

RURAL PROOFING OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY OPTIONS – Integrated Approach to the Management of Environmental Resources

1.1 Introduction

This paper presents the findings from rural proofing the draft options on policies on the Quality of the Environment – Integrated Approach to the Management of Environmental Resources and is a key component for influencing the authors of the draft preferred RSS Spatial Option. In pro-actively assessing the development of the Policy Options for the RSS Phase Three Revision the following has been considered:

- Whether the various options are likely to have a potential different impact for rural areas/people or uncertainty from that elsewhere, because of the particular characteristics of rural areas; and
- Where necessary, exploring what adjustments or compensations might be made to reflect rural needs and circumstances and produce the desired outcomes in rural areas or avoid/mitigate any undesirable impacts. Where appropriate rural proofing may also highlight opportunities to maximise positive impacts in rural areas

The options and explanatory text have been appraised against the Commission for Rural Communities Guidance [published May 2009] and is designed to be used alongside other appraisal systems including the Sustainability Appraisal process.

Please note that the checklist is designed to complement and not substitute consultation with rural communities, businesses and organisations. It is meant to be applied from the early stages of policy making although it may also be used during implementation and evaluation.

1.2 Integrated Approach to the Management of Environmental Resources

The Phase Three Revision aims to develop a strategy for the protection, conservation, enhancement and management of the region's environmental assets and resources, for their intrinsic value and wider social and economic benefits

The Options being considered are:

1. Environment led; promoting a landscape scale approach
2. Development led; targeting areas affected by significant growth
3. Spatial Strategy led, prioritising the protection of key assets and addressing areas of poor environmental quality in and around MUAs and Regeneration Zones

1.3 Analysis

In reviewing how rural issues relate to these policy options, i.e. setting out the questions to be explored by the Rural Proofing process, the three options have been considered. The table overleaf highlights which issues are likely to be relevant.

Table: Rural Proofing

RP Topic	Will the option/proposal.....	O1	O2	O3	Comments
Availability & Provision					
RP1: Availability of services	Affect the availability of public and private services?	√	√		<p>The first two options are likely to have a positive impact. Improvement in the environment meeting social and economic needs mean that there might be less reliance/need for the centralisation of services and the needs of the rural communities can be better catered for in situ giving a boost to the rural economy providing some of them.</p> <p>X Less positive 3rd option where rural renaissance is forgone and support only for MUAs and presumable urban regeneration zones</p>
RP2: Service Delivery	Be delivered through existing service outlets and how will you ensure rural residents can access services in areas where outlets are few and far between?	√	√		Not really relevant. This policy may indirectly enhance the existing service provision, particularly in rural areas.
RP3: Private sector involvement	Be delivered by the private sector or through a public-private partnership? Will the smaller and scattered population in rural areas provide a sufficient market to attract the private sector? Will there be similar opportunities for choice and competition? Does the private sector in rural areas have the capacity to deliver?	√	√		Positive impact – first two options. Highly likely that there will be a strong private sector involvement – particularly from land owners and managers as well as construction companies offering employment and support for local services

RP3: Private sector involvement				X	Option 3 – Not relevant – rural areas denied involvement
Delivery Costs					
RP4: Cost of delivery	Be more expensive to deliver in rural areas where people are more widely dispersed or economies of scale harder to achieve?	√	√		Preparation of action plans by AWM, RDPE, Natural England, Forestry Commission, Environment Agency, English Heritage, local authorities and others for managing the region's environmental assets should allow for higher unit costs in funding formulae if applicable.
RP5: Local delivery	Rely on local institutions for delivery? Will the policy be as effective in rural areas.	√	√		Public, private and voluntary sector delivery likely and it will be important that all are able to compete fairly and equitably in terms of funds for delivery. Specific support may be required in terms of capacity building and encouragement for private and voluntary sector input Clearly important to see policies embedded in county and district LDDs
Accessibility & Infrastructure					
RP6: Travel Needs	Affect travel needs or the ease and cost of travel? Will the impact be different in sparsely populated or remote rural areas, where typically journey times are longer, public transport is poor, and travel options are limited or expensive.	√	√		There will be the continuing need to carefully examine transport/access issues; minimising the impact on the rural road infrastructure and on road safety considerations

