

# South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan

## Settlement Hierarchy

### Background Paper

January 2018

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
1 Introduction and Purpose of document	3
2 National and Local Policy context	3
3 Evidence base and methodology	6
4 Options consultation	10
5 Pre-submission preferred options consultation	20
6 Appraisal and position of settlements in hierarchy	22
7 Issues raised at Regulation 19 consultation	29

## **Appendices**

- A** Settlement audit questionnaire
- B** Final Settlement hierarchy

# **1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT**

- 1.1 This document forms the technical evidence for the Settlement hierarchy. As part of the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2 a review has been carried out to determine a new settlement hierarchy. The establishment of a settlement hierarchy is an important part of South Northamptonshire's Local Plan Part 2. The West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy adopted December 2014 sets a framework for this process, indicating the hierarchy should be based on a robust analysis of services and facilities.
- 1.2 This paper will provide some additional detail and context for the final settlement hierarchy, as well as setting out the methodology used to develop the settlement hierarchy and how it has progressed following the responses received during the consultation stages of the Local Plan Part 2. The settlement hierarchy allows us to see where current facilities and services are located in the settlements around the district and will provide supporting evidence for the selection of the settlement hierarchy that will help to inform the spatial strategy for the district. Other considerations such as the location of potential development sites, the capacity of services and facilities and the scale of development are considered as part of the development strategy.
- 1.3 Its purpose is to provide supporting evidence for the selection of the settlement hierarchy that will help to inform the spatial strategy for the district.

# **2 NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY CONTEXT**

## **2.1 National Policy:**

- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2018) provides clear guidance on delivering housing. Within specific chapters of the NPPF there are clear links to the relevance of settlement hierarchies.
- 2.3 Paragraph 11 places the presumption in favour of sustainable development at the heart of the planning system.
- 2.4 Paragraph 8 identifies the three dimensions of sustainable development as economic, social and environmental.
- 2.5 Paragraph 78 states that 'to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities'
- 2.6 In addition Paragraph 83 (d) identifies the need for planning policies to enable the 'retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship'.

## **2.7 Local Policy:**

### **2.8 West Northants Joint Core Strategy**

2.9 The West Northants Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) was adopted in December 2014, it provides the framework for the Local Plan Part 2. The relevant policies in the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy in relation to the settlement hierarchy are policies S1, R1, R2 and R3.

2.10 Policy R1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) requires the Local Plan Part 2 to define a new settlement hierarchy. It recognises that there is a need for development in the rural areas, but aims to ensure that the scale of development is consistent with the objective of meeting local needs and supporting local services. The approach taken within the WNJCS provides some flexibility for the hierarchy to be tailored to reflect specific local circumstances.

2.11 The WNJCS sets out the criteria that will form the basis for the assessment as well as defining the 3 categories of settlement within which villages will be placed.

2.12 The categories are:

- **Primary Service villages –**

Have the highest level of services and facilities within the rural area to meet the day to day needs of residents including those from surrounding settlements. These settlements are the most appropriate for accommodating local housing and employment needs and would be the focus for service provision in the rural areas;

- **Secondary service villages**

These settlements have a more limited range of services, but still provide scope to meet some local needs for housing, employment and service provision;

- **Other villages**

These villages have an even more limited range of services and are more reliant on the services of larger centres for day to day needs. The scope for development within these villages is likely to be limited to windfall infill development, although some housing to provide for local needs may be suitable.

2.13 R1 sets out criteria to have regard to when establishing a settlement hierarchy:

- 1) The presence of services and facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents, including those from surrounding settlements;
- 2) Opportunities to retain and improve the provision and enhancement of services critical to the sustainability of settlements;
- 3) Accessibility, particularly by public transport to the main towns and sustainable employment opportunities;
- 4) Evidence of local needs for housing (including market and affordable housing), employment and services;
- 5) The role, scale and character of the settlement;
- 6) The capacity of settlements to accommodate development in terms of physical, environmental, infrastructure and other constraints
- 7) The availability of deliverable sites including previously developed land in sustainable locations;
- 8) Sustaining the rural economy by retaining existing employment sites where possible, by enabling small scale economic development, including tourism, through rural diversification and by supporting appropriate agricultural and forestry development;
- 9) Protect and enhance the character and quality of the rural areas' historic buildings and areas of historic or environmental importance and;
- 10) Enabling local community to identify and meet their own local needs.

2.14 In order to understand the extent to which the settlements in the district can be considered sustainable, a variety of indicators must be identified. These predominantly relate to service provision, facilities and accessibility. The indicator is essentially a service and/or facility which is valued for its contribution to the day to day functioning and needs of residents and businesses for the area.

