



---

# Craven Local Plan Examination

## Matter 4

### Statement by Craven District Council

---

**Matter 4** – Spatial Strategy and Housing Growth (Policy SP4)

**Hearing Day 3** – Thursday 11th October 2018 (Week 1)

September 2018

## Issue 1 – Settlement Hierarchy

Paragraph 4.37 of the Local Plan states that Skipton is by far the largest town in the District and contains the administrative functions of the District Council, along with a range of employment opportunities, goods and services.

Below Skipton (Tier 1), the hierarchy includes a further 4 tiers as follows;

- Key Service Centres – High and Low Bentham and Settle;
- Local Service Centres – Gargrave, Glusburn and Crosshills and Ingleton;
- Villages with Basic Services and Villages with Basic Services Bisected by the Yorkshire Dales National Park Boundary; and
- Small Villages, Hamlets and Open Countryside

### Q1. How was the hierarchy established?

#### Council's Response

1. The Council's *Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper September 2018*, (Appendix 1 to this 'Matters' paper) provides a summary of how the plan's settlement hierarchy was established. Further to the Examination questions being published on this issue, the Council considered it appropriate to publish this background paper to 'tell the story' of how the establishment of the Submission Draft Plan's settlement hierarchy had developed over the period of plan preparation.

### Q2. Does it take into account sufficient factors? Is the hierarchy of settlements consistent with the Framework which seeks to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable?

#### Council's Response

1. Yes. As stated in paragraph 4.36 of the Submission Draft Plan (PD001):  
*"In arriving at the preferred spatial strategy, consideration has been given to the roles of settlements, their respective functions and level of services and consideration of their ability to accommodate growth and improve the mix of housing."*
2. Annex 1 and 2 to the *Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper September 2018* provide lists of the services and facilities taken into account to inform the hierarchy. Paragraphs 4.5 to 4.14 of Appendix 1 set out how the role of

settlements and their ability to accommodate growth were also taken into account. These are considered sufficient and appropriate factors to have taken into account.

3. The settlement hierarchy has been established which apportions the highest levels of growth in those settlements which are already sustainable locations with good level of services accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. It is therefore consistent with the 'Framework'.

### **Q3. Have settlements been appropriately identified in the hierarchy?**

#### **Council's Response**

1. The majority of settlements have been placed in the hierarchy based on their level of services within the settlement. As stated in response to Q2 above, paragraphs 4.5 to 4.14 of Appendix 1 set out how the role of settlements and their ability to accommodate growth have affected their position in the hierarchy. It is the Council's view that all settlements have been appropriately identified in the hierarchy. Also see response to Q5 below.

### **Q4. What is the justification for identifying Villages with Basic Services Bisected by the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (Tier 4b) separately from other Villages (Tier 4a)? Does the Local Plan propose a different approach for development falling in Tiers 4a and 4b?**

#### **Council's Response**

1. Paragraph 4.16 of Appendix 1 explains that the separate identification of Tier 4a and Tier 4b settlements has largely come about in order to emphasise that those settlements bisected by the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority boundary have parts of their settlement outside the planning control of Craven District Council. There is no proposed different approach to growth in these settlements. However, their role as tourism hubs and gateways to the Dales is referred to in Policy SP4. Hence the need to protect and/or enhance their tourism role/function will be a consideration in the determination of planning applications.

## **Q5. How were villages in Tiers 4 and 5 determined? What factors were taken into account in deciding whether or not a village was identified in Policy SP4?**

### **Council's Response**

1. As now clarified in the *Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper September 2018* (Appendix 1), Tier 4 settlements were, generally identified and listed in Policy SP4 if they did not provide the level of services considered appropriate for Tier 3 settlements (page 9 of Annex 2), but still provided:
  - A children's play area andtwo out of the following three services/facilities:
  - A primary school,
  - A convenience shop,
  - A public house.
2. Tier 5 settlements are those villages and hamlets that fall below the service level described above for Tier 4 settlements. Tier 5 settlements are not listed in Policy SP4.

