



Eden Local Plan

Options Paper 2 - Housing Distribution

This paper introduces a background to how new housing could be distributed in the district. It then sets out options for how new housing could be distributed throughout the District, and includes our preferred option for growth.

Planning Policy Team

April 2014

Contents

	Page
Why has this paper been produced	1
Note on the Options Papers and how options will be taken forward	1
Why do we need a plan for distributing new housing?	1
Why can't this be done through Neighbourhood Plans?	1
What is the current strategy for distributing housing?	2
Why are we proposing to change the existing strategy?	2
Aims of any new strategy	2
Option 1: Key Hubs and Villages (Preferred Option).....	4
Why have we chosen this option?.....	6
Option 2: Proportional Growth.....	7
Why have we not chosen this option?.....	9
Option 3: Retain Existing Criterion	10
Why have we not chosen this option?.....	11
Option 4: Distribution Linked to Past Trends.....	12
Why have we not chosen this option?.....	14
Conclusions	15

Options Paper 2 - Housing Distribution

Why has this paper been produced?

- 1.1 This paper sets out options for distributing future housing within the district, including the amount of new homes that will be directed to towns and villages. A Preferred Option is included for discussion. This paper is supported by a technical paper which sets out more detail on how the options have been created.

Note on the Options Papers and how options will be taken forward

- 1.2 Three options papers have or will be produced, covering the overall housing target, this paper on housing distribution and a further paper on potential allocations. A combination of 4 options will be selected and tested following receipt of feedback on these options papers from Members and officers. Options and Technical papers covering employment numbers and distribution have also been prepared.

Why do we need a plan for distributing new housing?

- 1.3 There are several reasons:
- A Local Plan must show where new housing development will and will not be acceptable when the District Council considers planning applications, to help give certainty to landowners, developers and local communities.
 - When allocating sites we can take a view on what may be the most suitable locations based on promoting a more sustainable pattern of development. We do this by establishing a 'settlement hierarchy', which aims to locate development where it can best support existing or encourage new services and facilities.
 - By creating this hierarchy and allocating sites we can resist or restrict new development elsewhere by demonstrating we have sufficient deliverable sites to meet demand. The Council is required by Government to maintain at least five years of deliverable housing land, without which any plan is considered out of date. This risks housing proposals coming forward outside our hierarchy and being permitted by Inspectors at appeal.
 - It's a national policy requirement - paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) directs that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities and that isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided.

Why can't this be done through Neighbourhood Plans?

- 1.4 Ideally it would (or will) be. The District Council would like to see decisions on planning to be devolved as much as possible to those it affects, through Neighbourhood Plans or other community planning processes. This is why we will commit to supporting any village wishing to bring forward sites where we have not allocated any sites, or an alternative site strategy from the one we have set out in the Local Plan. However, as we are required to maintain a supply of deliverable housing land to avoid unfettered development coming forward we think it prudent at this stage to begin identifying sites. We would also very much like to hear your views on where the best sites may be as part of the consultation process on the Local Plan.

What is the current strategy for distributing housing?

1.5 Our existing method of distribution is set out in our adopted Core Strategy (2010) and follows a methodology set out in the now defunct Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West. This directs 60% of new growth to the Main Service Centre of Penrith, 9% to Appleby, 7% to Kirkby Stephen, 4% to Alston, (as Key Service Centres) 20% to 46 Local Services Centres and restricts growth elsewhere to affordable housing only. Key Service Centres are designated on the basis that they have a secondary school, library, doctor's surgery, post office, at least 200 square metres of retail floorspace and 1,500 residents. Local Service Centres are defined on the basis that they have at least a community or commercial bus service, and two out of three of a school, (non-mobile) post office or shop and a village hall or pub.

Why are we proposing to change the existing strategy?

1.6 We are now moving to creating a single Local Plan, and as part of this we have the opportunity to look again at how the current strategy is working, and whether it needs to be modified to best serve the needs of Eden. Feedback you have given us as part of past consultation, along with experience of operating this policy has told us that whilst, on the whole, the overall strategy of directing growth to the towns is the right one the following issues have emerged:

- Housing delivery in Penrith is below planned levels.
- Our current list of 46 Local Service Centres, whilst right in purpose, leads to difficulties in forward planning. The list could be said to be too pliable, meaning that the loss of a service can alter status overnight, reducing certainty on new development for local people and potential developers. The number of centres and the use of the existing criteria for designation has resulted in a list of villages which are very different in size and character. Furthermore, the list is in some ways self-reinforcing, as if villages elsewhere are deprived of new housing this means less demand for new community services to open, or the potential loss of current community facilities.
- The new strategy is responsive to recent changes in national guidance. We recognise that the current strategy may make it difficult for small scale housing to be developed in smaller villages, that may promote sustainable development in that area. All four of our options now account for the role that rural areas play in supporting the growth of the district.
- In practice much of our past housing supply has come forward on small sites in rural areas, and this remains an important source on new housing.