2.15 The WNJCS confirms that the hierarchy should be based on a robust analysis of services and facilities. It suggests the following list of services and facilities as indicators:

- **Most Important Services and Facilities:** Secondary School, Primary School, GP Surgery, General Food Store, Post Office, Village Hall/Community Centre, Public Transport (quality of service) and Public House/Restaurant.

- **Important Facilities and Services:** Other Shops/Takeaways, Local Employment Provision, Libraries/Outreach Centres and Pre-school Provision.
- **Other Facilities:** Play Area, Sports Ground and Allotments.

2.16 The WNJCS acknowledges that this list is only 'suggested' and that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) with consultation can vary the level of importance of a service or facility and can also take into account additional services and facilities, to reflect local circumstances.

## **2.17 Local Plan policies – Saved Local Plan Policies**

2.18 The saved policies within the 1997 Local Plan, although not specified as a settlement hierarchy there is a defacto settlement hierarchy that sets out the following policies Policy H4 Limited development villages, Policy H5 restricted infill villages and Policy H6 restraint villages and open countryside. The definition of settlements between these criteria was originally set by the Northamptonshire Structure Plan.

## **2.19 Neighbourhood Plans**

2.20 Neighbourhood Plans are prepared by local groups and are required to 'be in general conformity' with Local Plans. Once 'made' Neighbourhood Plans become part of the Development Plan for the area.

2.21 There are currently 2 adopted neighbourhood plans, these are for Kislingbury and Harpole. The settlement hierarchy can support neighbourhood plan as evidence for services and facilities and illustrates in a wider context where a settlement fits.

# **3 EVIDENCE BASE AND METHODOLOGY**

## **3.1 Settlement hierarchy methodology**

3.2 This topic paper sets out the approach that South Northamptonshire Council has adopted to establish the settlement hierarchy and how the consultations carried out have shaped the assessment and the finalised settlement hierarchy.

3.3 The settlement hierarchy has been compiled primarily through assessing each settlement on its relative sustainability to a range of services, facilities and economic attributes.

### 3.4 Quantitative assessment

3.5 The first part of the settlement hierarchy assessment was to carry out a quantitative assessment to understand the services and facilities available in each of the settlements across the district. In order to gather the information about the level of current provision and recognising valuable local knowledge that parish councils have; all rural parish councils /meetings across the district were asked to complete a settlement audit about the services and facilities that existed in settlements within their parish. This settlement audit took place at the same time as the issues consultation; October 2013 – January 2014. A copy of the settlement audit can be found at Appendix A.

3.6 To assist in the determination of a draft settlement hierarchy, the results of the settlement audit was used for the following purposes:

- To compare the relative sustainability of settlements based on a standard set of services and facilities; and
- To identify possible links between settlements to gain a picture of the relationship of settlements on one another and the manner in which some settlements may act as a local service centre for surrounding smaller settlements with few or no facilities of their own.

3.7 There are 90 villages and hamlets in South Northamptonshire. Each of these settlements were included within the audit. Where no response was received from a parish or where further information was required the council endeavoured to compile the relevant information from site visits and desktop analysis.

### 3.8 Categorisation of service and facilities

3.9 Consideration was given to the types of services and facilities available and whether they were considered to be important to everyday life as set out in the WNJCS. In addition to the service and facilities set out in the WNJCS, others were also added as they were considered to be either already present within the district, and/or required testing through consultation to gauge the importance attached to these additional services and facilities.

3.10 The extra services and facilities added were: Nursery/pre-schools/ social clubs / police station /churches and religious venues / dentist / petrol station / residential care home / Bank / park or wildlife site and mobile services. These were categorised into suggested levels of importance:

<b>Table 1: Services and facilities included in the settlement hierarchy and their suggested importance</b>		<b>Indicative score</b>
Secondary schools	Most important	10
GP surgery / Health centre	Most important	10
Primary school	Very important	8
General food store	Very important	8
Post office	Very important	8
Public transport (proximity and frequency of public transport service)	Very important	0-8
Public house	Very important	8
Local employment	Very important	0-8
Village hall	Important	6
Nursery/pre school	Important	6
Permanent library	Important	6
Restaurant / takeaway	Less important	4
Play equipment	Less important	4
Sports pitches/grounds	Less important	4
Allotments	Less important	4
Outreach centre	Less important	4
Social club	Less important	4
Permanent police station	Less important	4
Dentist	Less important	4
Petrol station	Less important	4
Residential care home	Less important	4
Bank	Less important	4



Park / wildlife site	Less important	4
Adult education	Less important	4
Other services	Less important	4
Church / chapel	Less important	4
Other religious building	Less important	4
Mobile service	Less important	4

3.11 In addition to the above categorisations, another category 'other considerations' was included; this took into account a number of sustainability factors. This considered a settlement's proximity to urban and rural service centres and to 'Most' important services and facilities and employment opportunities. The size of a settlements' population was also taken into account.

