

Subject: Proposed Revisions to the Local Service Villages Methodology
Lead Member/ Portfolio Holder: Councillor C Saint

Summary

To consider the recommendations from the Enterprise, Planning and Housing Policy Advisory Panel on the revised methodology for identifying Local Service Villages.

Recommendation

That the proposed revisions to the methodology informing the identification of Local Service Villages be endorsed and the resultant revised categorisation be reflected in the Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy.

1. Background/Information

The Enterprise, Planning and Housing Policy Advisory Panel (EPHPAP) at its meeting on 11 February 2014 received a report updating the previously agreed methodology for identifying Local Service Villages which were to play a key role in delivering the dispersal approach to providing future housing development in the District.

A copy of the report presented to the Panel is attached.

The following is an extract from the Minutes of the EPHPAP meeting:

Minute 38 – Proposed Revisions to the Local Service Villages Methodology

Consideration was given to an update on the methodology for identifying Local Service Villages (LSV) which were to play a key role in delivering the dispersal approach to providing future housing development in the District.

The Panel was reminded that the methodology had been refined in response to concerns expressed at previous consultation stages. As a result, the Intended Proposed Submission Core Strategy as endorsed by the Council in July 2013 had identified four groups of LSVs with a different scale of housing development proposed for each.

As a result of ongoing feedback on the LSV concept it was now proposed to further refine the methodology to take into account the following:

1. to make it clear that the size of the settlement was the overriding criterion, i.e. to be a LSV a settlement had to have at least 100 dwellings regardless of the presence of key facilities;
-

2. a check of current bus timetables had been undertaken as services were prone to change;
3. the score of one point for a 'fair' level of public transport service had been adjusted as follows:

Less than two hourly (Mon-Sat) to include a morning and afternoon work service. - This being considered appropriate as the availability of a work service was an important aspect of public transport for rural communities.

4. the availability of a public transport service close to a village had been taken into account, not just those that run through or adjacent to a village. A maximum distance of 500 metres between the edge of a village and the service had been applied.

The resultant changes to the scores from those given in the Intended Proposed Submission Core Strategy (July 2013) are contained in the Appendix to these Minutes.

The Panel was advised that further representations concerning the methodology had been received from Bearley Parish Council, Earlswood and Forshaw Heath Residents Association and Hampton Lucy Parish Council. These representations were taken into account by the Panel.

The options open to The Panel were to either:

- a. recommend to The Cabinet that the proposed revisions to the identification and categorisation of LSV's was endorsed: or
- b. propose an alternative approach for recommendation to The Cabinet.

In considering the options, the Panel acknowledged that the methodology for identifying Local Service Villages, and its application to the Council's proposed dispersal approach to future development, was well-established. However, a further refinement of the methodology was required so that it could be applied appropriately and consistently in and through the Core Strategy.

The proposed update would not have a material impact on the overall scale of development expected to be delivered in the LSVs over the plan period, which remained at 1800.

Following discussion, it was

RECOMMENDED to The Cabinet:

That the proposed revisions to the methodology informing the identification of Local Service Villages be endorsed and the resultant revised categorisation be reflected in the Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy.

1 Options open to The Cabinet

Having had the item referred to it, the following options are open to The Cabinet:-

- a) To agree the revised methodology as presented; or
- b) To refer the matter back to the EPHPAP Panel for further consideration.

Paul Lankester
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

