



## **RUFopoly Event**

**Birmingham City University**

**Millennium Point**

**30th May 2012**

### **Report for participants: “Reflections on game- playing and future applications of RUFopoly”**

Birmingham School of the Built  
Environment, Birmingham City University,  
July 2012

**Report produced by:  
Alister Scott, Rachel Curzon, Claudia Carter  
and Michael Hardman**



## Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
The event.....	1
Introduction to the report.....	1
Thank you .....	1
<b>Background context – RUFopoly’s journey.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Group One: Findings based on responses to RUFopoly questions .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Group Two: Findings based on responses to RUFopoly questions.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Summary of discussions .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Reflections on RUFopoly .....	21
Reflections on the themed videos .....	21
Reflections on playing the game .....	22
Developing the game further .....	24
The future of RUFopoly .....	25
Concluding comments.....	27
<b>Appendix 1: Agenda (Groups 1 and 2).....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix 2: List of participants, facilitators and organisers.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Group 1 - Responses to themed questions (after playing the game) .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Group 2 - Responses to themed questions (before playing the game) .....</b>	<b>41</b>

# Introduction

## The event

The purpose of the RUFopoly event in May 2012 was to critically reflect on the game, as an interactive decision-making tool for spatial planning and ecosystem services, and also to investigate options for its wider use. A select group of individuals, from a variety of backgrounds, were invited to attend. Through their knowledge and expertise it was hoped that numerous aspects of the game including the videos, the questions, the practicalities of playing the game and suggestions for its wider or future use would be discussed. The agenda for the event can be found in **Appendix 1**.

## Introduction to the report

During the event much information was gathered in a variety of formats. This included paper based evaluations, audio recordings during discussions, notes taken by facilitators, as well as the answers recorded on 'post-its' during the game playing process. This report sets out the findings from the game playing session plus summaries of a number of areas of discussion reflecting on the game and its future development and use.

## Thank you

Thank you for taking part in the RUFopoly event. The level of interaction and enthusiasm provided by those in attendance was fantastic. We are very grateful for your contribution of time, knowledge and expertise. (A list of participants and facilitators can be found in **Appendix 2**).

Thank you also to all the facilitators and the team in REIS for their help in the organisation and running of this event.

If you would like any further information about RUFopoly, this report or opportunities relating to this, please contact [Alister.scott@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Alister.scott@bcu.ac.uk) or [Rachel.curzon@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Rachel.curzon@bcu.ac.uk) for further information.

## Background context – RUFopoly's journey

RUFopoly was initially showcased at the RELU conference "Who Should Run the Countryside" in November 2011 as an outcome of our Relu funded project 'Managing Environmental Change at the Fringe: Reconnecting Science and Policy with the Rural-Urban Fringe'. It soon caught the attention of the national press, professional bodies, local authorities, and community groups. Since then it has made numerous appearances across the Midlands and beyond.

RUFopoly is an interactive game that enables players to journey through the fictitious county of RUFshire, which is under constant change from pressures for development and new opportunities generated by the region's growing population and changing environmental governance.

The purpose of the game is for players to answer questions relating to the themes of the project (Values, Connections, and Long Termism), as randomly determined by the throw of a dice. This journey of discovery enables players to experience the issues facing the rural-urban fringe. Players are supported by a facilitator who notes down answers and supporting justification given in discussions. This audit trail of decisions is then used to allow each player to devise their own vision set within improved understanding of the impact of their previous decisions.

This journey of discovery enables players to experience the issues facing the rural-urban fringe; a place of constant change and opportunity requiring decisions and ideas.

Rufopoly has become an unexpected and additional output from the project as it had huge appeal in summarising the complex research concepts we were grappling with into an effective and fun journey through a hypothetical rural-urban fringe (Rufshire).

## Group One: Findings based on responses to RUFopoly questions

Group 1 played RUFopoly without being exposed to the background of the project, sight of the questions or contextual material, such as the videos produced as part of the research project. They therefore answered the questions as they travelled across the board relying on their existing expertise, knowledge and values.

The following section details the answers to the various questions presented during a game of RUFopoly. The report also includes interesting statements made when attendees were discussing the option. This piece is structured according to theme, and then within that, by question number. There is a short summary, extracting the key issues from the responses, for each theme.

Introductory question			
<p>URF and RUF councils are currently consulting on their joint development plan for the future planning of the city-region up to 2029. They have devised four spatial options from surveys of housing/employment need (25,000 houses; 221 hectares of employment land). Which one do you favour and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 75% development in the existing centre (city 50% St Ruf 25% with the remaining 25% spread across the district villages.</li> <li>b) A new town for 16,000 residents (please indicate possible area within the plan).</li> <li>c) A redrawing of green belt boundaries to allow for more development (please indicate new boundaries on your plan).</li> <li>d) A focus on rural development with villages taking 50% growth and 25% in existing centres.</li> </ul> <p>If none of these 4 options are selected, suggest an alternative (with reasons)</p>			
Responses			
<p><b>The evidence collated shows a mixed response to the entrance question, with the majority (three responses) focussing on a), whilst there are a couple who respond to c) and d). This perhaps indicates that Group One favoured a development strategy which builds mostly on the existing urban, with minimal impact on the rural.</b></p>			
<p>a) Focus on employment, interest in regeneration on the fringe areas. Managed (strict) expansion. The development proposed should be in-keeping with size – proportional.</p>	<p>b) <i>No responses</i></p>	<p>c) Pressing needs of older urban areas with lack of suitable premises to sustainable economic development.</p>	<p>d) People need to be able to access the railway to get to work.</p>

### Spatial Planning and Ecosystem Services

**The majority of responses have a community-centric value, with responders opting to make adjustments based on the community's involvement. There is a specific focus on using existing resources and enhancing these for communal and visitor benefits. However, there is also evidence to suggest that planning should carefully enforce any form of development; restricting and punishing those who do not abide by the rules.**

#### Question

**7) Looking at the features in the square what key change would you make to improve the benefits**

to a) you; b) the community; and c) Ruffshire		
<b>Responses</b>		
Cannot answer question in a meaningful way. Not enough information to answer the question proposed. However, to speculate: since this is a post-industrial site we should engage with industry and try to restore landscape for EA – note quality issues? Bare-in-mind biodiversity, recreation and access etc.		
a) Who am I? I'd be living in a city not here. Nothing obvious that I'd want to do. Not interested on a personal level.	b) Preserve the greenspace. Retain the lake – depending what it is like.	c) Enhance green benefits to attract people – walks around the lake etc.
<b>Question</b>		
<b>10)</b> A disused quarry has been left to nature but is currently subjected to illegal fly tipping. The landowner is hoping to develop this area into coniferous woodland for timber production but the local Wildlife Trust argues that more benefits for conservation will accrue from a deciduous and coniferous mix with opportunities for timber production. In your view what is the best option and why?		
<b>Responses</b>		
Chose the Wildlife Trust option for a mix: Mix enhances growth rates of deciduous Benefits such as timber production Wildlife value Ensure linkages between conservation of trees – connection to existing green initiatives.		
<b>Question</b>		
<b>21)</b> The two landowners of the fields here decided to farm this land ecologically, with support from the local Wildlife Trust group and RSPB. The central area is undulating / hilly and there are some patches of heather remnants. What option would you recommend as an additional priority in the coming year to further improve environmental benefits and why?		
a) Set up a network of local landowners/farmers to encourage environmentally sensitive land management and ultimately extend the areal extent of the trust. b) Apply for planning permission to establish a small farm shop and sell produce from a range of local farms/food producers; use excess profit for trust land. c) Focus on initial work, but communicate progress and highlights through social networking sites (web blog, Facebook, twitter). d) Other (please specify)		
<b>Responses</b>		
a) Evidence from other research: Farms working together, agri-environment. A lot of benefits from this such as linkages, wildlife corridors etc. Ecological farm – to set up a network of landowners to widen impact but needs link to c).	b) <i>No responses</i>	
c) Social media to communicate progress from a). Vital tool to support set up of connected network.	d) Fuller/broader environmental ecosystem service audit of land to see how it might change and how [illegible] need compensating e.g. managing for carbon sequestration water quality. Assumption – grazing land may need to change	

		grazing patterns and risks of intensification. Be looking for full audit of ecosystem of the land to ecological or biodiversity. Water quality – how much to pay the farmer? What carbon sequestration benefits, other benefits, more environment audits to calculate carbon etc.	
<b>Question</b>			
<b>22)</b> St Ruf has been regularly flooding particularly during autumn and spring from increased water flow from the uplands in the AONB. What options for management of heavy rain might you consider to reduce flood risk? a) Increase flood defences in St Ruf outside the upland area b) Consider for the creation of lowland flood storage areas, such as flood meadows c) Consider upland management approaches such as tree planting to reduce peak flows d) Consider creating a multipurpose reservoir for flood protection ( Other option (please explain)			
<b>Response:</b>			
a) <i>No responses.</i>	b) Quite a lot of potential for flooded areas. Creation of lowland flood storage – flood meadows. Enhance habitats – maintain natural environment rather than hard defence measures. Flood run-off from uplands as a novice would suggest flood meadows and potential added value – would explore more detail on impact on uplands for b) and c).	c) <i>No responses.</i>	d) <i>No responses.</i>
<b>Question</b>			
<b>26)</b> A small community group has purchased a smallholding of 20 acres here and has started building, without planning permission, some low impact houses to pursue their green lifestyle. However, despite its location and small scale, the local RUF Wildlife Trust argues that this will deliver more environmental benefits than contemporary farming. Should the development be granted retrospective planning permission?			
<b>Responses</b>			
No, if they have ignored planning legislation it should not be given. Gypsies etc, if they did it they would have them tore down!			
<b>Question</b>			
<b>28)</b> A farmer is proposing to develop a small scale food waste (anaerobic digestion) plant in his RUF farmland. Waste will be collected from homes in the nearby urban area by truck on a daily basis, producing electricity from the bio-gas and using the liquid and solid by-product as soil enhancers. Both electricity and soil enhancer could be sold locally. This would provide three local jobs in an area predominantly used for commuting. However, the local village opposes this on grounds of smell, traffic and noise. Should it be built?			
<b>Response:</b>			
Anaerobic digestions. Concern over measure of noise – community would need to consider wider benefits – needs full assessment of impact bit immediate view would be benefits outweigh problems.			

<p><b>Making Connections in Grey-Green-Blue Infrastructure Planning</b></p> <p>The core message from these sets of questions centres on employment and the requirement for these spaces, and communities, to make connection with industry. Responders appear to base their answers on whether transformation or proposals would improve the area and prospects for those who reside there.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>2) Local residents are seeking your support for a community hall with car park for meetings and other community pursuits including a small sports hall and 2 start-up units for local businesses. The present inhabitants do not have any community facilities nearby apart from access to a room in a local school, outside school hours, seating 30. However some residents are concerned that the building will take up valuable green space in the square. What is your opinion on the merits of the development?</p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p> <p>In favour of the development. It would be a useful community resource – drive rural enterprise. Merits include a new community facility – viable all day community space, drive enterprise, coffee mornings – hits sustainable communities requirement. On the other hand, not sure what businesses would be interested.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>4) This area has been identified as a potential site for new housing development in the consultation draft of the local plan. The future inhabitants will share services (schools, retail, church and community) with existing developments east of square 3. How can the barrier of the main road be overcome or is the development not viable?</p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p> <p>Identification makes it sound ok – build a bridge over the road? Would provide pedestrian access. Make it more viable – build some services so they weren't sharing small retail or schools. More bus services and generally more connections. Don't want to build a bridge, instead monitor use of bus services.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>9) A new industrial estate 20 hectares for light industrial use in green belt land is supported by RUFhampton Council within the URF District Council's area. The proposal is driven by the wider economic needs of the city region and lack of large alternative brownfield sites. Which option would you support and why?</p> <p>a) Reject proposal: suggest developing 2-3 smaller industrial estates in surrounding villages</p> <p>b) Proceed with proposal but make it a low-carbon flagship project of national importance with a carbon neutral goal incorporating a district heating scheme, green roofs and high quality green space</p> <p>c) Accept proposal but reduce scale of development by 50%</p> <p>d) Reject the proposal outright: it is vital to retaining the integrity of the green belt and not permit any industrial encroachment</p> <p>e) Other option (please explain)</p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p> <p>b) Preference for b) but would have to see impact assessment. Close to conservation area but would bring employment; lack of alternative sites, so would choose either low carbon option or reduction of scale.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>18) A major employer in this area has recently closed with the loss of 2,500 jobs. The buildings stand empty. This has had a devastating effect on the local community. Four Masterplans are</p>



