.36	80	0.26	15	0.17	90	0.15	31	0.24	235								7.00 7				
Burnsall Village Hall	Yorkshire Dales National Park	2,576	BOLTON ABBEY	171	0.67	434	0.65	272	0.68	255	0.57	668	0.58	776	1.21		3.51							4.00 4				
Conistone with Kilnsey Village Hall	Yorkshire Dales National Park	2,252	UPPER WHARFEDALE	16	0.06	59	0.09	40	0.10	326	0.73	825	0.71	986	1.53	235								7.00 7				
Cracoe Village Hall		2,187	CALTON	59	0.23	147	0.22	92	0.23	277	0.62	772	0.67	840	1.31									10.00 10				
Grassington Devonshire Institiute	Yorkshire Dales National Park	2,902	GRASSINGTON	349	1.37	887	1.33	1,041	2.60	105	0.82	321	0.07	199	0.31	1,021								7.00 7				
Halton Gill Reading Room	Yorkshire Dales National		UPPER WHARFEDALE	41	0.16	79	0.12	33	0.08	24	0.23	82	0.28	80	0.12									4.00 4				



1	Park		l																Í									
Horton -in- Ribblesdale Village Hall	Yorkshire Dales National	1,004	PENYGHENT																									
village Fiall	Park			84	0.33	253	0.38	161	0.40	82	0.18	249	0.22	175	0.27	848	1.36	5.04	10.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	7.00	7.00	25.14	22.85%	36
Kettlewell Village Hall	Yorkshire Dales National	575	UPPER WHARFEDALE																									
	Park			39	0.15	172	0.26	111	0.28	48	0.11	118	0.10	87	0.14	235	4.89	4.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	33.93	30.84%	19
Kirby Malham Hall	Dales National	644	CALTON																									
	Park			45	0.18	100	0.15	57	0.14	69	0.15	215	0.19	158	0.25	115	10.00	1.80	4.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	33.05	30.05%	24
Langcliffe Village Institute	Yorkshire Dales National	4,650	SETTLE																									
	Park			329	1.29	761	1.14	653	1.63	563	1.25	1,357	1.17	987	1.53	5,281	0.22	1.31	4.00	4.00	4.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	30.24	27.49%	28
Malham Village Hall	Yorkshire Dales National Park	794	CALTON	101	0.40	219	0.33	109	0.27	54	0.12	194	0.17	117	0.18		10.00	2.07	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1 00	4.00	1.00	24.47	22.24%	20
Methodist Church Hall -	Yorkshire Dales	1,132	CALTON	101	0.40	217	0.33	109	0.27	54	0.12	174	0.17	117	0.18	115	10.00	2.06	4.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	24.47	22.24%	37
Hetton	National Park			77	0.30	225	0.34	146	0.36	125	0.28	316	0.27	243	0.38	115	10.00	1 56	4 00	7 00	7 00	1.00	1.00	4 00	4 00	27 93	25.39%	34
Stainforth Village Hall	Yorkshire Dales	4,413	PENYGHENT		0.50	225	0.54	140	0.50	125	0.20	510	0.27	243	0.50	115	10.00	1.50	4.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	ч.00	т.00	27.75	23.37/8	
	National Park			161	0.63	389	0.58	244	0.61	680	1.51	1,610	1.39	1,329	2.07	848	1.24	210	1 00	1.00	1 00	1.00	1 00	4 00	4 00	10 15	16.50%	53
The Ibbotson Institute	Yorkshire Dales	2,845	grassington	101	0.63	307	0.56	244	0.01	660	1.51	1,610	1.37	1,327	2.07	040	1.30	2.10	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	10.15	10.30%	
	National Park			123	0.48	356	0.54	239	0.60	352	0.78	870	0.75	905	1.41	1 021	1 13	1 84	4 00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4 00	4 00	15 68	14.26%	55
Threshfield Village Institue	Yorkshire Dales	2,902	GRASSINGTON	123	0.10	550	0.51	237	0.00	<u> </u>	0.70	0/0	0.75	705	1.11	1,021	1.13	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	15.00	1 1.20/0	
	National Park			349	1.37	887	1.33	1,041	2.60	105	0.23	321	0.28	199	0.31	1,021	1.13	0.89	1.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	20.25	18.41%	49



Appendix 4: Sport England Village and Community Halls guidance notes

The Sport England guidance notes for village and community halls detail some specifications for existing and designing new buildings.

- Building should be aesthetically pleasing and reflect the care taken to produce a quality facility capable of meeting the evolving needs of the community and the services it needs.
- A central location with sufficient car parking, close to shops and other well-used facilities and to public transport.
- □ A site that is equally accessible to established and new areas of development to established can instil a sense of ownership across the community.
- Requirements for on-site parking vary according to location but there are several factors to be taken into account:
 - Mark out bays for maximum utilisation and locate parking for disabled people close to the main entrance.
 - Define separate pedestrian routes and install ramped curbs between disabled parking bays and the entrance. Changes of level around the building must be ramped and may acquire handrails.
 - Provide bicycle lock-up parking close to the entrance where it can be overseen.
- Provide lighting for security and safety.