Aims of any new strategy

1.7 In light of the issues outlined above our aim has been to create a new distribution strategy which:

- Retains the broad thrust of existing one, with the main towns remaining the focus of new development
- Results in a robust and long lasting list of villages where new housing may be needed

- Strikes the right balance between certainty and flexibility, providing policy clarity with flexibility to take each application on its own merits
- Is capable of resisting unsustainable development in the wrong areas.
- Takes a more flexible approach to limited small scale affordable housing development in rural areas outside the towns and larger villages

1.8 Full details of the options are set out below are contained in the accompanying technical paper. They are summarised below:

- Option 1 - Preferred Option: Supporting settlements and services. This is similar to the current Core Strategy distribution, but includes limited modifications to slightly reduce rates at Penrith, and introduce more flexibility for development in rural areas. This option replaces the Local Service Centres definition with more tightly defined criteria, resulting in twenty 'Key Hubs'. The option also includes a list of smaller villages and hamlets, which are permitted limited growth to support local housing need and the vitality of the rural hinterland.
- Option 2: Proportional Growth. This approach uses settlement size to determine a suitable allocation for the plan period. It considers the possibility of applying a 1% growth policy to all the towns and villages. This approach would be reliant on windfall growth in the villages, rather than allocating for growth. The same criterion for Key Hubs used for Option 1 is applied, which promotes a pattern of sustainable centres for allocated growth.
- Option 3: Retain Existing Criterion. This provides an option of sticking with the current distribution strategy set out in the Core Strategy, amended to reflect the new preferred housing target for Eden.
- Option 4: Align the distribution strategy more in line with past trends. This looks at whether future housing should go in areas where it has come forward in the past. This option reduces levels at Penrith and significantly increases development in rural areas. To ensure that this option is as sustainable as possible, the Key Hubs criterion is applied to development in the rural areas.

1.9 The options, in more detail are:

Option 1: Key Hubs and Villages (Preferred Option)

Principal Town	Distribution	Site allocations	Housing Requirement	Affordable Housing Requirement
Penrith	50%	Yes	1409	30%
Market Towns				
Alston	4%	Yes	89	30%
Appleby	9%	Yes	141	30%
Kirkby Stephen	7%	Yes	171	30%
Total Towns	70%		1810	
Rural Areas				
Key Hubs	20%	Yes	406	30%
Villages and Hamlets	10%	No	0	Market enabled significant amount
Other rural areas	0%	No	0	100%
Total Rural	30%		406	
	Total	100%	2,216	

Key Hubs - Supporting settlements are defined as:

- **Armathwaite**
- **Brough and Church Brough**
- **Clifton**
- **Greystoke**
- **Hackthorpe**
- **High Hesket**
- **Kirkby Thore**
- **Langwathby**
- **Lazonby**
- **Low Hesket**
- **Nenthead**
- **Orton**
- **Plumpton**
- **Ravenstonedale**
- **Shap**
- **Stainton**
- **Tebay**
- **Temple Sowerby**
- **Warcop**
- **Yanwath**

The key hubs will serve as areas of local growth, which offer a range of key services to sustain surrounding villages. To qualify as a key hub, a settlement must have the following core facilities:

- Daily public transport to larger centres. To qualify, a settlement must have either a bus or rail service to a town either within, or outside of Eden.
- Either a GP surgery, or a primary school.

As the plan is implemented, the number of services and facilities within a settlement may increase or decrease. The list of key hubs are considered resilient to future change, however may be susceptible to changes in service provision. If a settlement is to gain or lose key hub status, this will be accounted alongside the wider review of the Local Plan.

