

Settlement Hierarchy Methodology

Comments and Feedback

March 2009



Settlement Hierarchy Methodology November 2008

1. Introduction	1
2. Consultation Process	1
3. Settlement Hierarchy Consultation	2
4. Next Steps	9

Introduction

1.1 This consultation statement provides details of the consultation undertaken, the comments received and the Councils response to the Local Development Framework (LDF) Settlement Hierarchy Methodology Consultation. All the comments received during the consultation have been carefully considered by the Council and appropriate actions will be taken as identified in this report. The Settlement Hierarchy, once complete, will be part of the evidence base which will underpin the LDF.

Consultation Process

2.1 The Council began work in earnest upon the LDF In January 2008 much of the early work focused upon gathering an evidence base and early community engagement. The first formal consultation stage upon the LDF was the Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation. This consultation ran for 11 weeks between 17th November 2008 and 30th January 2009. The consultation also included the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, and two parts of the evidence base; the Green Belt Review Methodology and Settlement Hierarchy Model. Each of the documents was available both in hard copy and as interactive versions on the council website. In addition leaflets were produced to explain the LDF process and to summarise the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and Core Strategy.

2.3 To compliment the documents and leaflets a number of consultation events were also undertaken. This included 6 drop-in events at venues across the district and 12 workshops/public meetings. Table 1 indicates the number of responses received and the number of people attending events.

Table 1: Responses to the Consultation

Consultation method	Number of respondents	Number of comments received
Core Strategy Issues and Options Documents	178	780
Green Belt Review Methodology	20	59
Settlement Hierarchy Methodology	10	27
Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	10	47
Attending events	389	-

3. Settlement Hierarchy Methodology Consultation

3.1 The consultation which ran from 17th November 2008 to 30th January 2009 was the second phase of consultation upon the Settlement Hierarchy. The aim of the second phase of consultation was to finalise the methodology prior to undertaking the first iteration of the model. The following section identifies the comments received upon the Settlement Hierarchy Model. Early consultation upon the Settlement Hierarchy was aimed at identifying a basis for the model and assessing the importance of different services and facilities.

3.1 In general the respondents to the early consultation were supportive of the idea of principle of producing a Settlement Hierarchy as well as the evolving methodology.

3.2 The comments received to the second period of consultation and the response of the Council are indicated in the following tables:

Table 2: Settlement hierarchy comments – Action required

Resp No	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
27	Mr Colin Holm	Government Team (West) Natural England		Further investigation required	In relation to the proposed methodology, the findings of the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (paragraph 2.8) should be used to inform the definition of the Settlement Hierarchy with regards to Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt). This is in addition to consideration of 'formal' public park provision as a criterion for assessing the role of individual settlements within the overall hierarchy (Table 4.1).	Access to Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards will be considered and included in the methodology if considered appropriate.
15	Toni Rios	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency	Table 3.2	Further investigation required	We look forward to comparing our accessibility analysis (when completed) with the Calderdale analysis as described in Table 3.2. The only issue	Discussions with the Highways Agency to compare data will assist in refining the model.

Resp No	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
					is that the main focus of accessibility is on access to services and that access to jobs (e.g. to larger employers) does not form an explicit part of the analysis.	
1	Matthew Brook		Figure 4.2	Agree - further action	Need to correct title. Not RouteFinder data.	Title to be changed.
5	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Table 4.3	Agree - further action	We believe data criterion 18b should read "private transport", not "public transport".	Change criteria as noted.
11	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Table 4.4	Further investigation required	Data criterion 18a (accessibility to nearby settlements - public transport) appears to differentiate little between areas which score from this criterion. We are not clear as to which centres/settlements have been used when calculating criterion 18a.	The issue of little variation between scores is likely to be an effect of good accessibility across the district if this is the case it would appear appropriate this is not reduced. However the reasons behind the scoring will be investigated. The centres/ settlements used to define the calculations in 18a will be listed in the final methodology.
6	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		5.4	Agree - further action	The definition of an "urban area" should be included at this stage, as that would make understanding the stage easier.	A definition of urban area will be included.
9	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.8	Agree - further action	It would be helpful if the paragraphs in Stage 4 were numbered, to allow comments to be made on their content as well as on the content of the various figures.	This will be amended in the final methodology.
3	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.10	Agree - further action	We would be grateful if you would provide us with the definition for the purposes of the Settlement Hierarchy Methodology of a bank/building society and of a nursery. We ask	Definitions will be provided in the final Settlement Hierarchy methodology. The model is a snap-shot of the most up to date information available at the time. Any known inaccuracies in this information will be amended prior to the next iteration of the model being run.