## **Issue 2 – Housing Growth**

### **Q1. How was the distribution of housing growth between the settlements established, and what evidence supports it? Is it justified?**

#### **Council's Response**

1. The distribution of housing growth between settlements has been derived from and is justified by three assessments. These were the identification of:
  - a) a settlement's position in the hierarchy (supporting evidence in Appendix 1)
  - b) the most appropriate spatial strategy, along with preliminary growth figures for each settlement. (supporting evidence in Sp001 and SA002)
  - c) the ability of settlement to accommodate preliminary growth figures. (supporting evidence SA005 and EL1.005c)

### **Q2. How does the distribution of housing growth take into account the proximity of settlements to one another? For example, how has the location of services in Settle taken into account when considering housing growth in Giggleswick?**

#### **Council's Response**

1. The distribution of housing growth is focused on an even geographic spread of higher order Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements. In this case, the larger settlements

are Skipton in the south-east, Settle in the central area, and Bentham in the north- west of the district. This relatively even spatial spread means that they can support Local Service Centres close to these settlements, such as Glusburn and Crosshills in the south- east, Gargrave in the central area, and Ingleton in the north -west of the district. Therefore, when considering housing growth in the Local Service Centres, their relative proximity to Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 settlements was considered so advantage can be taken of the proximity of settlements in terms of service usage.

- 2 The ability of future residents in Giggleswick to take advantage of the nearby services in Settle has been taken into account when considering housing growth in Giggleswick. However, a combination of the desirability of maintaining the provisions of the preferred spatial strategy (Sp001) and the importance of allowing the local community of Giggleswick to ‘shape their own surroundings’ indicates that the housing growth of the village should not be significantly increased. The following is an extract from the Council’s Policy Response Papers January 2018 (Page 78 of EL1.005c) when this issue was raised during the Pre-Publication Draft Plan consultation in June 2017:

*“Plan preparation by the Council has, since 2012 treated Settle and Giggleswick as two separate settlements of a different scale, function and character. During community involvement on the plan preparation the local community of Giggleswick have highlighted the importance of retaining the separate identity and village character of the settlement. In April 2016 the Council approved the spatial strategy of the plan for consultation following a sustainability appraisal of 5 spatial growth options. One of the options, Option B Dispersed Growth, considered allocating growth equally to both Settle and Giggleswick. The sustainability appraisal identified that Option E: A Balanced Hierarchy of Growth was the most sustainable and this strategy pointed to differentiating growth between Settle and Giggleswick at 10.5% and 0.8% respectively. Whilst it is accepted that the residents of Giggleswick will benefit from the proximity of services in Settle, it remains the Council’s view that the village’s growth should be significantly lower than that of Settle in order to retain it’s separate identity and village character”.*

### **Q3. Are the levels of growth appropriate and justified having regard to the size, role, function, and accessibility of each settlement to employment, services and facilities?**

#### **Council’s Response**

1. Yes, See responses to questions 1 to 5 under Issue 1 above.

**Q4. Considering the predominately rural geography of the District, is it appropriate to focus 50% of the housing growth in Skipton, and almost 72% across Skipton, Low and High Bentham and Settle?**

**Council's Response**

1. Yes, it is important in socio-economic and environmental terms to build up the main population centres in a predominately rural District. For example, the three towns mentioned have the best options in employment opportunities, services and public transport. The relatively high proportion of retirees in the local plan area, combined with the fact that the resident population will continue to age, means that it is very important to attract people of working age to live in the area. This can be achieved through concentrating employment opportunities close to residential availability, and this is generally best achieved in larger towns. Concentrating the majority of planned growth in these three towns also reduces the residential pressure on the natural environment, which is of high importance in itself to Craven, and it also encourages and grows the tourism economy.

**Q5. How will the spatial distribution of housing support sustainable communities in the Local Service Centres and Villages? Is Policy SP4 consistent with paragraph 55 of the Framework? Will there be enough growth in small, medium and large villages to help support sustainable rural communities?**

**Council's Response**

1. The Local Service Centres and Villages are to receive 28.2% of the development growth in the local plan. It is expected that, this percentage will promote sustainable development in rural areas of the plan area, and housing is to be located where it can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, the three Local Service Centres, which receive 3.5% of residential growth each, are located in three different parts (north, mid and south) of the plan area and which act as rural centres of growth which can support services in nearby villages. As examples, the Local Service Centre of Glusburn and Crosshills can support the nearby villages of Sutton, Farnhill and Kildwick, the Local Service Centre of Gargrave can assist Hellifield in combination with Settle, and the Local Service Centre of Ingleton can support Burton in Lonsdale. The Local Service Centres and Tier 4 villages can also provide some services for nearby small settlements within the boundaries of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. The Council is of the view therefore that Policy SP4 is consistent with the provisions of paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The distribution of planned growth for small, medium and large villages is deemed appropriate for the existing size, role and function of these settlements in the district and the largely rural geography of the district and will provide sufficient growth to help support sustainable rural communities. It is also an appropriate response to the choice of sites available in

the SHLAA.