<p>proposed on the following themes. Which one do you support and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Master plan A: Technology Park in conjunction with the adjoining Technology College</li> <li>b) Master plan B: Environmental Research Centre linked to renewable energy</li> <li>c) Master plan C: Intensive Urban Agriculture</li> <li>d) Master plan D: Urban wilderness allowing nature to reclaim the site.</li> <li>e) Other (please explain</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>a) Due to link to the technology college, local students, partnership making. Keep people in the area, retain local skills. Technology park – produce most potential for employment and spin offs.</p>	<p>e) Could explore option of redirecting development from contentious site at number 9) – sustainable usage of the site goes forward although wants to assess potential access of residents to 18).</p>
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>23)</b> There are proposals to secure and improve public access in the form of a regional trail for horses, cyclists and walkers alongside the canal running through the RUF. There is talk of a proposed bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund with matched funding from the council, British Waterways and Natural England. This will link the urban area to the AONB. What is your response to this proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Create a partnership with all groups involved so issues can be worked through and a unified voice created.</li> <li>b) Encourage individual interest groups to form who will feed into a strategy from different perspectives.</li> <li>c) Encourage individual interest groups to form, those with the loudest voice will influence the outcome.</li> <li>d) Do nothing as the proposal does not interest you.</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>b) Don't think it merits new partnership. Key points – consultation appropriate for other groups to feed into it. B) implies consultation.</p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>27)</b> A new service station is proposed along the motorway which would be visible from Rufsty. Villagers are generally against the proposal but the Highway Agency and URF Council see it as a way of creating new jobs and revenue. Which of the following options would you support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reject the proposal (existing service stations are 20 miles south, and 15 miles north).</li> <li>b) Accept the proposal but ensure shielded lighting and closure between 22:30 and 06:30</li> <li>c) Accept the proposal of a 24hr service station</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>a) Reject it, because there are sufficient service stations – can find more creative ways of making jobs.</p>	

<p><b>Values and Decision-Making</b></p> <p>The responder's core message here centres on the value of the natural landscape and how, even with ex-industrial sites, one should have rural at heart when decision-making. There is also considerable discussion on the addition of new development, such as polytunnels, and how this may improve the self-sufficiency and economy of the rural towns and villages.</p>
<b>Question</b>
<p><b>1)</b> A City Council Grant of £80,000 is available for a new community-initiated project. The conditions were: to provide something of social, economic and environmental benefit to the city;</p>

engage local citizens; be low-cost maintenance for the Council. Which of the following four bids on the final short-list would you vote for and why?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Getting a community orchard and food-growing projects going across the city using 1/5 of space in existing council parks.</li> <li>b) Establishing a car-boot sale pitch and community cafe in one of the socially disadvantaged suburbs of the city.</li> <li>c) Creating a peri-urban woodland using predominantly native tree and shrub species on 4 acres of derelict Council Warehousing land on the city fringe.</li> <li>d) Providing renewable energy through a single wind turbine which will be community owned.</li> </ul>
<b>Responses</b>
a) Community focus, more sustainable potential.
<b>Question</b>
<p><b>8)</b> A local landowner is seeking your views on the development of a former quarry, which is currently restored to a lake. What option would you favour and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Develop the recreation potential of the lake</li> <li>b) Develop the lake for conservation uses</li> <li>c) Create a small holiday village development around the lake</li> <li>d) Develop luxury executive housing around the lake</li> </ul> <p>Other option (please explain)</p>
<b>Responses</b>
a) Consideration taken with design to complement SAC. No motorised sports i.e. water sports, environmental impact activities, with infrastructure boundaries towards 7).
<b>Question</b>
<p><b>11)</b> A local farmer wishes to turn less productive fields into intensive horticulture involving polytunnels. The nearby St Ruf provides a ready-made local market (there is already a thriving farmers' market) and the business case is good as he has the necessary capital. However, there is concern about the landscape impact of the polytunnels and the local group "Save our RUF landscape" has asked you to support their campaign and protect the current farming landscape. What is your response and why?</p>
<b>Responses</b>
<p>Support the development of polytunnels – drives local enterprise, helps local farmers markets, 5-a-day, less import of fruit and vegetables, food miles – ecological benefits.</p> <p>This is a non-issue. It doesn't contravene the aesthetics of landscape. It's a temporary feature. Reasonable, sensible business proposition.</p> <p>Personal opinion – in-favour of polytunnels. Sympathetic with visual impact, but this needs to be balanced with employment needs. Also support local supply chain and low carbon. Would also consider the farming methods i.e. environmental impact.</p>
<b>Question</b>
<p><b>13)</b> You regularly walk the land in this green belt square as part of a wider recreational route alongside the RUF canal. This stretch of the canal has recently been restored by British Waterways and local volunteers. Given the potential increase in recreation (seasonal boating traffic and public access alongside the canal and link into the regional trail) what other opportunities would you support?</p>
<b>Responses</b>
<p>Would depend on level of usage and assessment for demand (e.g. for marine development?). If sufficient demand from walkers, could make it a 'destination' i.e. a trail or something? Would be a useful tool to get community to think about value of open space.</p>

<b>Question</b>
15) The lake in this former quarry workings is currently used as a recreational resource involving quiet water sports, angling and walking. It is also frequented by wildfowl including geese and herons but has no conservation designation. What do you value about a lake in this setting?
<b>Responses</b>
No interest in water sports: Value to walking, ecological elements are important, important to have informal spaces, making a benefit from ex-industry.

<b>Long-Termism - Temporal Perspectives</b>
There are mixed responses here concerning the notion of long term development. On one hand responders feel any form of housing development should be positioned away from the SAC; its infrastructure should not disturb this area either. On the other, some protest against the addition of green infrastructure, such as hills, to the landscape; concerned that this type of development may permanently damage the landscape.
<b>Question</b>
6) A planning application for 400 houses has been submitted as phase 3 of a development on the outskirts of RUFhampton (currently brownfield land). The area is zoned for housing development. Given the close proximity of the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) please indicate on your map how do you think this development should proceed whilst minimizing the impact on the SAC. Refusing the application is not an option as it conforms to all relevant local and national policies.
<b>Responses</b>
Make sure there is: sufficient buffer between development and SAC. Involve community groups to explore argument and by negotiation ensure having delivered but area protected. Explore use of levies to fund protection. Boundary implication and the buffer zone between SAC and housing area. Create amenity space but with necessary density. Activity and leisure. Alternatively space development out with a smaller buffer. Consideration of space, create a buffer zone (condition). Polluting influences away from SAC i.e. road infrastructure. Buffer zone minimum impact and bridge the 2 spaces. Instil community pride, signage and information about the area. Divert road.
<b>Question</b>
12) A landowner within the Green Belt wishes to convert his fields into a public park including BMX/skateboard facilities and outdoor gym areas. There is currently no public access to his land. Should this be permitted? a) No, it is development in the Green Belt and changes the nature of the RUF b) No, it has compromised the openness of the Green Belt c) Yes, although it is development it has not compromised the openness of the Green Belt d) Yes, it remains Green Belt with a much improved land use/surface of value to society e) Other conclusion (please explain)
<b>Responses</b>
d) In favour of public access to space – improved social value although not wildlife! Wants landowner to reflect on whether this is best use (for BMX/skating) – but sees value in land being accessible. Would want to see environmental impact associated but would encourage community use. Prefer progressive development, controlled by planning condition. Comprehensive consultation on

the appropriate line of environment i.e. grassland, wetland recreation facilities. Considerate development minimal built infrastructure.	
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>16)</b> There is a proposal to create a "hill" from construction and household waste of about 300 metres in height. This will help urban regeneration of RUFhampton and will take 10 years to complete. On completion it will be covered in decontaminated topsoil (also from urban regeneration) and landscaped. How would you treat this proposal in the best interests of the RUF?</p> <p>a) Welcome it for its positive impact on urban regeneration and negotiate a tipping levy to benefit wider RUF community projects.</p> <p>b) Maximise the benefits of this mountain through negotiating a long term tourism and recreation management plan</p> <p>c) Create a range of natural habitats to increase biodiversity and provide new (upland) wildlife areas to compensate for the impact of global warming</p> <p>d) Press for a scaled down hillock to better integrate with the RUF landscape character whilst achieving some of the above benefits in a shorter time scale</p> <p>e) Reject the proposal as inappropriate intrusive in the rural landscape, and unworkable</p> <p>f) Other (please explain your answer)</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
d) Hill reclamation – away from development but close to canal – not in-keeping with flatter topography. Concern is for movement away from encouraging recycling. Needs clever marketing and engagement. Although could be huge social value in reclamation (e.g. coal mine sites).	e) Reject proposal – disproportionate – 300m! Absurd!!! Not sure what the business case is – do we need more hills, aesthetics, is it needed for walking? Possible scale down, but still suspicious.

<b>RUF vision</b> <b>The visions provided stress the need for sensible development: a consideration of the scale, environment, balance, and the inclusion of community in decision-making. There is a strong emphasis on community benefit and the need to recognise how important the landscape is to these individuals. In particular, responders showcase their desire to retain the greenbelt but whilst also supporting economic development. Notably limited attention focussed on the wider environment suggesting it of secondary importance at the present time?</b>		
<b>Question</b>		
You have had a varied journey across the rural urban fringe. Please review answer cards and your plan and try to summarize your overall vision for RUFshire. Think about the timescale of the decisions you have taken (short, medium and long-term impacts) and the spatial scale (very localized, wider local community and landscape, sub-regional, wider).		
<b>Responses</b>		
A truly sustainable city with lifestyle amenity and development opportunities. Sacrifice green belt to make more sustainable city.	Considerate development of jobs and economy with the upmost preservation of greenspace and conservation areas.	Need to audit places for the environmental audits to understand the range of things that can be done. Economic case alongside business case.
Evidence-based decision-making and understanding of impact.	Support change cautiously, to look for economic development	Driving rural enterprise. Capitalising on existing

Widening decision-making reach – as wide a group of meaningful responses. Sees great value of community access and social benefit can outweigh environmental depending on impact.	that are innovative in that relative with natural environment.	resources. Added value from ecological resources.
---	--	---

## Group Two: Findings based on responses to RUFopoly questions

Group 2 were first asked to watch videos relating to the project, and then answer themed RUFopoly questions. Players had therefore been exposed to the project background and a number of the questions before playing the board game.

The following section details the answers given to the various questions during a game of RUFopoly. The report also includes interesting statements made when attendees were discussing the option. This piece is structured according to theme, and then within that, by question number. There is a short summary, extracting the key issues from the responses, for each theme.

### Introductory question

URF and RUF councils are currently consulting on their joint development plan for the future planning of the city-region up to 2029. They have devised four spatial options from surveys of housing/employment need (25,000 houses; 221 hectares of employment land). Which one do you favour and why?

- a) 75% development in the existing centre (city 50% St Ruf 25% with the remaining 25% spread across the district villages)
- b) A new town for 16,000 residents (please indicate possible area within the plan)
- c) A redrawing of green belt boundaries to allow for more development (please indicate new boundaries on your plan).
- d) A focus on rural development with villages taking 50% growth and 25% in existing centres.

If none of these 4 options are selected, suggest an alternative (with reasons)

### Responses

**Interestingly, there is a mix of responses to the opening question, with an equal distribution of answers. The majority favour option d) or a mix of multiple options. Nevertheless, a strong message is that there should be a focus on rural development, in particular with the smaller settlements.**

a) Would focus development on land between key built up areas and green belt (also considered option c).

b) New development in one place. Saves increasing the density of towns/villages. Saves greenspace. Build a good ecotown.

c) Distributed development but key urban plan. Greenbelt blunt policy instrument. However, its benefits could be redistributed, d) could be an option.

d) Would need more information on how to make it a sensible option, with possibly more on city sensible option.

Does not want new town issue of has to push connectivity.

Smaller settlements where there can be some growth – rather than upon greenbelt expansion.

Sensible compromise not just the new town area – connectivity improved via small areas. Job creation a key incentive.