Resp No	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
					because: 1 There has not been a bank/building society branch in Stainland for many years and the post office, which offered basic banking facilities, closed in August 2008; and 2 Although there is a primary school and a playgroup in the village, none of their signage refers to their offering nursery facilities.	
13	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.10	Agree - further action	If it is the Council's intention also to consider for new development urban sites we feel this intention should also be illustrated on a similar map inserted at this point and there should be a third map amalgamating the two.	The next run of the Settlement Hierarchy Model will include a map of potential urban areas.
19	Mr B Howarth	Head of Planning Dacre Son & Hartley	6.5	Agree - further action	The recommendations in paragraph 6.5 should not be as negative in terms of future growth, given that some Neighbourhood Service Centres will be able to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner.	This paragraph will be re-worded as not all Neighbourhood Service Centres will be inappropriate locations for development.
24	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial	6.5	Agree - further action	The recommendations in paragraph 6.5 should not be as negative in terms of future growth, given that some Neighbourhood Service Centres will be able to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner.	This paragraph will be re-worded as not all Neighbourhood Service Centres will be inappropriate locations for development.
12	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		6.7	Agree - further action	With regards figure 5.10 it is unclear whether the Council is referring only to non-urban areas or if it is also considering urban ones for development which have undeveloped land within their grid square	Urban areas will also be considered for new development. This will be made clear in the final Settlement Hierarchy Methodology.

Table 3: Settlement hierarchy comments - Noted

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
4	Dr Lesley Mackay			Noted	I am concerned that the model you are adopting in relation to the settlement hierarchy (paras 1.5-1.8) is static and does not appear to allow for changing populations, changing transport practices and services, etc.	The model is a snap-shot of the most up to date information available at the time. The model will be re-run as new relevant information and data becomes available.
10	Mr D R Witcher	Shibden Valley Society		Noted	The methodology used in the preparation of the hierarchy is complex but acceptable, as is the identification of the 12 Local Service Centres. The Society notes that the villages of Northowram and Shelf are not so identified, as they lack the range of facilities listed in the assessment criteria and hence rank lower on the final sustainability scores.	Noted
14	Mr Matthew Naylor	Yorkshire Water Services	3	Noted	Environmental factors need to be considered	The Settlement Hierarchy is part of the LDF evidence base it will inform but not create policy. Policy will be created through the development of the Core Strategy in light of all the available evidence base, which will include environmental considerations.
20	Mr B Howarth	Head of Planning Dacre Son & Hartley	Figure 5.7	Noted	Greetland is a sustainable centre, located in between Halifax and Elland, with a number of services and public transport services. Further development within and around Ripponden could provide further improvements to these services and facilities and could potentially allow the	Noted

					promotion of Greetland to the Local Service Centre.	
25	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial	Figure 5.7	Noted	Further development within and around Ripponden could provide further improvements to these services and facilities and could potentially allow the promotion of Ripponden to the Local Service Centre.	Noted
8	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.10	Noted	Stainland should be removed from the areas of search for potential sites for new development within the Settlement Hierarchy Model. The first reason is because Stainland is excluded from the hierarchy of centres in Stage 4. Secondly some of the scores are inaccurate.	The Settlement Hierarchy has been developed for two purposes. The first purpose is to highlight the services available within the main Calderdale settlements. This purpose will be used to provide evidence for the spread of development within the Core Strategy. For example, in accordance with the principles set out within the RSS Halifax is recognised as the districts main centre and therefore should accommodate most of the growth, Brighouse is its secondary centre etc. The second purpose of the model was to determine how sustainable individual grids within the model are. This will provide evidence of where there is development potential. It should be noted that the Settlement Hierarchy provides evidence it does not create policy. Policy will be formulated through the Core Strategy and Land Allocations documents taking account all the evidence available and in full public scrutiny. Any known errors in the model will be rectified prior to the next time the model is run.
2	Mr Ian Smith	English Heritage	6.1	Noted	As paragraph 6.1 of the Report notes, the sustainability of a settlement is in part determined by considering the level of and access to services. For the approach to be truly "sustainable" (in terms of the Government's four aims which are set out in PPS1 (and in Paragraph 1.2 of the Consultation Document), the assessment should	The Settlement Hierarchy is part of the LDF evidence base it will inform but not create policy. Policy will be created through the development of the Core Strategy in light of all the available evidence base, which will include environmental considerations.

					have factored in environmental considerations.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 4: Settlement hierarchy comments – Disagree/ not relevant