Villages and Hamlets - Development to meet local needs. Defined as:

Aiketgate, Ainstable, Blencarn, Blencow, Bolton, Brackenber, Brampton, Brough Sowerby, Brougham, Burrels, Calthwaite, Catterlen, Cliburn, Colby, Crackenthorpe, Croglin, Crosby Garrett, Crosby Ravensworth, Culgaith, Drybeck, Dufton, Eamont Bridge, Edenhall, Ellonby, Gaisgill, Gamblesby, Garrigill, Glassonby, Great Asby, Great Musgrave, Great Ormside, Great Salkeld, Great Strickland, Hartley, High Bank Hill, Hilton, Hoff, Hunsonby, Hutton End, Ivegill, Johnby, Kaber, Keld, Kelleth, Kings Meaburn, Kirkland, Kirkoswald, Knock, Laithes, Lamonby, Little Asby, Little Musgrave, Little Salkeld, Little Strickland, Long Marton, Longdale, Maulds Meaburn, Melkinthorpe, Melmerby, Milburn, Millhouse, Morland, Motherby, Murton, Nateby, Newbiggin (Ains.), Newbiggin on lune, Newbiggin (Dacre), Newbiggin (TS), Newby, Newton Reigny, North Dykes, Ousby, Outhgill, Reagill, Renwick, Roundthwaite, Ruckcroft, Salkeld Dykes, Sandford, Skelton, Skirwith, Sleagill, Sockbridge and Tirril, Soulby, Southwaite, Unthank, Waitby, Wharton, Winskill, Winton

Small scale development will be permitted in these locations, to support the development of diverse and sustainable communities. Development will be limited to infill sites or rounding off existing development in settlements.

Rural Exceptions

Subject to consultation, we consider the list of settlements in this policy comprehensive. Domestic housing will not be permitted in the open countryside. Rural exceptions housing (affordable housing only) in or adjacent to small clusters of housing may be permitted where there is evidence of justified housing need, and will be required to remain affordable in perpetuity.

Why have we chosen this option?

- It reduces the overall provision in Penrith, which reflects an allocation that is more likely to be delivered in the 15 year plan period.
- It recognises that small scale rural development has been and will continue to be a source of housing supply in Eden, which is reflected in a small allocation to these areas.
- It produces a set of village hubs considered to be resilient and unlikely to change
- It aims to encourage more affordable housing in rural areas.

Option 2: Proportional Growth

Principal Town	Distribution	Site allocations	Housing Target	Affordable Housing
Penrith	36%	Yes	948	30%
Market Towns				
Alston	3%	Yes	53	30%
Appleby	7%	Yes	95	30%
Kirkby Stephen	5%	Yes	68	30%
Total Towns	52%		1164	
Rural Areas				
Key Hubs	24%	No	570	30%
Villages and Hamlets	25%	No	531	Market enabled significant amount
Other rural areas	0%	No	0	100%
Total Rural	48%		1101	
Total	100%		2265	

Key Hubs - Supporting settlements are defined as:

- **Armathwaite**
- **Brough and Church Brough**
- **Clifton**
- **Greystoke**
- **Hackthorpe**
- **High Hesket**
- **Kirkby Thore**
- **Langwathby**
- **Lazonby**
- **Nenthead**
- **Orton**
- **Plumpton**
- **Ravenstonedale**
- **Shap**
- **Stainton**
- **Tebay**
- **Temple Sowerby**
- **Warcop**

- **Low Hesket**

- **Yanwath**

The key hubs will serve as areas of local growth, which offer a range of key services to sustain surrounding villages. To qualify as a key hub, a settlement must have the following core facilities:

- Daily public transport to larger centres. To qualify, a settlement must have either a bus or rail service to a town either within, or outside of Eden.
- Either a GP surgery, or a primary school

As the plan is implemented, the number of services and facilities within a settlement may increase or decrease. The list of key hubs are considered resilient to future change, however may be susceptible to changes in service provision. If a settlement is to gain or lose key hub status, this will be accounted alongside the wider review of the Local Plan.

The targets for the Principal and Market Towns should be considered minimum targets for growth. We will look favourably at additional sites within these centres, where sustainable development is promoted and there are no significant impacts that cannot be mitigated against.

Villages and Hamlets – Development to meet local needs. Defined as:

Aiketgate, Ainstable, Blencarn, Blencow, Bolton, Brackenber, Brampton, Brough Sowerby, Brougham, Burrels, Calthwaite, Catterlen, Cliburn, Colby, Crackenthorpe, Croglin, Crosby Garrett, Crosby Ravensworth, Culgaith, Drybeck, Dufton, Eamont Bridge, Edenhall, Ellonby, Gaisgill, Gamblesby, Garrigill, Glassonby, Great Asby, Great Musgrave, Great Ormside, Great Salkeld, Great Strickland, Hartley, High Bank Hill, Hilton, Hoff, Hunsonby, Hutton End, Ivegill, Johnby, Kaber, Keld, Kelleth, Kings Meaburn, Kirkland, Kirkoswald, Knock, Laithes, Lamonby, Little Asby, Little Musgrave, Little Salkeld, Little Strickland, Long Marton, Longdale, Maulds Meaburn, Melkinthorpe, Melmerby, Milburn, Millhouse, Morland, Motherby, Murton, Nateby, Newbeggin (Ains.), Newbeggin on lune, Newbiggin (Dacre), Newbiggin (TS), Newby, Newton Reigny, North Dykes, Ousby, Outhgill, Reagill, Renwick, Roundthwaite, Ruckcroft, Salkeld Dykes, Sandford, Skelton, Skirwith, Sleagill, Sockbridge and Tirril, Soulby, Southwaite, Unthank, Waitby, Wharton, Winskill, Winton