**Q6. What is the justification for the very prescriptive levels of housing growth between Tiers 2-4? For example, why is each of the [Key] Service Centres attributed 10.9% growth and Local Service Centres 3.5%?**

**Council's Response**

1. The levels of housing growth between Tiers 2-4 are guidelines for the distribution of housing growth as stated in Policy SP4. The chosen spatial strategy option in the sustainability appraisal (Sp001) provided some preliminary growth figures for each settlement.
2. In the spatial strategy option chosen, the Tier 2 settlements of Settle and Bentham were attributed 10.5% and 10.2% of the plan area's development growth respectively. Their percentages of growth have altered slightly over time mostly in response to changing circumstances in Tiers 3 and 4 settlements, such as, for example, the lack of availability of a site(s).
3. The Tier 3 settlements consist of Glusburn and Crosshills, Ingleton and Gargrave, with preliminary housing growth of 5.1%, 3.1% and 2% respectively. Equal distribution of percentage growth in the Tier 3 settlements was reached because of a number of reasons. Gargrave was able to accommodate a higher percentage, due to the availability of suitable land for the provision of Extra Care accommodation. Ingleton has two large available and suitable sites which meant that it can accommodate a slightly higher percentage. Glusburn and Crosshills is situated relatively close to the South Pennine Moors SPA (Phase 2) and SAC. To reduce recreational pressure on the SPA and SAC, and particularly considering the expected large residential growth of the neighbouring Bradford Core Strategy, the percentage of growth attributed to Glusburn and Crosshills was reduced. Each Tier 3 settlement had then an equal percentage of 3.5%.
4. The availability of a large brownfield site in a Tier 4 settlement with relatively good public transport links may ensure it receives a slightly higher percentage growth than other Tier 4 settlements. An example of such is the village of Cononley. Other Tier 4 settlements may have received lower percentages based on the lack of suitable sites put forward.
5. Overall, the quantum of growth to be distributed (230 dpa) has to be distributed in whole numbers (so 25 dwellings not 25.5 dwellings), and is also distributed on an iterative basis, in the light of what is to be distributed elsewhere, so the precise allocation percentages are an output of this process, because they are the arithmetic result of a given level of growth.

**Q7. What is the justification for the level of housing growth proposed in each of the Tier 4 settlements?**

**Council's Response**

1. The levels of housing growth in each of the Tier 4 settlements has been derived from the three assessments referred to in response to question 1 above. See also response to question 6 above.

**Q8. What is the justification for identifying Bolton Abbey and Long Preston in Tier 4, but not identifying any housing growth in the settlements?**

**Council's Response**

1. Bolton Abbey and Long Preston are settlements with a size, role and function commensurate with other settlements in Tier 4 and both settlements are also identified as service settlements in the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority's plan. Bolton Abbey is not allocated any housing growth in the spatial strategy because of the significance and sensitivity of its heritage assets. Long Preston is not to be allocated residential growth in the spatial strategy, because the vast majority of the settlement is within the Yorkshire Dales National Park and there is no land available for development in the small part of the village in the Craven local plan area.

**Q9. Where is the proposed level of housing growth going to come from in the 'Other Villages and Open Countryside' (6%)? How will it be distributed?**

**Council's Response**

1. The proposed level of housing growth will come from the development of small windfall sites through proposals envisaged in Tier 5 settlements (Policy SP4 J) and the type of proposals envisaged in paragraph 55 of the Framework. Examples of Tier 5 settlements include Draughton, Broughton, Thornton-in-Craven, West Marton, Wigglesworth, Coniston Cold, Newby, Rathmell and Lothersdale. These villages are dispersed across the plan area. Most of the plan area is open countryside, dominated by the agricultural industry, so a significant proportion of the growth allowance for the open countryside will come from proposals to meet the essential needs of agricultural and other land based or rural businesses for workers to live at or near their place of work. The distribution of this growth will therefore be guided by where the need exists. Growth may also come from proposals which help to sustain the rural economy by re-using redundant or disused buildings as live/work units or proposals that secure the viable re-use of a heritage asset and will be distributed on the basis of where these buildings and heritage assets are located. Dwellings of exceptional design quality may also contribute to growth (in a small way) in the open countryside. Proposals for rural exception sites to address local affordable housing needs may also contribute towards housing growth in smaller villages.