<p>RP7: Infrastructure</p>	<p>Rely on infrastructure (e.g. broadband ICT, main roads, utilities) for delivery? How will the policy work in rural areas, where the existing infrastructure is typically weaker (e.g. roads, electricity grid), some infrastructure doesn't exist (e.g. cable TV, mains gas) and upgrading of infrastructure may be difficult or expensive?</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>Consider using regulation or licences to encourage the development of improved infrastructure needed</p> <p>Not relevant</p>
<p>RP8: Administrative Areas</p>	<p>Delivery of the policy be challenging at the edges of administrative areas? Many rural people find it easier to cross an administrative boundary to access facilities.</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>Encourage "postcode" blindness and reciprocal sharing of service provision across administrative borders where this makes sense.</p> <p>Note: additional needs of rural communities either side of the Welsh Border: Border Proofing Welsh and English policies and delivery to ensure minimal impact.</p> <p>Not relevant</p>
<p>RP9: New buildings or development sites</p>	<p>Depend on new buildings or development sites? Where will these be located in rural areas, given that there are few brownfield sites and fewer locations where housing or other development will be acceptable?</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>Clearly important to see policies embedded in county and district LDDs being mapped and defined ensuring any development is of high quality and will contribute to local character and distinctiveness with minimum environmental impacts</p> <p>Not relevant</p>

Communications					
RP10: Communication	Rely on communicating information to individuals and communities? How will they access information in rural areas, where there are fewer (formal) places to obtain advice and information?	√	√		A clear communications policy encouraging the support from rural communities is essential. Failure to properly manage the communications process will have implications for securing buy-in for planning proposals and the opportunity of promoting community engagement in rural areas
Economies					
RP11: Impact on rural businesses	Impact on rural businesses, including the self-employed? Will it have a different effect on smaller businesses (which employ a greater proportion of the workforce in rural areas) or those sectors which are typically more significant in rural areas - farming and construction? Will the higher proportion of self-employed people in rural areas be affected by the policy (including women running part-time businesses)?	√	√	X	Positive Impact. The local economy and, with it, employment opportunities – creating jobs and economic value is very welcome particularly in rural areas and amongst rural communities Most rural businesses excluded
RP12: Impact on land-based industries	Have a particular impact on land-based industries and therefore on rural economies and environments? How will the policy affect the agricultural sector and the mining, extraction and water industries, which have a particular importance in many rural areas? Will there be a knock-on effect on the environment (given that 70% of the land is farmed)? Conversely, if the policy affects the environment, what are the implications for businesses based on natural resources such as tourism, leisure, renewable energy and food production?	√	√	X	Positive Impact. Lots of opportunities to identify “win-win” solutions which will deliver economic and environmental benefits – promoting local supply chains where possible and allowing/ encouraging a diverse range of rural enterprises. Not relevant

<p>RP13: Impact upon those on low income</p>	<p>Affect those on low wages or in part-time or seasonal employment? For those who work in rural areas, wages tend to be lower on average and a higher proportion of the workforce is engaged in part-time or seasonal employment. Will your policy implementation affect wage levels or people's access to quality employment? Will it affect the type of businesses that tend to pay low wages or offer seasonal/part-time work (e.g. agriculture, tourism)?</p>	<p>√</p>	<p>√</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>A probable positive impact. Additional employment opportunities e.g. traditional/journeyman skills could increase or extend the availability of seasonal employment opportunities. Consider measures to improve the choice of work (e.g. increasing skills, improving local childcare, improving transport to work).</p> <p>Not relevant</p>
<p>Disadvantage</p>					
<p>RP14: Disadvantaged Groups</p>	<p>To be targeted at the disadvantaged? How will it target disadvantage in rural areas, which is not usually concentrated in neighbourhoods? Do the indicators to be used for identifying need measure deprivation issues that are particular rural features (e.g. access to services, access to job opportunities, low earnings and housing affordability)?</p>	<p>√</p>	<p>√</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>Not directly relevant but increased access to local greenspace may improve health & wellbeing – particularly for low income disadvantaged groups or families are likely to be welcomed.</p> <p>Not relevant</p>