### Spatial Planning and Ecosystem Services

**There is consensus across the questions regarding the retention of the natural environment; ensuring that any form of development does not impact on the current landscape. Another particular focus is on the community's involvement with the planning process and how any adaption, or development, on the existing landscape should involve the local's views too.**

<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>3)</b> You are walking within this area and notice that a few residents are on site creating a flower display and they have placed a small wooden bench on a grass verge. The grass verge has also been dug up. You ask them why they are doing this on Council owned land. The residents explain that they are a community gardening group who wish to cultivate the under-used grass verges and green space in the area, due to the impossibility of securing allotment spaces managed by the local authority. What is your response?</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		
<p>Ask for information about groups. What level of support they have. Have they had any dialogue with the council and would seek to facilitate anything. Keen to make it happen, where are the blocks.</p>		
<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>7)</b> Looking at the features in the square what key change would you make to improve the benefits to a) you b) the community and c) Rufsire</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		
<p>a) Develop some local recreational amenities. Green areas – investigate biodiversity (food growing).</p>	<p>b) Explore the better utilisation of greenspace (wildlife corridors).</p>	<p>c) Ecological restoration.</p>
<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>10)</b> A disused quarry has been left to nature but is currently subjected to illegal fly tipping. The landowner is hoping to develop this area into coniferous woodland for timber production but the local Wildlife Trust argues that more benefits for conservation will accrue from a deciduous and coniferous mix with opportunities for timber production. In your view what is the best option and why?</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		
<p>Concerns about planting whole area, would want to use the site to improve connectivity. Mixed scheme option with smaller blocks on production with [ineligible] planting and wetland, with land-owner cooperation. Need appropriate model to generate income for land owner i.e. commercial and recreational land use.</p> <p>Is there a compromise – opportunity to produce commercial planting but leave most important trees for nature conservation? More imperative for mixed planting. Could landowner split site? Public access?</p> <p>Would enforce against fly tipping and in terms of future use – call meeting of landowner and other groups – landowners decision within planning policy paramount but look for reasonable solution first.</p>		
<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>22)</b> St Ruf has been regularly flooding particularly during autumn and spring from increased water flow from the uplands in the AONB. What options for management of heavy rain might you consider to reduce flood risk?</p>		
<p>a) Increase flood defences in St Ruf outside the upland area</p> <p>b) Consider for the creation of lowland flood storage areas, such as flood meadows</p> <p>c) Consider upland management approaches such as tree planting to reduce peak flows</p> <p>d) Consider creating a multipurpose reservoir for flood protection ( Other option (please explain)</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		

a) <i>No responses.</i>	b) More natural solution – flood defences pass problems on to others and would not interfere with upland eco-system. Tried and tested means of dealing with run off. A natural means of accumulating water, c) also an option.	c) New and different approach and it works – would be interesting way of doing it – upland management. Look for upland management solution (alternative option) i.e. hold more water, slow reduction of run-off. Physical flood defences as a last resort. Mitigate and off-set c) with above comments. Tree option last resort. Appropriate trees, hoping trees will soak up sufficient water. Contribute positively to aesthetic of area. Carbon catching etc.	d) <i>No responses.</i>
-------------------------	--	--	-------------------------

### Question

**26)** A small community group has purchased a smallholding of 20 acres here and has started building, without planning permission, some low impact houses to pursue their green lifestyle. However, despite its location and small scale, the local RUF Wildlife Trust argues that this will deliver more environmental benefits than contemporary farming. Should the development be granted retrospective planning permission?

### Responses

In general, the right way of doing things is getting planning permission. Especially due to unseen consequences and it sets a precedent. Too few facts to make decision – is house dug into ground? Is it a tent-type structure?

### Question

**28)** A farmer is proposing to develop a small scale food waste (anaerobic digestion) plant in his RUF farmland. Waste will be collected from homes in the nearby urban area by truck on a daily basis, producing electricity from the bio-gas and using the liquid and solid by-product as soil enhancers. Both electricity and soil enhancer could be sold locally. This would provide three local jobs in an area predominantly used for commuting. However, the local village opposes this on grounds of smell, traffic and noise. Should it be built?

### Responses

Very difficult, accept issues relating to energy security, economic benefit, conditions on truck use. Yes it should be built, extensive consultation to understand objectives. Its job creation and getting rid of economic waste in an environment trending movement – has significant merit. Not sure about its use in the UK? Its contributing to climate change issues, so good thing to do. Yes should be built, but before decision is made there needs to be a lot of work with community (perhaps site visits), so they can see/smell impact. Get a major junction so should be able to link in.



<b>Making Connections in Grey-Green-Blue Infrastructure Planning</b> <b>The core message throughout these questions appears to be the retention of the local populace. In particular, through job creation and the creation of local assets in order to retain existing communities. There is also repetition with regards to partnerships: the need for local to connect and work together in order to devise strategies and plan for the future.</b>	
<b>Question</b>	
<b>4)</b> This area has been identified as a potential site for new housing development in the consultation draft of the local plan. The future inhabitants will share services (schools, retail, church and community) with existing developments east of square 3. How can the barrier of the main road be overcome or is the development not viable?	
<b>Responses</b>	
Build an underpass- pedestrian access, by-pass barrier. Psychological barrier? More than one underpass. How many houses? Could community facilities be added? If not, would enhance access across major road – look for community viability first and foremost as sustainable solution.	
<b>Question</b>	
<b>5)</b> The Government has recently designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in this area (great crested newts and semi-ancient natural oak woodland). Management solutions to protect the conservation interest of the site are required. What would be your favoured strategy? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Fence the area off and have public access restricted by permit</li> <li>b) Identify and build one path through the reserve which allows restricted access only</li> <li>c) Have free access but use local community volunteers to manage the reserve and access</li> <li>d) Allow unfettered public access</li> <li>e) Other option (please explain)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
a) Don't like the questions – SAC pov is a) – but how do you deal with a) in a wider context of development? So a) is the right answer in a policy context. Don't find it a useful question. Not sure of land designation.	e) New SAC – would devise new option – bring together interested parties and devise management plan to enable use by local community – managed rather than open to protect features for designation.
<b>Question</b>	
<b>9)</b> A new industrial estate 20hectares for light industrial use in green belt land is supported by RUFhampton Council within the URF District Council's area. The proposal is driven by the wider economic needs of the city region and lack of large alternative brownfield sites. Which option would you support and why? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reject proposal: suggest developing 2-3 smaller industrial estates in surrounding villages</li> <li>b) Proceed with proposal but make it a low-carbon flagship project of national importance with a carbon neutral goal incorporating a district heating scheme, green roofs and high quality green space</li> <li>c) Accept proposal but reduce scale of development by 50%</li> <li>d) Reject the proposal outright: it is vital to retaining the integrity of the green belt and not permit any industrial encroachment</li> <li>e) Other option (please explain)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
c) Reject proposal but suggest a better way to do something in surrounding areas to reduce travel, more localised business, more local benefits and reduce migration.	
<b>Question</b>	
<b>18)</b> A major employer in this area has recently closed with the loss of 2,500 jobs. The buildings	

stand empty. This has had a devastating effect on the local community. Four Masterplans are proposed on the following themes. Which one do you support and why?
a) Master plan A: Technology Park in conjunction with the adjoining Technology College. b) Master plan B: Environmental Research Centre linked to renewable energy. c) Master plan C: Intensive Urban Agriculture. d) Master plan D: Urban wilderness allowing nature to reclaim the site. e) Other (please explain).
<b>Responses</b>
a) Devastation to community is loss of jobs. Tech park maximise job creation. College can provide links and give the park a head start. Buildings should be innovative and inspiration for local community.
<b>Question</b>
<b>23)</b> There are proposals to secure and improve public access in the form of a regional trail for horses, cyclists and walkers alongside the canal running through the RUF. There is talk of a proposed bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund with matched funding from the council, British Waterways and Natural England. This will link the urban area to the AONB. What is your response to this proposal? a) Create a partnership with all groups involved so issues can be worked through and a unified voice created b) Encourage individual interest groups to form who will feed into a strategy from different perspectives c) Encourage individual interest groups to form, those with the loudest voice will influence the outcome d) Do nothing as the proposal does not interest you
<b>Responses</b>
a) [Illegible] single coordinated output for maximum buy in. Hoping that partnership work does not lead to 'head banging'. Important to find consensus to proceeds. All in for proposal value. Leadership required (strong) and a mental engagement partner is to be the landowner. Create a partnership – likely to get in better outcome. More likely to get funding. Create good links across urban – rural area.
<b>Question</b>
<b>27)</b> A new service station is proposed along the motorway which would be visible from Rufsty. Villagers are generally against the proposal but the Highway Agency and URF Council see it as a way of creating new jobs and revenue. Which of the following options would you support? a) Reject the proposal (existing service stations are 20 miles south, and 15 miles north). b) Accept the proposal but ensure shielded lighting and closure between 22:30 and 06:30. c) Accept the proposal of a 24hr service station.
<b>Responses</b>
c) Ensure design and impact is properly asserted through the process. Lighting/glare carefully negotiated. Not too keen – accept on more conditions – design of building to be aesthetically pleasing. Fit-in with area – planting etc. Ecologically sensitive.

## Values and Decision-Making

There is a strong emphasis on utilising the natural landscape to benefit visitors and the local community. Responders seem to feel that these should value the natural assets and build

<p><b>infrastructure around them. Interestingly, a couple of attendees feel that expansion of the city should go ahead so that locals can benefit from job creation. Any form of expansion/development should be small-scale with minimum impact on the greenbelt/natural environment.</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p>	
<p><b>1)</b> A City Council Grant of £80,000 is available for a new community-initiated project. The conditions were: to provide something of social, economic and environmental benefit to the city; engage local citizens; be low-cost maintenance for the Council. Which of the following four bids on the final short-list would you vote for and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Getting a community orchard and food-growing projects going across the city using 1/5 of space in existing council parks.</li> <li>b) Establishing a car-boot sale pitch and community cafe in one of the socially disadvantaged suburbs of the city.</li> <li>c) Creating a peri-urban woodland using predominantly native tree and shrub species on 4 acres of derelict Council Warehousing land on the city fringe.</li> <li>d) Providing renewable energy through a single wind turbine which will be community owned.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>d) Could provide energy needs locally, protect then as climate change happens. Benefits to av socially disadvantaged.</p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p>	
<p><b>8)</b> A local landowner is seeking your views on the development of a former quarry, which is currently restored to a lake. What option would you favour and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Develop the recreation potential of the lake</li> <li>b) Develop the lake for conservation uses</li> <li>c) Create a small holiday village development around the lake</li> <li>d) Develop luxury executive housing around the lake</li> </ul> <p>Other option (please explain)</p>	
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>a) Expansion area of RUFhampton – link with these. Allow local city to engage with environment and health and wellbeing. Potential for job creation [illegible]. Open-minded landowner – would look for a mix of a) and b) – increase habitat connectivity but seek recreation linkages too – integrated site as green lung to link to urban extension of RUFhampton.</p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p>	
<p><b>11)</b> A local farmer wishes to turn less productive fields into intensive horticulture involving polytunnels. The nearby St Ruf provides a ready-made local market (there is already a thriving farmers' market) and the business case is good as he has the necessary capital. However, there is concern about the landscape impact of the polytunnels and the local group “Save our RUF landscape” has asked you to support their campaign and protect the current farming landscape. What is your response and why?</p>	
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>Landscape man-made anyway. Develop local horticulture is important – food security, local sustainability. Food education, in favour as long as the community are involved.</p>	<p>Declining as there are no planning restrictions and thus progress must be balanced against need to register feelings – too many protest groups = no progress.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p>	
<p><b>13)</b> You regularly walk the land in this green belt square as part of a wider recreational route</p>	

alongside the RUF canal. This stretch of the canal has recently been restored by British Waterways and local volunteers. Given the potential increase in recreation (seasonal boating traffic and public access alongside the canal and link into the regional trail) what other opportunities would you support?	
<b>Responses</b>	
Water resource stimulate activity. Local healthy living activities. Focus on informal learning opportunities. Opportunity for gentle exercise. Take an interest in the area. Encourage local conservation etc.	
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>19)</b> Under the forthcoming neighborhood plan proposals a local landowner with majority community support wants to develop more houses. However, these are within the green belt and close to an AONB. As there is an identified need for housing within a recent housing survey, what would be your response?</p> <p>a) Agree and select best area within or adjoining 'square' 19 on your plan.  b) Disagree as no new housing should be built in the green belt.  c) Look to increase the number of houses in your favoured area.  d) Look to decrease the number of houses in your favoured area.  e) Other (please explain your answer).</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
a) That just doesn't happen! That is purpose of neighbourhod plan to bring people together and get what they want – longer term aims – affordable housing for local people.	c) Housing development for local need. Small-scale. Not speculative development. Fact is, there is community support for it. Need for housing, housing in a place with minimal impact, positioning important.