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
17	Mr B Howarth	Head of Planning Dacre Son & Hartley		Disagree	The factual representation of individual settlements as a result of the rigid scoring mechanism results in a ranking of settlements with little meaning as to their future potential for expansion or improvement in sustainability.	The Settlement Hierarchy provides valuable evidence with regards the availability of services. It should be noted that the Settlement Hierarchy is part of the LDF evidence base it will inform but not create policy. Policy will be created through the development of the Core Strategy in light of all the available evidence base, which will include environmental considerations.
22	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Disagree	The factual representation of individual settlements as a result of the rigid scoring mechanism results in a ranking of settlements with little meaning as to their future potential for expansion or improvement in sustainability.	The Settlement Hierarchy provides valuable evidence with regards the availability of services. It should be noted that the Settlement Hierarchy is part of the LDF evidence base it will inform but not create policy. Policy will be created through the development of the Core Strategy in light of all the available evidence base.
16	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Table 3.2	Disagree	An area with a nursery school receives 1 full point (classified as essential in table 4). However this can also include playgroups and pre- and after-school care. Although these other categories are also important, they do not offer the same level of full-time care that nurseries can, which can be particularly beneficial to parents in full-time employment.	Whilst the comments are noted the provision of child care facilities of any kind are considered important therefore no changes are suggested.
21	Mr B Howarth	Head of Planning Dacre Son & Hartley	5	Disagree	We would recommend that the Settlement Hierarchy considers the grouping of Greetland and West Vale along with the nearby larger settlement	The Settlement Hierarchy and Green Belt Review are separate parts of the LDF evidence base and whilst each will influence the Core Strategy they have been developed for different purposes and to satisfy different criteria.

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
					of Elland. This would be consistent with the identification of clusters of settlements creating continuous built-up areas within the Green Belt Methodology.	
26	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial	5	Disagree	We would recommend that the Settlement Hierarchy considers the grouping of some small settlements, which individually may not even register in terms of their score as a Neighbourhood Service Centre, yet collectively along with the nearby settlements they may be classified as a settlement. This would be consistent with the identification of clusters of settlements creating continuous built-up areas within the Green Belt Methodology.	The Settlement Hierarchy and Green Belt Review are separate parts of the LDF evidence base and whilst each will influence the Core Strategy they have been developed for different purposes and to satisfy different criteria.
7	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.2	Disagree	It appears that Stainland should not be included within this map.	The name Stainland is included on the map for reference and orientation purposes.
18	Mr B Howarth	Head of Planning Dacre Son & Hartley	6.2	Disagree	We do not agree with Para 6.2 which states that "It should be stressed that just because a settlement is considered sustainable it does not mean it will be expected to accommodate a particular level of growth, especially where there are no sites available to develop." The lack of "sites available to develop" is not reason to discount development.	The Settlement Hierarchy score only relates to an individual grid not those surrounding it as that grid will have its own score. Therefore sites need to be available within the grid which has been scored. However because the Settlement Hierarchy is evidence and not policy it can also be used to indicate what facilities are lacking in a grid and ensure these are overcome.
23	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial	6.2	Disagree	We do not agree with Para 6.2 which states that "It should be stressed that	The Settlement Hierarchy score only relates to an individual grid not those surrounding it as that grid will

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
					just because a settlement is considered sustainable it does not mean it will be expected to accommodate a particular level of growth, especially where there are no sites available to develop." The lack of "sites available to develop" is not reason to discount development.	have its own score. Therefore sites need to be available within the grid which has been scored. However because the Settlement Hierarchy is evidence and not policy it can also be used to indicate what facilities are lacking in a grid and ensure these are overcome.

Table 5: Settlement hierarchy comments – Deal with under different DPD

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
11	Mr Gary Micklethwaite		3.11	Deal with under different DPD	We object to any large scale development in the Clifton area of Brighouse - Road conditions and rural considerations should be the primary concerns.	The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), adopted May 2008, identified Halifax as a Sub-regional town and Brighouse as a Principal Town. This means that Halifax should be the prime focus for growth within the district and Brighouse the main local focus for growth in the district. The Calderdale LDF must be in conformity with the RSS. This comment relates to specific sites and is not relevant to either the Core Strategy or Green Belt Review therefore it will be considered as part of the consultation upon the Land Allocations and Designations document.

4. Next Steps

4.1 All the actions noted in this document will feed into the final Settlement Hierarchy Methodology. Following a revision of the methodology the first iteration of the Settlement Hierarchy Model will be undertaken, it is currently anticipated this work will be completed in summer 2009. Once complete the results will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) evidence base and will be used to inform the production of the Core Strategy and

Land Allocations and Designations documents which will form essential elements of the LDF. It is anticipated that the Settlement Hierarchy Model will need to be run on a periodic basis to ensure it is kept up to date with changing circumstances in service provision.

4.2 Once complete the first iteration of the Settlement Hierarchy Model will be made available on the Council's website (www.Calderdale.gov.uk).