Other considerations	Indicative score
Distance to large urban centre	0-6
Distance to rural service centre	0-6
Distance from 'most important' service or facility (i.e. secondary school and GP surgery)	0-6
Settlement population	0-4
Proximity to business park / size of business park	0-8
Bus service frequency to urban area	0-10
Proximity to railway station	0-8

### 3.12 Scoring system

3.13 The aim was to use a simple points system, to provide a general understanding of the level of facilities and services available to each

settlement, but at the same time to give appropriate weight to 'Most important' services and facilities compared to 'Important' and 'Other' services and facilities. The 'Most' important services and facilities receiving the higher scores and 'Less' important receiving the lowest. Indicative scores were also provided for the 'Other considerations'.

3.14 The key elements of the scoring system were:

- The scoring system recorded a score for the presence of a specific service or facility rather than how many existed.
- The settlement hierarchy considered services and facilities at the time of writing
- It did not consider the capacity of the existing services, as this will be taken into account as part of the wider plan making process.
- No assumptions were made as to whether there may be anticipated services in new or as a result of new developments.

3.15 The information provided by the parish council's was entered into a spreadsheet and each settlement was 'scored' according to the scoring system as set out in Table 1.

3.16 Based on the nature of services and facilities that existed in a settlement an indicative score for each settlement was provided. At this stage although a score was applied to each settlement based on the quantitative assessment and the scoring mechanism used above, the assessment did not determine which category, as set out in the WNJCS (para 16.12) (Primary service village, Secondary service village and Other villages) a settlement would fall into. This part of the assessment would be established following the options consultation.

3.17 This information formed the basis of a draft settlement hierarchy in terms of indicative scores and was published as part of the Local Plan Part 2 Options consultation for review, question and comment.

## **4 OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

4.1 The Part 2 Local Plan options consultation took place in 2016 over an 11 week period. In relation to the settlement hierarchy, this consultation provided the opportunity to:

- Test the accuracy of the information that had been gathered on the level of services and facilities that existed within the settlements;

- Determine whether the split in categorisation in terms of the services and facilities were suitable
- Establish whether there were other services and facilities that should be included, or if some services/facilities should be excluded from the assessment;
- Consider if appropriate weight had been applied to the specific services and facilities.

4.2 A key component of the options consultation was a questionnaire<sup>1</sup>. This contained 42 questions, of which 15 were specific to the settlement hierarchy assessment.

**Table 2: Summary of representations made in relation to questions asked on the settlement hierarchy**

Question	Response received	Comment
Q3: Should all the services and facilities listed be included in the settlement hierarchy appraisal?	53% of respondents answered yes.  Why include a dentist if no village reports the provision of a dentist?  Police station is not considered an appropriate measure of services and facilities	Noted.  Both dentist and police station have been removed from the assessment.
Q3a: Is the importance attached to each correct?	50% of respondents answered No.  The weighting attached for a GP surgery should take into account opening hours  Primary schools should be as important as secondary schools  Play areas, play equipment and sports pitches are considered inappropriately ranked as	Noted.  The number of days/hours a week has been taken into account and will be consulted on during the pre-submission preferred options.  Primary school have has their level of importance changed to 'Most important'

	<p>'less important' as they are considered to make positive contributions to settlements</p> <p>village halls and churches should be more important</p>	<p>Play areas/sports pitches etc. have been reclassified as 'recreational facilities' and their level of importance has changed to 'Very important'.</p>
<p>3b: Are there other services or facilities that should be included in the settlement hierarchy?</p>	<p>Fire stations</p> <p>Access to broadband</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>Chemists</p> <p>Transport links</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>4: Do you think that the services and facilities considered the most important should be given a higher score?</p>	<p>Overall the response to this was a higher score than already stated was not required</p>	
<p>5: Are there any other services/facilities that should be classed as 'most important'?</p>	<p>Primary schools</p> <p>Pre-schools</p> <p>Public transport</p> <p>Sports/play equipment</p> <p>Food shops</p> <p>Places of worship</p> <p>Post office</p> <p>Village halls</p> <p>Local employment</p>	

<p>6: Should the presence of more than one type of 'most important' or 'very important' service result in additional scores being given?</p>	<p>36% of respondents said No.</p> <p>More than one type of resource does not necessarily add value</p> <p>It is about assessing the type of provision not the volume</p>	
<p>7: Should a settlements distance from a larger urban area or a rural service centre be factored into the settlement hierarchy?</p>	<p>42% of respondents said Yes.</p> <p>Proximity to an urban area should be factored into the assessment and these will support rural communities</p> <p>Rural communities cannot rely on public transport to access urban areas</p> <p>This could be unfair as smaller settlement closer could score more than a larger settlement</p>	
<p>8: Should the nearest location of the 'most important' services and facilities be factored into to the settlement hierarchy assessment of sustainability, if not present in the village?</p>	<p>The ease of access is not dependent on distance alone</p> <p>Amenities out of the locality invariably require transport and this creates other issues</p> <p>This will cause over-complication</p>	
<p>9: Do you consider that settlements should be scored depending on the level of</p>	<p>It is the level of services that are important</p>	