<p><b>Long-Termism - Temporal Perspectives</b></p> <p><b>There appears to be a strong message of financial considerations coming from the majority of the questions answered in this section. There is also an emphasis on the inclusion of community in any long-term development plans; included the locals in the consultation and implementation processes. Responders urged that any long-term prospects should be sensitive to the area and not impact on the environment.</b></p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>12)</b> A landowner within the Green Belt wishes to convert his fields into a public park including BMX/skateboard facilities and outdoor gym areas. There is currently no public access to his land. Should this be permitted?</p> <p>a) No, it is development in the Green Belt and changes the nature of the RUF  b) No, it has compromised the openness of the Green Belt  c) Yes, although it is development it has not compromised the openness of the Green Belt  d) Yes, it remains Green Belt with a much improved land use/surface of value to society  e) Other conclusion (please explain)</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>e) In purpose as a parkland yes, but not sure about BMW as it could be intrusive, need to be sensitive to localities. Access needs to be addressed. Important to have public use of land is a reasonable idea.</p> <p>Like re-creation, but not the suggested activity. That should be in the built environment. Outdoor again, possible if sympathetic to surroundings. I need to understand scale and infrastructure. Not against diversification but design would need to be considerate.</p>	

<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>14)</b> A community forum has collected 2000 signatures from residents of this square who are complaining to URF District Council about the lack of recreational facilities. The quarry to the north east has reached the end of its working life and a condition of its restoration is for it to be usable as a community resource. Bearing in mind there is a lack of recreational resources in the area what type of facility would you like to see provided?</p> <p>a) Sports pitches for rugby and football as well as a skate ramp  b) A nature reserve which is accessible to the public  c) A council owned leisure centre with a swimming pool, tennis courts and squash courts  d) A community woodland  e) Other (please explain your answer)</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		
e) If existing club in need and viable and vibrant go with a). C) also if council had capital and able to maintain, ensure viability. Decision depends on viability.		
<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>16)</b> There is a proposal to create a "hill " from construction and household waste of about 300 metres in height. This will help urban regeneration of RUFhampton and will take 10 years to complete. On completion it will be covered in decontaminated topsoil (also from urban regeneration) and landscaped. How would you treat this proposal in the best interests of the RUF?</p> <p>a) Welcome it for its positive impact on urban regeneration and negotiate a tipping levy to benefit wider RUF community projects.  b) Maximise the benefits of this mountain through negotiating a long term tourism and recreation management plan  c) Create a range of natural habitats to increase biodiversity and provide new (upland) wildlife areas to compensate for the impact of global warming  d) Press for a scaled down hillock to better integrate with the RUF landscape character whilst achieving some of the above benefits in a shorter time scale  e) Reject the proposal as inappropriate intrusive in the rural landscape, and unworkable  f) Other (please explain your answer)</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		
b) Attractive mound – turning economic assets. Viewed to merger existing rural and farm opportunities yet create community benefits (mostly illegible).	c) Quiet countryside if no animals, need to increase biodiversity, empty of wildlife, encourage this and will improve our appreciation of the countryside, manicured landscape not ecologically beneficial.	d) Look for opportunity to extend site area to benefit usual profile, minimise the impact. Need to consider connection between longer-term proposals. Mitigate short-term.
<b>Question</b>		
<p><b>17)</b> This site is proposed for landfill with a projected 20 year capacity. How might you change your behavior and that of the residents of RUFshire to reduce their dependency on the provision of such sites in the longer term? Or are you happy with the identification of new sites for landfill in the future?</p>		
<b>Responses</b>		
Landfill for local allotments to consider waste policy – incinerator? Decision for technical expert – stress positive benefit in longer-term – also examine sustainability policy of council.		
<b>Question</b>		

<p><b>25)</b> You are conducting a survey on the desired future use of this area (square 25). All players on the board must stop and you must obtain their preferred option for this space. You then report on the majority view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Intensive agricultural production including a state of the art 'mega dairy' for 1,000 cattle</li> <li>b) A small B1 (light industrial) estate</li> <li>c) Creation of a shallow scrape for wildlife</li> <li>d) Small holiday village</li> <li>e) Leave it as it is</li> </ul>
<p><b>Responses</b></p> <p>Majority vote – e).</p> <p>Discussion about dairy implications, animal welfare.</p> <p>Agriculture in greenbelt is acceptable.</p> <p>Not a holiday village – against it in principle.</p> <p>Not sure dairy would deliver for farmer.</p>

<p><b>RUF vision</b></p> <p><b>Responders urge for a balanced approach when attempted to develop for the RUFshire area. In particular, they call for community involvement and the utilisation of natural resources before introducing new features. Job creation ranks high on the agenda, with responders ushering for the vision to include an element on employability of the local communities.</b></p>		
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>You have had a varied journey across the rural urban fringe. Please review answer cards and your plan and try to summarize your overall vision for RUFshire. Think about the timescale of the decisions you have taken (short, medium and long-term impacts) and the spatial scale (very localized, wider local community and landscape, sub-regional, wider).</p>		
<p><b>Responses</b></p>		
<p>Living and working environment. More in favour of creating opportunities. Greenbelt is part of working environment. Could otherwise risk losing jobs, opportunities for homes. Is separation of greenbelt necessary? A lot of RUF is not greenbelt.</p>	<p>Development should be used to enable the most successful culture for existing settlements, by meeting housing needs (evidence, both current and culture). Should enable appropriate economic development and enable landowners to optimise opportunities.</p>	<p>Strategic issue – does not mean that other small [illegible] would not exist. Environmentally appropriate solution – natural options where possible. Encourage consultation and amicable settlement. Balanced decision but understanding needed for value of progress.</p>
<p>Sustainable job creation throughout RUFshire. Interaction between local communities with increased recreation and facilities. 'Sensitive' development within the fringe environment. Increasing policies, jobs and places and interest and setting city engagement.</p>	<p>Approach area from holistic sense. Needs to be a area where communities sufficiently engaged in decision-making (understood/informed). Needs to be balance reality of growth. Using constraints to work in environment – link things up.</p>	<p>Support economic development where it's sensitive to promote local environmental sustainability. Conservation measures taken. Balanced approach.</p>
<p>Rural/urban connectivity (social, economic and environmental).</p>		

## Summary of discussions

### Reflections on RUFopoly

The following sections provide a commentary on material gathered through audio recordings and note taking during the open discussion reflecting on RUFopoly (themes, questions, future development) and also the related videos. All participants from both groups were present at this stage.

### Reflections on the themed videos

Firstly, a number of comments were recorded in relation to the policy brief videos, the major output of the same project as RUFopoly. These videos related to the four themes of RUFopoly – long termism, connectivity, values and spatial planning/ecosystem services. At the event in May 2012, for the first time, the team explored the relationship between the videos, the questions and the game. The following provides a summary of the key points emerging from this. They are displayed according to theme.

#### **Long termism:**

- Video: It was suggested that the video could have covered more topics, was at times hard to take in and contained lots of jargon. Given the theme, it was felt that the long termism theme did not incorporate issues of questions that went far enough into the long term.
- Questions: Participants felt that more detail was needed to support the questions and that the general public would struggle to answer them. The multiple choice elements were found to be frustrating by some players due to wanting to combine two options. There was a general feeling that the policy brief video was aimed more at professionals: policy makers, practitioners and academics rather than communities.

#### **Connectivity:**

- Video: Participants felt the video format would appeal to a wide audience although there was still an issue with jargon. The video dealt with a lot of connectivity issues but seemed to omit masterplanning.
- Questions: Viewing the questions as a single entity was found to be ineffective.

#### **Values:**

- Video: The video was useful in that it had a narrow focus and was aesthetically pleasing. However, the 'top-down approach' with only professional people providing their views / experts speaking throughout was highlighted as a potential flaw. There was a suggestion that material needed to be obtained from more people 'on the ground' and for deeper engagement. In addition it was felt that more opposing views i.e. the polytunnel argument, were needed. There was some argument that the issue of value had not been sufficiently covered. There was a need to consider how best to convey the information.

- Questions: Further context would be helpful, for example a visual concept of the polytunnel to aid the player. Also, questions should be prompted to encourage players to be consistent in the way they approach things.

### **Spatial Planning and Ecosystem Services:**

- Video: Participants enjoyed the policy brief but wanted it to provide more information on Rufsire and have better connections between the video and questions. It was also noted that the video was very much studio based and some speakers on the video appear more comfortable than others. Whilst the video is an effective means of communication and may relate to policy-makers, it was suggested that communities and politicians could become lost as the video assumed a lot of knowledge and it was difficult to keep up. There were also comments about the theme itself with regard to the existence of the urban / rural divide and why 'ecosystems and SP' had been chosen and not 'economic and SP or something else'.
- Questions: Positive response to questions which 'provide mixed controversies'. They were found to be 'both thought provoking and to encourage decisiveness' and require the player to make a myriad of small decisions. However the questions were seen as challenging and required a background about the framework. Questions were found to be more difficult without the map.

### **Reflections on playing the game**

Participants kindly offered a number of positives about the game, specifically what they liked about it, including:

*"that it's very concrete, it gives you a concrete way of looking at things which for someone who isn't a planner is really helpful and all the sort of different issues are represented in a concrete way".*

*"It made me think of things I wouldn't normally think of, or have to think about".*

*"I liked the spatial awareness it gives you... that you are looking beyond the site... you are looking from a much higher perspective"*

*"I liked the game element that you had to move around the table, quite dynamic... the thing that it does require is to ... requires a little bit of prior knowledge or ability to de code the shapes and the colours"*

*"Like it cos it is a game, I mean it's fun...original...we spend our lives going to workshops!.. The gaming element is excellent. But that brings its own problems, the game to what end. For example, how do you win the game? I think it's about the right length, the questions are pitched in relation to the material quite nicely"*

*"I liked the question where it stopped all the players. All players had to answer one question together and discuss options - it was interesting, the negotiation, different thoughts and backgrounds came to the fore there"*



There was also some useful comments about how the game could be improved. The use of labels on the base map, so the players would have further information, was discussed with suggestions of exploring how to supply more detail without cluttering the board. Overall, the scale of the base map was felt to be suitable. There were no particular strong feelings about the placement of the questions around the board or that they were grouped by theme.

One issue that attracted a lengthy discussion was the introductory question that all players were required to answer before the start of the game. The introductory question asked players to consider urban expansion and the placement of housing development from a large scale perspective. Participants largely felt that the introductory question did not relate to the remaining questions or the process of playing the game. Some of these comments are included below:

*"...imagined if we'd given different answers in our groups that it would take us down different routes but it didn't"*

*"The introductory question is the big issue that most Local Authorities face at the moment... which the government hasn't been able to crack... national house building especially in green belt and the urban fringe and most of the questions we got into were the nitty gritty that authorities face everyday... there was a gap between the big issue and the small"*

*"after the first question it then wasn't tackled because all the other questions would normally apply even if there was no housing growth pressures on the area... all the rest of the questions would still apply. But what weren't jotted down - how does the big question really impact on these areas so St RUF should have said you need to accommodate 400 houses as part of the joint planning..."*

*"... think that the gap could be very usefully bridged by the facilitator. For me, I liked the open question because it set the overall strategic policy context within which you were having to respond but what would have been really helpful especially, with community groups, is you need to have that push factor all the time - you might want to do that but you can't because it doesn't fit your preferred option or if you are going to be true to your preferred option then..."*

In the creation of the game we had hoped that this initial question would help players to provide, or consider, a justification to their answers. We thought that there was potentially a value in encouraging players to do this from the start. We will consider how to better incorporate this question into the game, for example, returning to it more specifically at the end of the game with the facilitator identifying and encouraging discussion around any inconsistencies. Further detailed ideas on how an overarching question could be incorporated into the game are listed below:

- Force players to stop part way through the game and return to the bigger question.
- Creation of different pathways through the game reflecting different visions.
- Group game where individuals play a different role – e.g. conservation, biodiversity, economic development etc.

- Could be a more tactical game where other groups playing the game impact on other players due to decisions they have made on the board. Could all play from different perspectives.
- Each player could start game with a different premise e.g. economic development. Every answer then has to correspond with that goal. This would illustrate how different types of development relate to different decisions.
- Players could go through an iterative process where they revisit answers. They play the game considering for example, economic development and then go through again looking to promote ecological coherence. They have to judge what is important and decide if they would change their answers. This could make the game very long though.

And finally:

*“If purpose is to get people thinking about the implications of choosing a specific strategic option... if the purpose is ... getting them thinking... looking at development from a more holistic view and bring all sorts of people into the process then need element of challenge as you go through it...”*

### Developing the game further

The discussion then moved on to consider the games format. RUFopoly is currently presented as a hard copy, folding board game with a variety of shaped counters, post-its on which to record answers and two dice to be thrown to move around the board. Participants debated how far additional information (e.g. a full set of Rufshire documents - policy, planning, land use, posters, strategy) would be a useful addition. It was noted that who the potential audience was would have a bearing on this answer.

*“It is a physical game, the more information you add the more complicated it gets and I think one of the advantages of an online game is you can stage the game, far easier online...”*

*“... could be very resource heavy, also depends on use. If you were seeking to use it in two day long interactive workshop then may need that level of detail but if using it for an hour, then too complex”*

*“... going back to issue of needing more information to answer the questions – cannot answer some questions properly with facts at hand. Could consider spacing on questions – plenty of room on some to add further information. Some squares need more context... or a picture... to aid explanation or background understanding”.*

In addition, some participants felt that the tensions between the two district councils had not been fully explored. They suggested that this would be an interesting aspect to incorporate further through bringing it out more strongly in the game.

The project team have considered developing a computer version of RUFopoly. One of the concerns which the team have noted is that in an online version, there would be no facilitator and they felt this would result in a loss of detail and lower levels of discussion. The potential for a

computer and/or online version was floated to participants to gauge their feelings on the matter. Responses varied in enthusiasm:

*“Could in an online version go even further... where player’s decisions impact on each other, like second life!”*

*“I think that the real learning to be got out of this is through discussion that takes place over the choices and responses to challenges. I think to do it in isolation would miss this learning opportunity”.*

*“... as a group game, ok, but as an individual...could you score answers so you see the repercussions of decisions?...”*

*“Value for me is the debate and discussion around the issues. Would of liked to have done questions as a group, or in pairs, so you get that discussion around an issue cos I am interested in the decision making process that people go through, what they trade off... As an individual you can be convinced you have done the right thing but that could be lack of knowledge, own value systems... having that dialogue and debate with another person is really valuable”*

*“... if it was online it would be a different sort of experience. There is a lot of value in how it is now”*

Returning to the practicalities of playing the hard copy of the game, participants were asked if they appreciated the opportunity to select their own counters. This produced some interesting ideas about how to develop the game in a different direction.