## Issue 3 – Housing Growth on Non-allocated sites

### Land within Settlements

**Q1. What are the reasons for not defining the boundaries of settlements on the Policies Map? Will it be clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities whether a site falls within the main built up area?**

#### **Council's Response**

1. There is no policy or practice guidance at national level which advises that settlement boundaries should be defined around settlements. Some local planning authorities use these boundaries, in their local plans as a tool to identify the boundary between built up areas and the countryside, others use a definition of the main built up area within the relevant policy.
2. The Craven Local Plan has chosen to define the main built up area of a settlement and consider this is a preferable approach to the delineation of settlement boundaries. The definition of the main built up area within Policy SP4 allows future changes to the existing built up area on the edge of a settlement and changes to the characteristics of the land on the edge of a settlement to be taken into account at the time of any development proposal, which could be many years in the future. Settlement boundaries may be accurate and effective at the time of their identification, but can become out of date during the plan period. In accordance with the NPPF and in the interests of sustainable growth, Policy SP4 incorporates flexibility in its management provisions for new housing development to be built beyond the existing built up area as newly defined by the development of the plan's proposed housing land allocations. The drawing up of settlement boundaries at the time of the adoption of the plan would be out of date in the event of such development taking place.
3. The \*\* footnote starting at the bottom of page 50 of the Submission Draft Plan, (PD001), plus some suggested changes to it in Appendix 2, provides the plan's definition of the main built up area of a settlement listed in the policy. It is considered that this definition provides sufficient clarity over whether a site will fall within the main built up area of a listed settlement.

**Q2. What is the justification for supporting proposals for new development on non-allocated sites within Tier 1-4 settlements provided that they relate to previously developed land?**

## **Council's Response**

1. One of the core planning principles of the NPPF (para 17, bullet 8) is to encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. The re-use of previously developed land within the main built up areas of listed settlements, provided it accords with environmental and other protection policies in this plan will assist in supporting this core planning principle.

### **Q3. How would a decision-maker react to a proposal for new residential development on previously undeveloped land within the main built-up area of a Tier 1-4 settlement?**

## **Council's Response**

1. Much of the previously undeveloped land within the main built area of listed settlements is proposed for protection, because of its environmental, community and sport/recreational value. Proposals on this 'designated' land would be assessed against the criteria of the plan's policies to protect these valued areas, as well as other relevant plan policies. If the land itself was not protected by policy, a proposal for residential or other type of development would be supported, subject to its compliance with generic policies in the plan on design; impact on the surrounding area, including neighbouring properties, heritage features e.g. conservation area or listed building, and transport and traffic considerations; and availability of a suitable access.
2. Notwithstanding the above position in responding to this question and Q2 above, it would perhaps be clearer and more accurate, for the plan to support all appropriate developments within a settlement's built up area, provided they do not conflict with policies of the plan that protect open spaces, natural and historic interest. Hence criterion SP4 H) is proposed to be modified accordingly (Appendix 2)

## **Land adjoining Settlements**

### **Q4. Policy SP4 I) supports the release of non-allocated sites adjoining the main built up area of settlements where a) to c) are met. Does the policy apply to all settlements, or just Tiers 1-4? As submitted is this clear?**

## **Council's Response**

1. Policy SP4 I) only applies to Tier 1-4 settlements with SP4 J) applying to Tier 5 settlements. The proposed modifications (PM) to this policy set out in Appendix 2 now makes it clear which settlements are covered by Policy SP4 I).

**Q5. The main built up area is defined as the “continuous built form” of a settlement. Is this sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities? Is the policy effective?**

**Council’s Response**

1. To provide sufficient clarity to decision makers, developers and local communities on the extent of a settlement’s main built up area, and in the light of the need for the definition to cover smaller Tier 5 settlements, proposed modifications to this definition have been put forward in Appendix 2.

