

## **HAMBLETON DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Report To:** Cabinet  
11 April 2017

**Subject:** **AUDIT OF VILLAGE SERVICES**

**All Wards**  
**Portfolio Holder for Planning: Councillor B Phillips**

---

### **1.0 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 To seek approval from Cabinet for the revised Settlement Hierarchy, which will form the spatial approach in the emerging Local Plan.
- 1.2 The Settlement Hierarchy was developed to provide a spatial guide to the location of development and activities within the Local Development Framework (LDF). The position of a settlement within the hierarchy is determined by the number of services and facilities and access to public transport. The existing Settlement Hierarchy is set out in the Interim Planning Guidance Note – Development in Rural Settlements and was based on an audit of facilities and services undertaken in 2014.
- 1.3 In spring 2016, the Council undertook an audit of facilities and services within each of the settlements within the Settlement Hierarchy. Surveys were sent to Parish Councils where their parish area included one or more of the settlements. North Yorkshire County Council provided information on changes to bus services within the settlements, highlighting those instances where there had been a gain or loss of bus services. This formed part of the audit. Information relating to availability of sports pitches, other outdoor sports areas, children play areas and casual recreation areas was provided by colleagues within the district council and also formed part of the audit. The results of the audit were input into a database which generates a sustainability score for each settlement.
- 1.4 A full copy of the Audit of Village Services is attached at Annex A.
- 1.5 The 2016 audit shows that there have been some minor changes in scores for Service Villages since the 2014 audit but the changes are not sufficient to require a change in status within the Settlement hierarchy. The majority of these marginal changes are due to reported changes in bus services. It is therefore considered appropriate to retain the existing defined Service Villages of Great Ayton, Great Broughton, Hutton Rudby, Brafferton/Helperby, Huby, Huthwaite, Linton on Ouse, Stillington, Crakehall, Kirkby Fleetham, Snape, West Tanfield, Carlton Miniott, Topcliffe, Brompton, East Cowton and Morton on Swale.
- 1.6 The 2016 score shows that there have been some minor changes in scores for Secondary Villages since the 2014 audit. The changes are not sufficient to require a change in status within the Settlement hierarchy. This is with exception to Scruton where a children's pre-school playgroup has closed since the last audit was undertaken. Under the previous scoring system Scruton would consequently become an Other Village. However, on reflection, it is suggested that a playgroup / nursery should not score the same as a primary school and this would see Scruton retained as a Secondary Village.
- 1.7 There have been few marginal changes in the facilities and services in Other Villages.
- 1.8 Under the existing Settlement Hierarchy, Hutton Rudby and Rudby are treated as two separate villages, with Hutton Rudby being a 'Service Village' and Rudby an 'Other Village'. In response to the comments received to the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation it is

recommended that Hutton Rudby and Rudby should be considered as one settlement 'Hutton Rudby and Rudby' as they share a number of facilities and services.

1.9 The Settlement Hierarchy will continue to form the spatial approach for new development in the emerging Local Plan.

## **2.0 LINK TO COUNCIL PRIORITIES:**

2.1 The Settlement Hierarchy forms the basis of the spatial strategy for the new Local Plan. Preparation of a new Local Plan for Hambleton will help to deliver many of the Council's priorities: Driving Economic Vitality, Enhancing Health and Well-being, Caring for the Environment and Providing a Special Place to Live.

## **3.0 RISK ASSESSMENT:**

3.1 There is no risk in approving the recommendation.

3.2 The key risk is in not approving the recommendation as shown below:-

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Implication</b>	<b>Prob*</b>	<b>Imp*</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Preventative action</b>
There is no clear spatial strategy to underpin the emerging Local Plan or for making development management decisions.	Adverse impact on the soundness of the Local Plan and lack of clarity in decision making.	4	4	16	To adopt the Settlement Hierarchy.

Prob = Probability, Imp = Impact, Score range is Low = 1, High = 5

The risks associated with not agreeing with the recommendations significantly outweigh the risks of agreeing the recommendations and is considered acceptable.

## **4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

4.1 There have been modest costs involved in consultation such as postage and printing costs, however these are covered by the Local Plan budget.

## **5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 There are no legal implications.

## **6.0 EQUALITY/DIVERSITY ISSUES**

6.1 Equality and Diversity Issues and have been considered however there are no issues associated with this report.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION(S):**

8.1 That Cabinet approves the revised Settlement Hierarchy set out in the Audit of Facilities and Services Report.

HELEN KEMP

**Background papers:** Audit of Village Services and Facilities Report  
**Author ref:** CS  
**Contact:** Caroline Skelly  
 Planning Policy and Conservation Team Leader  
 01609 767150