*“If it fixed your point of view then it might be interesting...”*

*“Could choose a counter that reflects your values...”*

*“I think you could move it along with consultation methods using thought boards, you answer your question and then put your post it for others to see. At certain points, stop and discuss more widely, important for others to see the different issues and viewpoints. That may encourage more discussion”*

*“... one variation on the counters is to have six different people - a landowner, developer, politician, ‘cos as the politician goes round they may compromise their own values... landowner has personal interest, the planner, the swampy type... That would make people question their own values. Would have to play it as a group...could fashion counters that looked like these people!”*

*“Wouldn’t have to have debate as went round board...Give people role to play... could play individually and then feedback or play as a group and discuss each question from all viewpoints”.*

## **The future of RUFopoly**

The discussion then moved towards the future of RUFopoly. Facilitators asked participants to consider how or when they could consider using RUFopoly in their professional lives. This included ideas on how it may need to be adapted for different audiences.

*“Quite difficult to work with clients from house builders, greenfield, relating to the whole housing need aspect, people coming into a consultation. We’re moving more into interactive exhibitions, getting them thinking about a site. Reality is, people are very upset about what is going on in our area. Trying to make people think about range of issues. If development went ahead, what may they gain? So it would need to be more site specific, short and snappy. People have quick look round, and then want to go...Needs to be quick and informative. Couldn’t get them to read background material – few points only...”*

*“...think it would be useful to get people to think about different challenges. They are there because it affects them in their lives. They are local people”*

*“I’d like to play it with some development management officers to work through how you set policies in a wider context and to get a broader debate and positives and negatives of specific applications in a wider context. Think it would work very nicely”*

*“From a community perspective, they are interested in their place, so it would need to be their town, the geography would have to be right”*

Participants had differing views on whether the base map should be neutral as it currently is (set in Rufford) or represent a real place. This was felt to largely depend on what the purpose of the event or workshop was. If it was to be used to prompt debate or an ice breaker at start of a consultation, then a neutral version would work best to ‘take the heat out of a situation’, ‘open up debates’ and encourage people to think about balancing needs. However, there remained distinct views on how far the game could be used with the public:

*“... it’s an educational tool for the community, it can be part of that skill building for themselves before the neighbourhood planning process”*

*“...first stage of an iterative process”*

*“seems to be aimed at people who have a good handle on what it is all about, or people who have a lot of time to work it through. Neither of those apply to a consultation”*

*“...would need good facilitation to make it work”*

*“...can see how to use it to help people understand tensions but not for understanding community scale planning”*

*“...neighbourhood planning level... is it too much for your average neighbourhood group? Needs to be a simpler version, scaled down”*

There were also some very helpful suggestions on how the game could be applied in different contexts and with a variety of audiences. These are listed below:

- Development of an adult educational course around RUFopoly where the tutor uses it to create informed citizens who understand more about where they live. Could see that happening in communities very effectively.

- Useful training tool for planning committees (elected members specifically)
- 6<sup>th</sup> form A-Level Geography – may need to consider the way the information is presented, think about what’s on the syllabus.
- Possibility of a children’s version.
- Useful in Geography degrees too, useful for exercises around planning, environmental stewardship etc.
- Would be interested to see it translated into a different context e.g. river catchment areas. To make decisions about habitat, tree planting, also relating to the planning system and decision making process.
- Could build a bank of questions for different situations. Could relate to a much wider breadth of themes e.g. RELU themes and projects.
- Suggestions of urban, coastal, upland as ‘extension packs’ or multiple versions of the game.
- Could consider variations that were not just driven by the questions. For example, considering the implications of different options on the same space. Would be good to have mixture of community groups to discuss the issue – could use monopoly type houses, hotels and even skyscrapers! Would encourage players to consider the “Distribution and development within a functional landscape”.

Participants felt that there were a few issues that the team may wish to consider, in particular the role of the introductory question and the manner of playing the game, before exploring new variations of RUFopoly. Overall, the feedback on RUFopoly was positive and left the team with many useful ideas to consider not only in improving the current version but in developing further applications and formats.

### Concluding comments

This event has been rather unique with the level of interaction participants have had with the board and videos. Essentially, due to the in-depth nature of this session, there were a considerable amount of useful comments made: these ranged from positive remarks regarding the concept, to highlighting areas of improvement and how RUFopoly could develop in the future. For instance, there was a substantial amount of discussion surrounding the entrance question and its suitability, whilst there was also some discussion regarding the level of information for each question; a few participants felt that more explanation was required for some of the questions on the board. In a similar manner to these comments regarding the board, the videos also received positive feedback and some suggestions for improvement. Perhaps unlike previous events, the detailed nature of this RUFopoly session allowed participants to voice these comments and make suggestions via note form.

Since this event on the 30th May, RUFopoly has travelled to a variety of other destinations around the country, for example the concept has visited: Scottish Government (June 2012); International

SURF Interreg conference, Aberdeen (28 June 2012); Gaywood Valley SURF Interreg case study: Officers Masterclass, Kings Lynn (11 July 2012). There are many more dates in the diary; these can be found on the BCU RUFopoly pages. Information regarding these visits is added to the news section of the RUFopoly BCU page or the RUFopoly Twitter account (@RUFopoly). RUFopoly has also sparked interest from a variety of bodies wishing to build on the concept. For instance, there has been some discussion regarding the possibility of the game being used in communities, perhaps with RUFopoly providing a visual platform for public consultation. The concept has also informed recent research projects and bids in progress. Information surrounding these research projects will soon be uploaded to the BCU website, so keep a look out for details in the near future!

## Appendix 1: Agenda (Groups 1 and 2)

RUFopoly event – 30<sup>th</sup> May 2012

Birmingham City University, Millennium Point

### Group 1: Agenda

Time	Activity	Room
8.30	Arrivals and breakfast buffet	MP203
8.50	Welcome to School and Faculty (Dr Nick Morton)	
9am	Summary of the Relu 'Managing Environmental Change at the Rural-Urban Fringe' project and introduction to the team (Prof Alister Scott)	
9.10	Introduction to RUFopoly (Dr Rachel Curzon)	
9.20	Purpose of event (Alister)	
9.30	<b>Time to separate into two groups!</b>	
9.30-10.20	<b>Group 1 – Play RUFopoly</b>  Break out into classroom to play RUFopoly! Facilitators will guide you through the game.	MP382
10.20	Coffee / comfort break	MP203
10.30	<b>Group 1</b> will stay in MP203 and watch the videos  Divide into four small groups to represent the four themes of the project – time, connections, values and spatial planning/ecosystem services. Watch and evaluate videos and RUFopoly questions. Devise summary points for feedback.	MP203
11.20	All return to MP203 (opportunity for brief comfort break/coffee)	MP203
11.30	Walking evaluation tour!	MP382
12noon	Self-reporting – each themed group to look at own theme and compare pre/post game responses – report back to whole group.	MP203
12.15	Reflections on RUFopoly – discussion of strengths and weaknesses	
12.30	Taking it forward - Opportunities and threats Summary of key points, next steps, thank you etc (Alister)	
1pm	Buffet – food for thought! All participants to complete an evaluation form over lunch about the session, level of interest in future development of RUFopoly, taking it forward etc.	
1.30	End	

## RUFopoly event – 30<sup>th</sup> May 2012

**Birmingham City University, Millennium Point**

### Group 2: Agenda

Time	Activity	Room
8.30	Arrivals and breakfast buffet	MP203
8.50	Welcome to School and Faculty (Dr Nick Morton)	
9am	Summary of the Relu 'Managing Environmental Change at the Rural-Urban Fringe' project and introduction to the team (Prof Alister Scott)	
9.10	Introduction to RUFopoly (Dr Rachel Curzon)	
9.20	Purpose of event (Alister)	
9.30	<b>Time to separate into two groups!</b>	
9.30-10.20	<b>Group 2</b> will stay in MP203 and watch the videos  Divide into four small groups to represent the four themes of the project – time, connections, values and spatial planning/ecosystem services. Watch and evaluate videos and RUFopoly questions. Devise summary points for feedback.	MP203
10.20	Coffee / comfort break	MP203
10.30	<b>Group 2 – Play RUFopoly</b>  Break out into classroom to play RUFopoly! Facilitators will guide you through the game.	MP382
11.20	All return to MP203 (opportunity for brief comfort break/coffee)	MP203
11.30	Walking evaluation tour!	MP382
12noon	Self-reporting – each themed group to look at own theme and compare pre/post game responses – report back to whole group.	MP203
12.15	Reflections on RUFopoly – discussion of strengths and weaknesses	
12.30	Taking it forward - Opportunities and threats Summary of key points, next steps, thank you etc (Alister)	
1pm	Buffet – food for thought! All participants to complete an evaluation form over lunch about the session, level of interest in future development of RUFopoly, taking it forward etc.	
1.30	End	



## Appendix 2: List of participants, facilitators and organisers

### List of Participants

John Blewitt  
Robert Fish  
Emma Webster  
Sarah Holmes  
John Acres  
Andrew Matheson  
Russell Elliott  
Sally Thomas  
Anne Liddon  
Robert Hindle  
Colin Tingle  
Rachel Macklin  
Michael Tichford  
Pater Wright  
Kathleen Maitland

### Facilitators

Birmingham School of the Built Environment team:

- Alister Scott [Alister.Scott@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Alister.Scott@bcu.ac.uk)
- Rachel Curzon [Rachel.Curzon@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Rachel.Curzon@bcu.ac.uk)
- Claudia Carter [Claudia.Carter@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Claudia.Carter@bcu.ac.uk)
- Michael Hardman [Michael.Hardman@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Michael.Hardman@bcu.ac.uk)
- Nick Morton [Nick.Morton@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Nick.Morton@bcu.ac.uk)
- Peter Larkham [Peter.Larkham@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Peter.Larkham@bcu.ac.uk)
- Jenna Wallis (MA Environmental and Spatial Planning student)  
[Jenna.Wallis@mail.bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Jenna.Wallis@mail.bcu.ac.uk)

### Event organisers

Research, Innovation and Enterprise team:

- Charmaine Stint [Charmaine.Stint@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Charmaine.Stint@bcu.ac.uk)
- Dominika Michalik [Dominika.Michalik@bcu.ac.uk](mailto:Dominika.Michalik@bcu.ac.uk)

## Appendix 3: Group 1 - Responses to themed questions (after playing the game)

### GROUP ONE

This RUFopoly event occurred at Millennium Point, Birmingham City University and featured an audience of invited attendees.

This is Group One's in-depth thoughts on the questions. These questions were answered in isolation, after the videos and away from the board game.

The following report highlights the comments to the various questions presented in RUFopoly. The report also includes interesting statements made when attendees were discussing the option. This piece is structured according to theme, and then within that, by question number. There is a short summary extracting the key issues from the responses for each theme.

Spatial Planning and Ecosystem Services	
Question	
<b>3)</b> You are walking within this area and notice that a few residents are on site creating a flower display and they have placed a small wooden bench on a grass verge. The grass verge has also been dug up. You ask them why they are doing this on Council owned land. The residents explain that they are a community gardening group who wish to cultivate the under-used grass verges and green space in the area, due to the impossibility of securing allotment spaces managed by the local authority. What is your response?	
Responses	
Good idea and good luck with the guerrilla gardening. Adaption comes from being a little radical.	I support guerrilla gardening because it helps to reconnect people with natural processes and food production. As long as it doesn't interface with other functions of public space, I approve.
Question	
<b>7)</b> Looking at the features in the square what key change would you make to improve the benefits to a) you; b) the community; and c) Rufshire.	
Responses	
Can't answer, cannot see the board, and cannot see the state it is.	I always emphasise multifunctionality / diversity / plurality so I am with the WT especially with there's an economic case,
Question	
<b>10)</b> A disused quarry has been left to nature but is currently subjected to illegal fly tipping. The landowner is hoping to develop this area into coniferous woodland for timber production but the local Wildlife Trust argues that more benefits for conservation will accrue from a deciduous and coniferous mix with opportunities for timber production. In your view what is the best option and why?	
Responses	
I agree with the Wildlife Trust that a mixed use would benefit a wider group of people, not just the	

landowners so I would support that.	
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>21)</b> The two landowners of the fields here decided to farm this land ecologically, with support from the local Wildlife Trust group and RSPB. The central area is undulating/hilly and there are some patches of heather remnants. What option would you recommend as an additional priority in the coming year to further improve environmental benefits and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Set up a network of local landowners/farmers to encourage environmentally sensitive land management and ultimately extend the areal extent of the trust.</li> <li>b) Apply for planning permission to establish a small farm shop and sell produce from a range of local farms/food producers; use excess profit for trust land.</li> <li>c) Focus on initial work, but communicate progress and highlights through social networking sites (web blog, Facebook, twitter).</li> <li>d) Other (please specify)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
a) This would promote landscape scale land management which has proven benefits for ecosystem service provision.	d) My view is it should stay the same. A better audit (e.g. ES) from this parcel is now needed. [Illegible].
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>22)</b> St Ruf has been regularly flooding particularly during autumn and spring from increased water flow from the uplands in the AONB. What options for management of heavy rain might you consider to reduce flood risk?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Increase flood defences in St Ruf outside the upland area</li> <li>b) Consider for the creation of lowland flood storage areas, such as flood meadows</li> <li>c) Consider upland management approaches such as tree planting to reduce peak flows</li> <li>d) Consider creating a multipurpose reservoir for flood protection ( Other option (please explain)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
b) and c) Would provide low-cost, ecologically friendly interventions.	c) and d) Natural interventions in step with the landscape: need to reward farmers for this.Funding the costs of technical interventions.
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>26)</b> A small community group has purchased a smallholding of 20 acres here and has started building, without planning permission, some low impact houses to pursue their green lifestyle. However, despite its location and small scale, the local RUF Wildlife Trust argues that this will deliver more environmental benefits than contemporary farming. Should the development be granted retrospective planning permission?</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
Yes, 20 acres is nothing and this is a platform for experimental work. Go for it!	No, this would be unjust. Why should they get away with breaking the rules? Why didn't they apply for planning permission in the first place?
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>28)</b> A farmer is proposing to develop a small scale food waste (anaerobic digestion) plant in his RUF farmland. Waste will be collected from homes in the nearby urban area by truck on a daily basis, producing electricity from the bio-gas and using the liquid and solid by-product as soil enhancers. Both electricity and soil enhancer could be sold locally. This would provide three local jobs in an area predominantly used for commuting. However, the local village opposes this on grounds of smell, traffic and noise. Should it be built?</p>	

Responses	
Yes this will benefit the whole community. There is now evidence suggesting that such a development will produce smell or noise and traffic could be regulated fairly easy.	Really depends on the net energy benefit for the community. I head toward permission!