**Q6. What is the justification for restricting proposals for new development coming forward under Policy SP4 I) unless it can be demonstrated that the planned growth for that settlement will not be delivered?**

**Council’s Response**

1. This policy criterion of the Submission Draft Policy SP4 I) a) applies to Tiers 1 to 4 settlements where, with the exception of Bolton Abbey and Long Preston, guidelines for planned growth levels for each settlement have been identified. Where necessary to meet these guideline growth levels, land has been allocated for housing whilst respecting and protecting the sensitivities of the plan area’s and neighbouring plan areas’ environments of local, national and international importance. The justification for restricting the release of non-allocated sites for housing comes from the following:
  - Meeting the objectively assessed need (OAN) and allocating land to meet the OAN.
  - The need for the planning system to be genuinely plan led.
  - The need to secure the most sustainable pattern of growth.

**Meeting the OAN and allocating land to meet the OAN**

2. Policy SP1 of the Submission Draft Plan seeks to provide for a minimum of 230 dwellings per annum (dpa) between the years 2012 and 2032 across the plan area. This compares with the plan’s evidence base (SHMA 2017 (Ho013)) which estimates the OAN for the plan area as being 206 dpa. The same evidence base estimates that the OAN for the whole Craven Housing Market Area (HMA) during that period is 242 dpa. With the provision of a minimum of 230 dpa in the plan area, and an estimated provision of 27 dpa in the Craven District by the Yorkshire Dales National Park Plan (Ot007) within the HMA, at least 257

dwellings per annum are being planned to be delivered. These figures show that for both areas, the plan area and HMA, the OAN should be more than met.

3. Furthermore, the NPPF (paragraph 47, third bullet point) accepts the possibility that plans might only be able to identify broad locations for longer term growth (i.e. for years 6 to 15 following adoption of the plan). However, the Craven Local Plan, through Policies SP5 to SP11, is seeking to identify specific deliverable and developable sites to more than meet the 230 dpa over the whole plan period up to 2032 (Table 5 of PD001).
4. It is considered that these circumstances justify the plan's proposed management of the release of non-allocated land for housing.

### **A genuinely plan-led system**

5. The first core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 17, bullet one, states that planning should: "*be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, .....*".
6. Para 154 of the NPPF indicates that Local Plans should not only set out opportunities for development but also "clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where." Setting out a general policy restraint on non-allocated sites outside of built up areas is consistent with this objective of the NPPF, but the policy approach also recognises that there may be exceptions where such development would be justified. These exceptions are identified in cases (a), (b), and (c) of Policy SP4 I).
7. Without this management measure, there is a risk that windfall housing development extending into the countryside on the edge of Tier 2 to 4 settlements would come forward and be implemented prior to, or at the same time as sites allocated for housing in the local plan. As referred to below under the heading 'The most sustainable pattern of growth', there is a substantial amount of land that is available, and potentially suitable, for housing on the edge of these settlements. After several years of plan preparation and local communities shaping their surroundings, this 'queue jumping' in the eyes of local communities would not present the planning system as plan-led. Further, the construction of housing on non-allocated land during the early years of the plan period, without good justification, does not in the Council's view constitute a genuinely plan led approach.
8. In effect, this criterion, quite rightly in the Council's view, gives a sequential preference, and encouragement, to the delivery of allocated sites. In the event that an allocated site and/or site with planning permission is clearly not coming

forward, then it will be appropriate, subject to the criteria set out in the policy, to consider favourably alternative proposals to meet the planned growth for a settlement.

9. In response to question 5 within Matter 6 on Housing Land Supply, the plan seeks to address the backlog of housing completions from the first 6 years of the plan period from 1 April 2012, within the first 5 years from adoption of the local plan. Compared with the proposed 230dpa housing requirement, the amount of allocated land for housing seeks to address this backlog and secure an average annual completion rate of 385 dwellings for the first 5 years following adoption of the plan. This is a challenging delivery rate especially at a time when there will be considerable uncertainties in the housing market and the nation's economy caused by 'Brexit'. Given these market condition uncertainties, delivering the plan led growth of the Craven Local Plan on the plan's land allocations is unlikely to be assisted by additional land being granted planning permission early in the plan period. This could affect land banking and result in further uncertainty to local communities and the planning system over when and where development is coming forward.
10. It is considered that these circumstances justify the plan's proposed management of the release of non-allocated land for housing.