Small scale development will be permitted in these locations, to support the development of diverse and sustainable communities. Development will be limited to infill sites or rounding off existing development in settlements.

Rural Exceptions

Subject to consultation, we consider the list of settlements in this policy comprehensive. Domestic housing will not be permitted in the open countryside. Rural exceptions housing (affordable housing only) in or adjacent to small clusters of housing may be permitted where there is evidence of justified housing need, and will be required to remain affordable in perpetuity.

Why have we not chosen this option?

- Reduced certainty for local community and developers on future location of housing when applied across the whole district.
- Results in high rates of dispersed development when applied across the whole district.
- Option does not promote strategic rural growth, designed to retain and support key areas.
- May reduce the ability of the district council to maintain an identified land supply, in line with Government planning guidance.

Option 3: Retain Existing Criterion

Principal Town	Distribution	Site allocations	Housing Target	Affordable Housing
Penrith	60%	Yes	1766	30%
Market Towns				
Alston	4%	Yes	88	30%
Appleby	9%	Yes	145	30%
Kirkby Stephen	7%	Yes	143	30%
Total Towns	80%		2142	
Rural Areas				
Local Service Centres	20%	Yes	422	30%
Other rural areas	0%	No	0	100%
Total Rural (Core Strategy)	20%		422	
Total	100%		2564	

Local Service Centres - Supporting settlements

- Armathwaite
- Bolton
- Brough and Church Brough
- Calthwaite
- Clifton
- Croglin
- Crosby Ravensworth
- Culgaith
- Gamblesby
- Great Asby
- Greystoke
- Long Marton
- Maulds Meaburn
- Melmerby
- Milburn
- Morland
- Nenthead
- Orton
- Ousby
- Plumpton
- Ravenstonedale
- Renwick

- Hackthorpe
- High Hesket
- Ivegill
- Kings Meaburn
- Kirkby Thore
- Kirkoswald
- Langwathby
- Lazonby
- Shap
- Skelton
- Sockbridge and Tirril
- Stainton
- Tebay
- Temple Sowerby
- Warcop
- Yanwath

The Local Service Centres have a role to play in accommodating new development but on a scale in keeping with their character and community need. These are defined as settlements with a range of services and public/community based transport facilities where sustainable development can take place. The services required for a settlement to be declared a Local Service Centre are:

To have a public/community transport link to a larger centre.

And to have 2 out of 3 of the following:

- A shop or post office
- A primary school
- A village hall or pub

Rural Exceptions

Small scale housing development will be permitted in rural settlements (around 3 or more contiguous dwellings) if it meets the following criteria:

Provides 100% affordable housing to meet an identified local housing need.

The development meets the sequential approach to land use set out in policy CS1 to the satisfaction of the Council. Evidence might be required to confirm that there are no suitable, available or achievable sequentially preferable sites prior to greenfield sites being released for development.

The design of the proposed development would respect the character and quality of the natural and historic environment

All normal site planning requirements are met.

Why have we not chosen this option?

- Reduced certainty for local community and developers on future location of housing when applied across the whole district
- Results in high rates of rural development when applied across the whole district

- May reduce the ability of the district council to maintain an identified land supply, in accordance with Government planning guidance.

Option 4: Distribution Linked to Past Trends

Principal Town	Distribution	Site allocations	Housing Target	Affordable Housing
Penrith	33%	Yes	794	30%
Market Towns				
Alston	3%	Yes	52	30%
Appleby	7%	Yes	73	30%
Kirkby Stephen	6%	Yes	107	30%
Total Towns	49%		1026	
Rural Areas				
Key Hubs	26%	Yes	782	30%
Villages and Hamlets	29%	No	370	Market enabled significant amount
Other rural areas	0%	No	0	100%
Total Rural (Core Strategy)	51%		1152	
Total	100%		2178	