Making Connections in Grey-Green-Blue Infrastructure Planning	
Question	
<p>2) Local residents are seeking your support for a community hall with car park for meetings and other community pursuits including a small sports hall and 2 start-up units for local businesses. The present inhabitants do not have any community facilities nearby apart from access to a room in a local school, outside school hours, seating 30. However some residents are concerned that the building will take up valuable green space in the square. What is your opinion on the merits of the development?</p>	
Responses	
NO RESPONSES	
Question	
<p>4) This area has been identified as a potential site for new housing development in the consultation draft of the local plan. The future inhabitants will share services (schools, retail, church and community) with existing developments east of square 3. How can the barrier of the main road be overcome or is the development not viable?</p>	
Responses	
NO RESPONSES	
Question	
<p>5) The Government has recently designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in this area (great crested newts and semi-ancient natural oak woodland). Management solutions to protect the conservation interest of the site are required. What would be your favoured strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Fence the area off and have public access restricted by permit</li> <li>b) Identify and build one path through the reserve which allows restricted access only</li> <li>c) Have free access but use local community volunteers to manage the reserve and access</li> <li>d) Allow unfettered public access</li> <li>e) Other option (please explain)</li> </ul>	
Responses	
NO RESPONSES	
Question	
<p>9) A new industrial estate 20hectares for light industrial use in green belt land is supported by RUFhampton Council within the URF District Council's area. The proposal is driven by the wider economic needs of the city region and lack of large alternative brownfield sites. Which option would you support and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reject proposal: suggest developing 2-3 smaller industrial estates in surrounding villages</li> <li>b) Proceed with proposal but make it a low-carbon flagship project of national importance with a carbon neutral goal incorporating a district heating scheme, green roofs and high quality green space</li> <li>c) Accept proposal but reduce scale of development by 50%</li> <li>d) Reject the proposal outright: it is vital to retaining the integrity of the green belt and not permit any industrial encroachment</li> </ul>	

e) Other option (please explain)
<b>Responses</b>
<b>NO RESPONSES</b>
<b>Question</b>
<p>18) A major employer in this area has recently closed with the loss of 2,500 jobs. The buildings stand empty. This has had a devastating effect on the local community. Four Masterplans are proposed on the following themes. Which one do you support and why?</p> <p>a) Master plan A: Technology Park in conjunction with the adjoining Technology College.</p> <p>b) Master plan B: Environmental Research Centre linked to renewable energy.</p> <p>c) Master plan C: Intensive Urban Agriculture.</p> <p>d) Master plan D: Urban wilderness allowing nature to reclaim the site.</p> <p>e) Other (please explain).</p>
<b>Responses</b>
<b>NO RESPONSES</b>
<b>Question</b>
<p>23) There are proposals to secure and improve public access in the form of a regional trail for horses, cyclists and walkers alongside the canal running through the RUF. There is talk of a proposed bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund with matched funding from the council, British Waterways and Natural England. This will link the urban area to the AONB. What is your response to this proposal?</p> <p>a) Create a partnership with all groups involved so issues can be worked through and a unified voice created</p> <p>b) Encourage individual interest groups to form who will feed into a strategy from different perspectives</p> <p>c) Encourage individual interest groups to form, those with the loudest voice will influence the outcome</p> <p>d) Do nothing as the proposal does not interest you</p>
<b>Responses</b>
<b>NO RESPONSES</b>
<b>Question</b>
<p>27) A new service station is proposed along the motorway which would be visible from Rufsty. Villagers are generally against the proposal but the Highway Agency and URF Council see it as a way of creating new jobs and revenue. Which of the following options would you support?</p> <p>a) Reject the proposal (existing service stations are 20 miles south, and 15 miles north).</p> <p>b) Accept the proposal but ensure shielded lighting and closure between 22:30 and 06:30</p> <p>c) Accept the proposal of a 24hr service station</p>
<b>Responses</b>
<b>NO RESPONSES</b>

<b>Values and Decision-Making</b>
<b>Question</b>
<p>1) A City Council Grant of £80,000 is available for a new community-initiated project. The conditions were: to provide something of social, economic and environmental benefit to the city; engage local citizens; be low-cost maintenance for the Council. Which of the following four bids on the final short-list would you vote for and why?</p>

<p>a) Getting a community orchard and food-growing projects going across the city using 1/5 of space in existing council parks.</p> <p>b) Establishing a car-boot sale pitch and community cafe in one of the socially disadvantaged suburbs of the city.</p> <p>c) Creating a peri-urban woodland using predominantly native tree and shrub species on 4 acres of derelict Council Warehousing land on the city fringe.</p> <p>d) Providing renewable energy through a single wind turbine which will be community owned.</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>a) Community orchard – this will have the greatest long term benefits – engaging communities in food production, local/reduce food miles, reduce costs, build community cohesion. Could be in underutilised areas of parks as well.</p> <p>This option appears to be the only one which satisfies all of the conditions of the council grant. The use of space within parks to transfer care and costs to the community. Produce could be sold locally. The spaces could be used for community education and improved cohesion.</p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p>8) A local landowner is seeking your views on the development of a former quarry, which is currently restored to a lake. What option would you favour and why?</p> <p>a) Develop the recreation potential of the lake</p> <p>b) Develop the lake for conservation uses</p> <p>c) Create a small holiday village development around the lake</p> <p>d) Develop luxury executive housing around the lake</p> <p>e) Other option (please explain)</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>a) I would favour the recreational development of the lake with strict control imposed by the local authority i.e. low environmental impact activities with minimal development of buildings and structures.</p>	<p>e) It might be possible to combine recreation, conservation and holiday accommodation on one site. Bring maximum social environmental, and economic benefit. Luxury housing offers little economic benefit.</p>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>11) A local farmer wishes to turn less productive fields into intensive horticulture involving polytunnels. The nearby St Ruf provides a ready-made local market (there is already a thriving farmers' market) and the business case is good as he has the necessary capital. However, there is concern about the landscape impact of the polytunnels and the local group "Save our RUF landscape" has asked you to support their campaign and protect the current farming landscape. What is your response and why?</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>I would not support the objection to the farmer's plans. The local production of food is a boost to the economy in terms of jobs and trade would outweigh the aesthetic considerations. It would also be preferable that the farming was sympathetic to the natural environment.</p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p>13) You regularly walk the land in this green belt square as part of a wider recreational route alongside the RUF canal. This stretch of the canal has recently been restored by British Waterways and local volunteers. Given the potential increase in recreation (seasonal boating traffic and public access alongside the canal and link into the regional trail) what other opportunities would you support?</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>I wouldn't but keep the canal, at this point, as a wildlife corridor as well as recreation resources.</p>	

Only those that was of minimal or low environmental/visual impact etc. Conservation or wildlife areas or walking routes or perhaps cycle trails. I would also suggest projects promoting the history and heritage of the canals such as museums etc.	
<b>Question</b>	
<b>15)</b> The lake in this former quarry workings is currently used as a recreational resource involving quiet water sports, angling and walking. It is also frequented by wildfowl including geese and herons but has no conservation designation. What do you value about a lake in this setting?	
<b>Responses</b>	
Recreational opportunities in a peaceful environment and joining this with conservation – managing activity with nature is good for the soul!	
The space brings a balance of natural environment between the two urban developments of RUF. There is already potential for a recreational lake at 8, so I would value 15 as a natural space.	
<b>Question</b>	
<b>19)</b> Under the forthcoming neighbourhood plan proposals a local landowner with majority community support wants to develop more houses. However, these are within the green belt and close to an AONB. As there is an identified need for housing within a recent housing survey, what would be your response?	
a) Agree and select best area within or adjoining ‘square’ 19 on your plan. b) Disagree as no new housing should be built in the green belt. c) Look to increase the number of houses in your favoured area. d) Look to decrease the number of houses in your favoured area. e) Other (please explain your answer).	
<b>Responses</b>	
a) Difficult to decide. Not sure I understand the question.	b) No large scale development on greenbelt land. Look to use other sites closer to the main areas of urban development as an alternative. Potential sites would be favoured if Brownfield or urban re-development.
<b>Question</b>	
<b>20)</b> As you are walking along the side of the road in this area, you see a substantial amount of fly tipping. What is your response?	
a) Clear up the rubbish yourself and dispose of it correctly b) Walk on and do nothing c) Report it to the police d) Continually moan about the state of the area to anyone who will listen e) Other (please explain)	
<b>Responses</b>	
e) Report to the council and work to raise awareness of the issue until properly addressed. Letters to councilors the papers etc.	Report it to the local authority that is responsible for fly tipping (not the police) so that they can understand trends in their protective work.

<b>Long-Termism - Temporal Perspectives</b>
<b>Question</b>

<p><b>6)</b> A planning application for 400 houses has been submitted as phase 3 of a development on the outskirts of RUFhampton (currently brownfield land). The area is zoned for housing development. Given the close proximity of the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) please indicate on your map how do you think this development should proceed whilst minimizing the impact on the SAC. Refusing the application is not an option as it conforms to all relevant local and national policies.</p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>
<p>New to understand the potential impacts on the SAC as new development. Site is currently a Brownfield site so will be positive use of site. Would want to engage with relevant user groups linked to SAC to ensure concerns addressed as fully as possible. Would anticipate a buffer would be required between new development and SAC – would want to ensure this as large as possible. Investigate constituency levy to support SAC.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p>
<p><b>12)</b> A landowner within the Green Belt wishes to convert his fields into a public park including BMX/skateboard facilities and outdoor gym areas. There is currently no public access to his land. Should this be permitted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No, it is development in the Green Belt and changes the nature of the RUF</li> <li>b) No, it has compromised the openness of the Green Belt</li> <li>c) Yes, although it is development it has not compromised the openness of the Green Belt</li> <li>d) Yes, it remains Green Belt with a much improved land use/surface of value to society</li> <li>e) Other conclusion (please explain)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>
<p>c) and d) Still don't know whether this proposal is legally compromises the openness of the greenbelt, but know that the greenbelt is strategically economic expansion. This is a farmer wanting to diversify. In favour of increasing access to greenspace and social benefit. Need to understand impact on the environment and biodiversity. Still would query value of BMW/skateboard facilities – social value only limited to specific group.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p>
<p><b>14)</b> A community forum has collected 2000 signatures from residents of this square who are complaining to URF District Council about the lack of recreational facilities. The quarry to the north east has reached the end of its working life and a condition of its restoration is for it to be usable as a community resource. Bearing in mind there is a lack of recreational resources in the area what type of facility would you like to see provided?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sports pitches for rugby and football as well as a skate ramp</li> <li>b) A nature reserve which is accessible to the public</li> <li>c) A council owned leisure centre with a swimming pool, tennis courts and squash courts</li> <li>d) A community woodland</li> <li>e) Other (please explain your answer)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>
<p>Need to ensure that proposal is what community and residents want. There are 2000 signatures what do these 2000 people want. May need to place boundaries around the potential for the site and consider its past life. The quarry will have some ecological features which will need to be conserved/enhanced which may impact on development. Potential to overlap with Q12 and new community access/facilities need to ensure these complement one another.</p>
<p><b>Question</b></p>
<p><b>16)</b> There is a proposal to create a "hill" from construction and household waste of about 300 metres in height. This will help urban regeneration of RUFhampton and will take 10 years to complete. On completion it will be covered in decontaminated topsoil (also from urban</p>