### **The most sustainable pattern of growth**

11. Site availability detailed in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Update 2018 (Ho010) and site suitability detailed in the Residential Site Selection Process (SA005) suggest that, without the management of the release of sites that adjoin Tiers 2 to 4 settlements, the plan's spatial strategy confirmed by the SA of Strategies and Growth Options (SA002) as the most appropriate sustainable pattern of growth, will be at risk of failure.
12. For example, using the data published in SA005 Tier 4 settlements of Policy SP4 have 34 sites, together making up 54 hectares of land which are available and potentially suitable for housing, but were rejected for allocation because they were not required to meet the identified housing requirement for the relevant settlement. Without the proposed management of the release of sites, it is considered there is an unacceptable risk that the level of growth during the plan period within this lower tier settlement hierarchy could significantly exceed the planned growth in conflict with the plan's spatial strategy. This housing release management is necessary to make the plan effective and sound.

**Q7. How does this requirement relate to Policy SP1 which sets out a minimum (rather than a maximum) housing requirement?**

**Council's Response**

1. As stated in response to Q6 above, more than enough land to meet the plan's housing requirement is being allocated on sites that are deliverable and developable. Furthermore, through the development of windfall housing sites within the built up areas of listed settlements, particularly in Skipton; the delivery of rural exception sites and the development of sites adjoining settlements that are justified by special circumstances such as meeting a specialist housing need, additional housing is likely to come forward. Hence, this managed release approach is compatible with Policy SP1's reference to a 'minimum' housing requirement.

**Q8. How will a decision-maker determine whether or not the planned level of housing growth in a particular settlement will be delivered within the plan period for the purposes of Policy SP4 I)? How will Table 5 be updated?**

**Council's Response**

1. The planned level of growth in a particular settlement is the amount of dwellings which the plan estimates should be built in that settlement by the end of the plan period. For example, the number of dwellings planned for Bentham in Policy SP4 from 2012 to 2032 is 501. This is the settlements planned growth. The planned growth for each listed settlement above Tier 5 settlements is given in column 4 of Table 5 of the Submission Draft Plan (Page 57).
2. The PM in Appendix 2 proposes to delete Table 5 of the plan, but to add an additional column to the guidelines for the distribution of new dwellings to deliver the spatial strategy giving a figure for the planned growth for each settlement. The PM also adds explanatory text to this policy on how the Council's annual monitoring of the plan will assess whether or not each settlement's planned growth is being delivered. Table 5, or similar, will form part of the Council's housing monitoring reporting and be updated annually. Following the adoption of the plan, the Council will review its housing monitoring arrangements and consideration will be given to align the process of preparing its annual monitoring of the plan area's five year housing land supply with the monitoring of whether the planned level of growth within relevant settlements is being achieved.

**Q9. Where planning permission has been granted for new residential development in a settlement, but has not come forward, how would a decision-maker react to a proposal for housing under Policy SP4 I)?**

**Council's Response**

1. The reasons for a site's non-implementation would need to be assessed through the proposed Council's annual monitoring arrangements and SHLAA updates. (See response to Q8 above). If there are no known physical or ownership constraints and the site remains attractive in the market place, there should, at least in the short term, be no reason to cast doubt over the site's delivery. If clear reasons become known on why a site is unlikely to come forward within the remainder of the plan period, despite it having planning permission, then this would be identified in the Council's annual monitoring arrangements.
2. Each allocated site and site with planning permission can be assessed in this manner on an annual basis and in looking at updated figures on completions by settlement, a decision can be made on whether the settlement's planned growth is being delivered. The publication of this information on an annual basis will then inform decision makers, developers and local communities on the need to release additional sites in accordance with Policy SP4 I) a).