Key Hubs - Supporting settlements are defined as:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armathwaite • Brough and Church Brough • Clifton • Greystoke • Hackthorpe • High Hesket • Kirkby Thore • Langwathby • Lazonby • Low Hesket | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nenthead • Orton • Plumpton • Ravenstonedale • Shap • Stainton • Tebay • Temple Sowerby • Warcop • Yanwath |
|---|---|

The key hubs will serve as areas of local growth, which offer a range of key services to sustain the surrounding villages. To qualify as a key hub, a settlement must have the following core facilities:

- Daily public transport to larger centres. To qualify, a settlement must have either a bus or rail service to a town either within, or outside of Eden.
- Either a GP surgery, or a primary school

As the plan is implemented, the number of services and facilities within a settlement may increase or decrease. The list of key hubs are considered resilient to future change, however may be susceptible to changes in service provision. If a settlement is to gain or lose key hub status, this will be accounted alongside the wider review of the Local Plan.

Villages and Hamlets - Development to meet local needs. Defined as:

Aiketgate, Ainstable, Blencarn, Blencow, Bolton, Brackenber, Brampton, Brough Sowerby, Brougham, Burrels, Calthwaite, Catterlen, Cliburn, Colby, Crackenthorpe, Croglin, Crosby Garrett, Crosby Ravensworth, Culgaith, Drybeck, Dufton, Eamont Bridge, Edenhall, Ellonby, Gaisgill, Gamblesby, Garrigill, Glassonby, Great Asby, Great Musgrave, Great Ormside, Great Salkeld, Great Strickland, Hartley, High Bank Hill, Hilton, Hoff, Hunsonby, Hutton End, Ivegill, Johnby, Kaber, Keld, Kelleth, Kings Meaburn, Kirkland, Kirkoswald, Knock, Laithes, Lamonby, Little Asby, Little Musgrave, Little Salkeld, Little Strickland, Long Marton, Longdale, Maulds Meaburn, Melkinthorpe, Melmerby, Milburn, Millhouse, Morland, Motherby, Murton, Nateby, Newbeggin (Ains.), Newbeggin on lune, Newbiggin (Dacre), Newbiggin (TS), Newby, Newton Reigny, North Dykes, Ousby, Outhgill, Reagill, Renwick, Roundthwaite, Ruckcroft, Salkeld Dykes, Sandford, Skelton, Skirwith, Sleagill, Sockbridge and Tirril, Soulby, Southwaite, Unthank, Waitby, Wharton, Winskill, Winton

Small scale development will be permitted in these locations, to support the development of diverse and sustainable communities. Development will be limited to infill sites or rounding off existing development in settlements.

Rural Exceptions

Subject to consultation, we consider the list of settlements in this policy comprehensive. Domestic housing will not be permitted in the open countryside. Rural exceptions housing (affordable housing only) in or adjacent to small clusters of housing may be permitted where there is evidence of justified housing need, and will be required to remain affordable in perpetuity.

Why have we not chosen this option?

- The high rate of completions in rural areas compared to the towns masks a declining trend in completions in the rural areas outside current Local Services (likely to be the result of Core Strategy policy beginning to bite over time). This option does not reflect the low levels of growth in Eden's principal and market towns. Past rates of development in the towns have been lower than many villages; as such they do not serve as accurate representations of growth in the district.
- This option does not perform as well in sustainable development terms, leading to more dispersed development and reliance on the car.
- Reducing development rates for Penrith means less housing to support Penrith's economy. It would also be advantageous to seek to boost more affordable housing in urban areas as a means of helping reduce the outflow of younger people from the district.

Conclusions

- The NPPF requires that we define a settlement hierarchy that is resilient to change, promotes the retention of local facilities and the use of sustainable transport methods.
- The current settlement distribution does not fully account for the role that rural areas can play in supporting housing growth in the district.
- By changing our distribution strategy, we can explore ways in which we can help offer greater support to Eden's villages and create a list of centres which will promote strategic growth.
- Four have been developed to reflect a range of scenarios, reflecting evidence and potential options for growth. The new growth options redefine the list of settlements in Eden, offering greater certainty to which locations will be appropriate for growth and reduce sprawl into the open countryside.
- Of the scenarios for growth, Option 1 is our preferred strategy. This involves a slight reduction in the distribution for Penrith, which is redirected to the rural villages. This strategy will also involve less risk for Penrith, as it remains the focus for development but provides a more deliverable figure for growth. Overall, this presents a more balanced option than the current distribution strategy (option 3).
- Options 2 and 4 have been devised to reflect growth that is proportionate and related to past rates of development. These options shifted the emphasis for development away from the towns to the villages, which would present a less favourable model for sustainable growth in the district.