regeneration) and landscaped. How would you treat this proposal in the best interests of the RUF?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Welcome it for its positive impact on urban regeneration and negotiate a tipping levy to benefit wider RUF community projects.</li> <li>b) Maximise the benefits of this mountain through negotiating a long term tourism and recreation management plan</li> <li>c) Create a range of natural habitats to increase biodiversity and provide new (upland) wildlife areas to compensate for the impact of global warming</li> <li>d) Press for a scaled down hillock to better integrate with the RUF landscape character whilst achieving some of the above benefits in a shorter time scale</li> <li>e) Reject the proposal as inappropriate intrusive in the rural landscape, and unworkable</li> <li>f) Other (please explain your answer)</li> </ul>
<b>Responses:</b>
d) Need to consider the long term impacts of this and also the short term element. Impact during area operating as landfill – transport, noise, pollution etc. Also the long term elements e.g. nature, methane, pollution (leaching into lakes). 300m seems high although if topography of area is flat then adds interest. Could be well regenerated in future e.g. other areas successfully managed. Also concerns re: impact of landfill on sustainability – recycling agenda.
<b>Question</b>
<b>17)</b> This site is proposed for landfill with a projected 20 year capacity. How might you change your behavior and that of the residents of RUFshire to reduce their dependency on the provision of such sites in the longer term? Or are you happy with the identification of new sites for landfill in the future?
<b>Responses</b>
Wouldn't want to continue funding new sites for landfill – concerns over sustainability re: recycling and pro-environmental behaviours. Need to do large-scale marketing behaviour change campaign linked to employers, schools and communities.
<b>Question</b>
<b>24)</b> This village is at the gateway for the AONB and residents are very concerned at the huge increase in visitors each year which clearly exceeds current road and parking capacity, resulting in traffic delays, congestion and off- street parking. A recent meeting has identified the following options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Build a major new car park outside the village</li> <li>b) Put double yellow lines through the village preventing street parking</li> <li>c) Establish a free park and ride scheme from St Ruf</li> <li>d) Expand the current railway station car park from 30 spaces to 300</li> <li>e) Actively de-market the area and promote other visitor destinations</li> </ul>
<b>Responses</b>
Suggestions a) and d) need more exploration and evidence collecting on the theme. Don't agree with e). All suggestions need to be explored with the community in the village and also the visitors to the area, would these stop people visiting as there is a positive economic impact of tourism for the area.
<b>Question</b>
<b>25)</b> You are conducting a survey on the desired future use of this area (square 25). All players on the board must stop and you must obtain their preferred option for this space. You then report on the majority view. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Intensive agricultural production including a state of the art 'mega dairy' for 1,000 cattle</li> <li>b) A small B1 (light industrial) estate</li> </ul>

- c) Creation of a shallow scrape for wildlife
- d) Small holiday village
- e) Leave it as it is

#### Responses

Why does it need to change? Need to understand that first...then can undertake an assessment of the options and the impacts of them undertaking consultation to be able to fully understand them.

#### RUF vision

#### Question

You have had a varied journey across the rural urban fringe. Please review answer cards and your plan and try to summarize your overall vision for RUFshire. Think about the timescale of the decisions you have taken (short, medium and long-term impacts) and the spatial scale (very localized, wider local community and landscape, sub-regional, wider).

#### Responses

RUFshire is a place that meets its growth need of the communities but does it in a way that builds cohesion, values and enhances natural assets.	Still believe that more evidence is needed before decisions can be made. Need to be clear about justified for change and impact of change to ensure that RUFshire is a desirable place to be.
Minimal development on the RUF with specific focus on protections SACs, greenbelt and AONB. Concessions possible but with heavy conditions imposed by the local authority.	Development that is based on the ecosystem approach and the multifunctionality of land. Encouragement of rural enterprise and community values within an overall agreed plan.
Encourage innovation and experimentation (guerrilla gardening/small holdings etc.) even if this contravenes 'rules'. Always emphasise multifunctionality and always make the case in change, for construction in business terms.	

## Appendix 4: Group 2 - Responses to themed questions (before playing the game)

### GROUP TWO

This RUFopoly event occurred at Millennium Point, Birmingham City University and featured an audience of invited attendees.

This is Group Two's in-depth thoughts on the questions. These questions were answered in isolation, after the videos and away from the board game.

The following report highlights the comments to the various questions presented in RUFopoly. The report also includes interesting statements made when attendees were discussing the option. This piece is structured according to theme, and then within that, by question number. There is a short summary extracting the key issues from the responses for each theme.

Spatial Planning and Ecosystem Services	
Question	
3) You are walking within this area and notice that a few residents are on site creating a flower display and they have placed a small wooden bench on a grass verge. The grass verge has also been dug up. You ask them why they are doing this on Council owned land. The residents explain that they are a community gardening group who wish to cultivate the under-used grass verges and green space in the area, due to the impossibility of securing allotment spaces managed by the local authority. What is your response?	
Responses	
My initial response would be 'great'. I would be supportive of a community who wants to utilise their local environment in a productive way and feel sufficiently empowered to do so. If there was conflict with the council I would try to mediate, if I had a role to do so and suggest this could be seen as a trial for using council land in this way.	"Good for you"! I have seen this approach work well in Malmo, Sweden. The issue is to ensure the local authority accept the logic of the approach and have a mechanism for local groups to identify the verges or green areas where this may be acceptable, but also those where it may not be e.g. due to planned maintenance, underground services, legal constraints etc.
Question	
7) Looking at the features in the square what key change would you make to improve the benefits to a) you; b) the community; and c) RUFshire.	
Responses	
Can't easily answer without seeing the board.	
Question	
10) A disused quarry has been left to nature but is currently subjected to illegal fly tipping. The landowner is hoping to develop this area into coniferous woodland for timber production but the local Wildlife Trust argues that more benefits for conservation will accrue from a deciduous and coniferous mix with opportunities for timber production. In your view what is the best option and why?	

<b>Responses</b>	
First get agreement to stop fly tipping and remove rubbish. Second get landowner and Wildlife Trust together to see if it is possible to create a coniferous woodland which has commercial potential but also leaves the most important wildlife spaces e.g. by leaving some areas unplanted or by [illegible] mix of species. The need for cooperation and consensus building is paramount. If agreement cannot be reached then work with the Wildlife Trust to identify an alternative site with a long term future.	I am not an expert so I would not personally suggest a best option. The key must surely be to facilitate the two parties meeting and understanding each other's arguments and seeing how they fit into the wider picture. Ultimately, unless the planning system places restrictions in the quarry, the owner will have the right to "develop" his land as he wishes, as long as there is no material harm.
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>21)</b> The two landowners of the fields here decided to farm this land ecologically, with support from the local Wildlife Trust group and RSPB. The central area is undulating/hilly and there are some patches of heather remnants. What option would you recommend as an additional priority in the coming year to further improve environmental benefits and why?</p> <p>a) Set up a network of local landowners/farmers to encourage environmentally sensitive land management and ultimately extend the areal extent of the trust.</p> <p>b) Apply for planning permission to establish a small farm shop and sell produce from a range of local farms/food producers; use excess profit for trust land.</p> <p>c) Focus on initial work, but communicate progress and highlights through social networking sites (web blog, Facebook, twitter).</p> <p>d) d) Other (please specify)</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
a) Encourage good practice and disseminate the results with a focus on establishing a much wider area with an ecological focus, thus creating wider habitat benefits and connectivity. Aim to show neighbouring farmers the positive benefits of this approach both to the environment and to them as land managers.	e) Why is an additional priority required? It seems the two landowners are progressing well without further outside aid.
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>22)</b> St Ruf has been regularly flooding particularly during autumn and spring from increased water flow from the uplands in the AONB. What options for management of heavy rain might you consider to reduce flood risk?</p> <p>a) Increase flood defences in St Ruf outside the upland area</p> <p>b) Consider for the creation of lowland flood storage areas, such as flood meadows</p> <p>c) Consider upland management approaches such as tree planting to reduce peak flows</p> <p>d) Consider creating a multipurpose reservoir for flood protection ( Other option (please explain)</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
b) Creation of lowland flood storage areas. Artificial flood defences are merely likely to send/create a problem elsewhere further down the river.	b) or c) To address the flooding problem in the lowland and improve the water retention capacity in the uplands.
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>26)</b> A small community group has purchased a smallholding of 20 acres here and has started building, without planning permission, some low impact houses to pursue their green lifestyle.</p>	

However, despite its location and small scale, the local RUF Wildlife Trust argues that this will deliver more environmental benefits than contemporary farming. Should the development be granted retrospective planning permission?	
<b>Responses</b>	
The key issue is that all the normal planning issues are considered and a logical and defensible decision is reached, whether that will be approval or refusal. Without some approval system we would revert to unplanned, uncoordinated, decision making.	It depends on the location of the development. However, if possible the group should be encouraged to continue whilst making it clear that they have to operate within the law. Work with the group to reach a solution that enables their way of managing the land to continue.
<b>Question</b>	
<b>28)</b> A farmer is proposing to develop a small scale food waste (anaerobic digestion) plant in his RUF farmland. Waste will be collected from homes in the nearby urban area by truck on a daily basis, producing electricity from the bio-gas and using the liquid and solid by-product as soil enhancers. Both electricity and soil enhancer could be sold locally. This would provide three local jobs in an area predominantly used for commuting. However, the local village opposes this on grounds of smell, traffic and noise. Should it be built?	
<b>Responses</b>	
The planning system already has the tools and processes to determine this. Each party should be made aware of how they can participate in the process.	It depends on the scale of noise, smell etc. but I would be inclined to say yes it should be built. However, before any decision a lot of work should be done to allay the fears of the community; maybe arranging a visit to a similar facility etc.

<b>Making Connections in Grey-Green-Blue Infrastructure Planning</b>	
<b>Question</b>	
<b>2)</b> Local residents are seeking your support for a community hall with car park for meetings and other community pursuits including a small sports hall and 2 start-up units for local businesses. The present inhabitants do not have any community facilities nearby apart from access to a room in a local school, outside school hours, seating 30. However some residents are concerned that the building will take up valuable green space in the square. What is your opinion on the merits of the development?	
<b>Responses</b>	
Planning policy would need to be given due consideration, however, in principle I am in favour of the development proposals. The Localism Act is encouraging residents and other stakeholders to play a greater role in the creation of their environment, the fact that residents have identified the need for these facilities must merit in offering support. The fact that job creation may also result with the start-up units and also construction activity should also add some weight.	Difficult to answer in isolation, what other community facilities, or workspace, already exist in the local area of nearby villages? Loss of greenspace would be acceptable if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The demand for and viability of the facilities is reasonably certain.</li> <li>• Connectivity is good with the wider countryside.</li> <li>• There is appropriate provision of private greenspace, in gardens etc.</li> <li>• The creation of new facilities would not prejudice any existing facilities.</li> </ul>

Question	
<p><b>4)</b> This area has been identified as a potential site for new housing development in the consultation draft of the local plan. The future inhabitants will share services (schools, retail, church and community) with existing developments east of square 3. How can the barrier of the main road be overcome or is the development not viable?</p>	
Responses	
<p>The main road would appear to be a big barrier which will affect the connectivity of the two areas. Consider the merits of whether the areas could be better connected via a foot bridge perhaps? If viable cost? If this cannot be achieved then it would seem sensible to consider other more viable locations that will connect the residential areas to the shared services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can't see alternative section upon the board [mostly illegible].</li> <li>• Disconnection is sustainably a bad idea [illegible again].</li> <li>• Need to find a way to give priority to crossing pedestrians – traffic rights, speed limits enforced harder etc.</li> <li>• Bridges and underpasses are poor solutions, unless the bridge is gentle in profile and beautiful.</li> </ul>
Question	
<p><b>5)</b> The Government has recently designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in this area (great crested newts and semi-ancient natural oak woodland). Management solutions to protect the conservation interest of the site are required. What would be your favoured strategy?</p> <p>a) Fence the area off and have public access restricted by permit</p> <p>b) Identify and build one path through the reserve which allows restricted access only</p> <p>c) Have free access but use local community volunteers to manage the reserve and access</p> <p>d) Allow unfettered public access</p> <p>e) Other option (please explain)</p>	
Responses	
<p>a) This is the best answer, but need to ensure other space and connectivity to wider countryside is provided.</p>	<p>c) Option C) would be my preferred strategy. It is important for local communities to engage with their environment and more importantly to enjoy it. This strategy would allow for this to happen.</p>
Question	
<p><b>9)</b> A new industrial estate 20 hectares for light industrial use in green belt land is supported by RUFhampton Council within the URF District Council's area. The proposal is driven by the wider economic needs of the city region and lack of large alternative brownfield sites. Which option would you support and why?</p> <p>a) Reject proposal: suggest developing 2-3 smaller industrial estates in surrounding villages</p> <p>b) Proceed with proposal but make it a low-carbon flagship project of national importance with a carbon neutral goal incorporating a district heating scheme, green roofs and high quality green space</p> <p>c) Accept proposal but reduce scale of development by 50%</p> <p>d) Reject the proposal outright: it is vital to retaining the integrity of the green belt and not permit any industrial encroachment</p> <p>e) Other option (please explain)</p>	
Responses	
<p>b) The economic benefits to the area must be a key consideration and whilst the loss of greenbelt land would be regrettable, this would seem a good compromise. The proposed structures should of course</p>	<p>If the evidence is reliable and the developer will deliver the site great:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale is important</li> <li>• Green infrastructure is</li> </ul>