**Q10. Does the policy, or other applicable policies in the Local Plan, encourage the effective use of previously developed (brownfield) land?**

**Council's Response**

1. Yes. This policy encourages the use of previously developed land within sustainable settlements. Land allocations for housing and employment have favoured the use of previously developed land. Policy ENV7: LAND AND AIR QUALITY criterion b) also provides support more generally to the re-use of such land. This states that:-  
*"The re-use of previously developed (brownfield) land of low environmental value will be encouraged and supported"*

**Q11. What are the "special economic, environmental and/or social circumstances" for the purposes of Policy SP4 I)? Is this clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities? Is the policy effective?**

## **Council's Response**

1. The NPPF allows isolated new homes in the countryside, if special circumstances apply. It gives examples of what these special circumstances might be. Similarly, this policy seeks to ensure that if special circumstances exist, more homes can be provided for during the plan period. These circumstances might be that a particular type of housing need is not being met e.g. housing for older people, housing for local workers, live/work units, and self-build housing. These proposals could have significant social and economic benefits. Alternatively, some previously developed land might provide an environmental benefit through its redevelopment on the edge of a settlement or the infilling of a small parcel of land surrounded on three sides by the settlements main built up area, could provide additional affordable housing without extending the built up area into the wider countryside.
2. These examples are now set out in the revised policy wording in the PM at Appendix 2

## **Tier 5 Settlements**

**Q12. How will a decision-maker determine whether or not a proposal for new development is “consistent with the role and function of the settlement” for the purposes of Policy SP4 I) i)?**

## **Council's Response**

1. As clarified by the proposed modifications to Policy SP4 I) this part of the policy does not apply to Tier 5 settlements.

**Q13. What is the justification for Policy SP4 I) vi)? How does this relate to the spatial strategy and principle of new residential development in or adjoining settlements?**

## **Council's Response**

1. As clarified by the proposed modification to Policy SP4 I) this part of the policy does not apply to Tier 5 settlements. However, it is accepted that this criterion, as it applies to Tier 1 to 4 settlements, is more one relating to local impact rather than to spatial strategy. In the light of the PM for a new policy INF7 Sustainable Transport and Highways, (See Matters Paper 11) which now includes a similar criterion, this reference in Policy SP4 can be withdrawn. (See Appendix 2)



**Q 14. Policy SP4 J) supports proposals for housing in Tier 5 settlements subject to meeting criteria a) to e). However, Tier 5 settlements are not listed in Policy SP4. How will decision-makers, developers and local communities determine when part J) applies?**

**Council's Response**

1. Part J of Policy SP4 will apply to all other settlements across the plan area not listed in this policy. Such settlements include Draughton, Broughton, Thornton-in Craven, West Marton, Wigglesworth, Coniston Cold, Newby, Rathmell and Lothersdale. These examples are included in the proposed modifications to the explanatory text of this policy (Appendix 2). This part of the policy will also apply to smaller settlements, including hamlets but they must be recognised in published sources such those of the Ordnance Survey as a named settlement/community.

**Q15. Is Policy SP4 J) intended to apply to even very small clusters of houses with no shops, services or facilities?**

**Council's Response**

1. No. Such very small clusters of housing will not be recognised in published sources as a named settlement/community.

**Residential Development Outside Settlements**

**Q16. How is the 'countryside' defined for the purposes of Policy SP4? How would a decision-maker determine whether or not a site falls within the countryside, or a Tier 5 settlement such as a hamlet?**

**Council's Response**

1. In the proposed modification to the explanatory text (paragraph 4.53) and Policy SP4 K), the countryside is defined as all areas outside the existing main built up area of Tier 1 to 5 settlements and outside the land allocations for development in the Local Plan . This definition now makes it clear to a decision maker whether a proposal falls within the countryside or within a Tier 5 settlement.

**Q17. What is the justification for requiring proposals for new development to accord with the Framework under Policy SP4 K), and, then meet criteria i) to iii)?**

**Council's Response**

1. The proposed modification wording now avoids requiring proposals to accord with the Framework and then also meet criteria i) to iii).

**Q18. How does Policy SP4 allow for circumstances where the design of a new dwelling is of an exceptional quality? Is Policy SP4 consistent with the Framework in this regard?**

**Council's Response**

1. The proposed modification to Policy SP4 now cross refers only to the NPPF and other relevant local plan policies. This allows for circumstances where the design of a new dwelling is of exceptional quality and is consistent with the Framework.

---

**Craven District Council**



If you would like to have this information in a way that's better for you, please telephone **01756 700600**.

**Planning Policy Team** | 01756 706472 | [localplan@cravendc.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@cravendc.gov.uk)