<p>be sympathetic to the surrounding area and the 'green' credentials and efficiency should help reduce running costs for the end users, and most importantly, have less impact on the environment. I would deem this as 'sustainable development' in all senses. Job creation and environmental credentials.</p>	<p>important</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community is important</li> </ul>
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>18)</b> A major employer in this area has recently closed with the loss of 2,500 jobs. The buildings stand empty. This has had a devastating effect on the local community. Four Masterplans are proposed on the following themes. Which one do you support and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Master plan A: Technology Park in conjunction with the adjoining Technology College</li> <li>b) Master plan B: Environmental Research Centre linked to renewable energy</li> <li>c) Master plan C: Intensive Urban Agriculture</li> <li>d) Master plan D: Urban wilderness allowing nature to reclaim the site.</li> <li>e) Other (please explain)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>I would consider option a) to consider the best way forward. The empty building, whilst unsightly, is probably not what has devastated the community. Significant job losses will be the main cause and should be addressed by job creation and investment. With an established technology college offering links to clients/contracts, this site would be ideal for the technology park.</p>	<p>a) or b) depending on the potential to provide opportunities for the former workforce and to 'work' worth the community. Would consider some space for c) if demand exists: wider options appraisal to consider if the site might support a new village and eco town development, or major leisure development.</p>
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>23)</b> There are proposals to secure and improve public access in the form of a regional trail for horses, cyclists and walkers alongside the canal running through the RUF. There is talk of a proposed bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund with matched funding from the council, British Waterways and Natural England. This will link the urban area to the AONB. What is your response to this proposal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Create a partnership with all groups involved so issues can be worked through and a unified voice created</li> <li>b) Encourage individual interest groups to form who will feed into a strategy from different perspectives</li> <li>c) Encourage individual interest groups to form, those with the loudest voice will influence the outcome</li> <li>d) Do nothing as the proposal does not interest you</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>a) A partnership and collaborative strategy would be far better. You'll be working to one agenda and as a larger group have the potential of having a much louder voice.</p>	<p>Need to know who is responsible for the strategy and leading to pick it.</p>
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>27)</b> A new service station is proposed along the motorway which would be visible from Rufsty. Villagers are generally against the proposal but the Highway Agency and URF Council see it as a way of creating new jobs and revenue. Which of the following options would you support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reject the proposal (existing service stations are 20 miles south, and 15 miles north).</li> <li>b) Accept the proposal but ensure shielded lighting and closure between 22:30 and 06:30</li> </ul>	

c) Accept the proposal of a 24hr service station	
<b>Responses</b>	
b) Offers a compromise to a certain degree. Job creation and investment is important to the local area. There should be plenty of ongoing consultation with residents and local stakeholders to try and improve their perceptions.	c) Only if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy supports</li> <li>• The case is made on contribution to Highway debate</li> <li>• The economic impact on local services is considered</li> <li>• Might the new revision prejudice or provide new opportunity?</li> <li>• The opportunity is widened to improve [illegible] the motorway for cars.</li> <li>• There is evidence that jobs are needed in the area</li> <li>• Affected by development</li> <li>• Young people from the local area will get a chance to work</li> <li>• Sustainable travel to work solutions can be created which includes the rural villages</li> </ul>

<b>Values and Decision-Making</b>
<b>Question</b>
<p>1) A City Council Grant of £80,000 is available for a new community-initiated project. The conditions were: to provide something of social, economic and environmental benefit to the city; engage local citizens; be low-cost maintenance for the Council. Which of the following four bids on the final short-list would you vote for and why?</p> <p>a) Getting a community orchard and food-growing projects going across the city using 1/5 of space in existing council parks.</p> <p>b) Establishing a car-boot sale pitch and community cafe in one of the socially disadvantaged suburbs of the city.</p> <p>c) Creating a peri-urban woodland using predominantly native tree and shrub species on 4 acres of derelict Council Warehousing land on the city fringe.</p> <p>d) Providing renewable energy through a single wind turbine which will be community owned.</p>
<b>Responses</b>
a) Community orchard or local food growing project.
<b>Question</b>
<p>8) A local landowner is seeking your views on the development of a former quarry, which is currently restored to a lake. What option would you favour and why?</p> <p>a) Develop the recreation potential of the lake</p> <p>b) Develop the lake for conservation uses</p> <p>c) Create a small holiday village development around the lake</p> <p>d) Develop luxury executive housing around the lake</p> <p>Other option (please explain)</p>
<b>Responses</b>
b) The lake should be developed for conservation purposes.
<b>Question</b>
<p>11) A local farmer wishes to turn less productive fields into intensive horticulture involving polytunnels. The nearby St Ruf provides a ready-made local market (there is already a thriving</p>



farmers' market) and the business case is good as he has the necessary capital. However, there is concern about the landscape impact of the polytunnels and the local group "Save our RUF landscape" has asked you to support their campaign and protect the current farming landscape. What is your response and why?
<b>Responses</b>
Despite the visual impact, the development of local food security combined with an economic enterprise is of a higher priority.
<b>Question</b>
<b>13)</b> You regularly walk the land in this green belt square as part of a wider recreational route alongside the RUF canal. This stretch of the canal has recently been restored by British Waterways and local volunteers. Given the potential increase in recreation (seasonal boating traffic and public access alongside the canal and link into the regional trail) what other opportunities would you support?
<b>Responses</b>
Conservation initiatives to maintain amenity. Social/health amenities for disadvantaged people. Cultural and art activities relating to water, history and heritage.
<b>Question</b>
<b>15)</b> The lake in this former quarry workings is currently used as a recreational resource involving quiet water sports, angling and walking. It is also frequented by wildfowl including geese and herons but has no conservation designation. What do you value about a lake in this setting?
<b>Responses</b>
Biodiversity – place for wildlife and opportunities for environmental learning.
<b>Question</b>
<b>19)</b> Under the forthcoming neighbourhood plan proposals a local landowner with majority community support wants to develop more houses. However, these are within the green belt and close to an AONB. As there is an identified need for housing within a recent housing survey, what would be your response? a) Agree and select best area within or adjoining 'square' 19 on your plan b) Disagree as no new housing should be built in the green belt c) Look to increase the number of houses in your favoured area d) Look to decrease the number of houses in your favoured area e) Other (please explain your answer)
<b>Responses</b>
c) Increase number of houses in my favoured area if that would minimise impacts on AONB.
<b>Question</b>
<b>20)</b> As you are walking along the side of the road in this area, you see a substantial amount of fly tipping. What is your response? a) Clear up the rubbish yourself and dispose of it correctly b) Walk on and do nothing c) Report it to the police d) Continually moan about the state of the area to anyone who will listen e) Other (please explain)
<b>Responses</b>
c) Report it to the police and write to local press with view to starting local campaign against fly tipping.

<b>Long-Termism - Temporal Perspectives</b>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p>6) A planning application for 400 houses has been submitted as phase 3 of a development on the outskirts of RUFhampton (currently brownfield land). The area is zoned for housing development. Given the close proximity of the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) please indicate on your map how do you think this development should proceed whilst minimizing the impact on the SAC. Refusing the application is not an option as it conforms to all relevant local and national policies.</p>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>Who is the game aimed at? Long term perspective = design/local v design...look at needs of local and new communities. Question whether the SAC is still relevant. Does the longer term, needs of the future, outweigh designation? Sensible design, maximise sustainable principles, find out views and perspectives of those who live there – include them in the process.</p> <p>Why all of the above? To be sure policy is still relevant to make the development work in the longer term – respecting, as seen appropriate, the local history etc. Ensure local people buy in to the general principles and to help question our assumptions.</p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p>12) A landowner within the Green Belt wishes to convert his fields into a public park including BMX/skateboard facilities and outdoor gym areas. There is currently no public access to his land. Should this be permitted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No, it is development in the Green Belt and changes the nature of the RUF</li> <li>b) No, it has compromised the openness of the Green Belt</li> <li>c) Yes, although it is development it has not compromised the openness of the Green Belt</li> <li>d) Yes, it remains Green Belt with a much improved land use/surface of value to society</li> <li>e) Other conclusion (please explain)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>Between c) and d). It has not caused long term damage to principal of greenbelt. Potentially reduced need to travel (and this more sustainable) for youth to go to other possible more central facilities. To provide for people in the local area and stop movement out.</p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p>14) A community forum has collected 2000 signatures from residents of this square who are complaining to URF District Council about the lack of recreational facilities. The quarry to the north east has reached the end of its working life and a condition of its restoration is for it to be usable as a community resource. Bearing in mind there is a lack of recreational resources in the area what type of facility would you like to see provided?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sports pitches for rugby and football as well as a skate ramp</li> <li>b) A nature reserve which is accessible to the public</li> <li>c) A council owned leisure centre with a swimming pool, tennis courts and squash courts</li> <li>d) A community woodland</li> <li>e) Other (please explain your answer)</li> </ul>	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>e) It could be in fact is any of the responses, but given strength of community feeling you would need to understand what they wanted. I would look to long term provision avoiding short lived 'facts'. Long-termism would need to consider changes to funding arrangements, maintenance etc.</p>	
<b>Question</b>	
<p>16) There is a proposal to create a "hill " from construction and household waste of about 300 metres in height. This will help urban regeneration of RUFhampton and will take 10 years to complete. On completion it will be covered in decontaminated topsoil (also from urban</p>	

regeneration) and landscaped. How would you treat this proposal in the best interests of the RUF?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Welcome it for its positive impact on urban regeneration and negotiate a tipping levy to benefit wider RUF community projects.</li> <li>b) Maximise the benefits of this mountain through negotiating a long term tourism and recreation management plan</li> <li>c) Create a range of natural habitats to increase biodiversity and provide new (upland) wildlife areas to compensate for the impact of global warming</li> <li>d) Press for a scaled down hillock to better integrate with the RUF landscape character whilst achieving some of the above benefits in a shorter time scale</li> <li>e) Reject the proposal as inappropriate intrusive in the rural landscape, and unworkable</li> <li>f) Other (please explain your answer)</li> </ul>
<b>Responses:</b>
a) and c) I think this combination would provide more immediate funding to undertake tasks, but build on this long term for natural habitats/global warming etc.
<b>Question</b>
<b>17)</b> This site is proposed for landfill with a projected 20 year capacity. How might you change your behavior and that of the residents of RUFshire to reduce their dependency on the provision of such sites in the longer term? Or are you happy with the identification of new sites for landfill in the future?
<b>Responses</b>
<b>**Unanswered**</b>
<b>Question</b>
<b>24)</b> This village is at the gateway for the AONB and residents are very concerned at the huge increase in visitors each year which clearly exceeds current road and parking capacity, resulting in traffic delays, congestion and off- street parking. A recent meeting has identified the following options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Build a major new car park outside the village</li> <li>b) Put double yellow lines through the village preventing street parking</li> <li>c) Establish a free park and ride scheme from St Ruf</li> <li>d) Expand the current railway station car park from 30 spaces to 300</li> <li>e) Actively de-market the area and promote other visitor destinations</li> </ul>
<b>Responses</b>
<b>**Unanswered**</b>
<b>Question</b>
<b>25)</b> You are conducting a survey on the desired future use of this area (square 25). All players on the board must stop and you must obtain their preferred option for this space. You then report on the majority view. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Intensive agricultural production including a state of the art 'mega dairy' for 1,000 cattle</li> <li>b) A small B1 (light industrial) estate</li> <li>c) Creation of a shallow scrape for wildlife</li> <li>d) Small holiday village</li> <li>e) Leave it as it is</li> </ul>
<b>Responses</b>
<b>**Unanswered**</b>

<b>RUF vision</b>	
<b>Question</b>	
You have had a varied journey across the rural urban fringe. Please review answer cards and your plan and try to summarize your overall vision for RUFshire. Think about the timescale of the decisions you have taken (short, medium and long-term impacts) and the spatial scale (very localized, wider local community and landscape, sub-regional, wider).	
<b>Responses</b>	
Create a sustainable environment focussed on job creation. Ensure that development is sustainable and in the context and sympathetic to the surrounding environment.	My vision is essentially one that looks to support biodiversity, local food security and enterprise, whilst recognising the need for a sensitive approach to housing development.
A location where communities are involved in decision-making and decision made which reflect a holistic approach to the environmental, commercial and social needs of the area. The view of RUFshire is not taken in the isolation but those links into the localities e.g. lowland/upland links are recognised and taken into account in the decision-making process.	