<p>population within them?</p>	<p>It is not a reliable indicator that a high population means high level of services</p> <p>The indicators of sustainability are far more important than the population size</p> <p>A small community can be just as sustainable as a large one</p> <p>Not necessarily a reflection of services and facilities</p>	
<p>10: Should local employment provision via business parks within or close proximity to a settlement be weighted according to the distance from a settlement?</p>	<p>If there are employment opportunities very close to the settlement then that should count</p> <p>Local employment does not necessarily give rise to employment for nearby local people</p> <p>Local provision is an important consideration in sustainability terms</p>	
<p>11: Should the capacity of the business park in terms of the number of business units be included in the settlement hierarchy assessment of sustainability?</p>	<p>40% of respondents said No.</p> <p>The more the capacity the more opportunities for employment</p> <p>The number of persons employed in a business park is more important than the number of units</p> <p>Business parks do not enhance facilities or</p>	

	services for local communities	
12: Should settlements where there is a bus service to larger urban areas be scored higher in the settlement hierarchy's assessment of sustainability?	<p>These can be withdrawn at any time so cannot be relied upon</p> <p>This is an important part of the settlement facilities giving options for those without own transport can have access to other areas</p> <p>Settlements with a regular e.g. at least hourly should score higher in the settlement hierarchy</p> <p>You need to take into consideration the frequency and usage of the service</p> <p>Bus services should not be scored as a reliable indicator as by their own nature timetables can be altered and the services currently on offer could change</p>	
13: Should settlement where there is a bus service to market towns or primary service villages be scored higher in the settlement hierarchy's assessment of sustainability?	<p>Better transport links should ensure better sustainability and therefore some weight should be given to this</p> <p>If the service is too infrequent to make a difference to the population if adds no value to those settlements and does not enhance their</p>	

	sustainability	
14: Should the frequency of bus services be considered as part of a settlement's accessibility?	<p>58% of respondents said Yes.</p> <p>Frequency and start and finish times should be considered</p> <p>Rural bus timetables often only operate in peak times only and this should be taken into account</p> <p>There is a significant difference between a regular hourly service and one that provide an early morning and evening service</p>	
15: Some settlements have access to or are close to passenger rail services. Should the assessment take account of the proximity/frequency of rail services and final destinations	<p>Unclear whether this actually improves sustainability as rail miles may be very unsustainable for daily journeys to work, especially for longer distance journeys.</p> <p>The criteria applying to rail services should mirror considerations for bus services</p> <p>Although the sustainability scoring matrix should reflect rail provision, it should not influence the overall scoring to such an extent that it becomes a key determinant in the classification of settlement within the hierarchy</p>	
16: Should public transport	All rural bus services are	



<p>services that are publically funded or subsidised score a lower score due to their potential vulnerability of services being reduced or stopped.</p>	<p>vulnerable to reduction or cancellation</p> <p>It is not uncommon for subsidies to be cut/reduced, making bus services commercially unviable. Therefore they should score fewer points</p> <p>As development is a long term strategy, any factor that could change at little notice should not influence the determination of settlement hierarchy.</p>	
---	--	--

#### 4.3 Options consultation responses and amendments to the assessment

4.4 A number of representations on the settlement hierarchy were received during the options consultation. Following on from this it was determined that:

- There were a number of services and facilities that were considered not applicable for settlements within South Northamptonshire and were removed from the assessment. This included a dentist, police station, petrol station, residential care home, bank and outreach centres, other services.
- There were a number of representations regarding primary schools in the local community. It was considered that primary schools should be re-classified as ‘Most important’ and either be equal to or be accorded a greater level of importance than secondary schools. It was deemed that primary schools would be reclassified as ‘Most important’.
- GP surgery. There were some comments regarding the level of service being provided by surgeries. It was highlighted that although a surgery existed within a settlement, the number of days / hours and therefore the availability of the service was reduced compared to surgeries in other settlements. To reflect the availability of a GP surgery, the scoring was adjusted accordingly with surgeries offering daily service (Monday-Friday) scoring the full 10 points, those offering less than this would receive 5 points. If a settlement scores points for having a GP under ‘Most important services and facilities, it does not score additional points under

'other considerations' and distance to the 'Most' important service or facility.

- Some respondents felt that access to broadband should be identified in the list of facilities and services. Changing working practices, an increase in homeworking, online shopping and many other day-to-day activities have all contributed to the reliance on online activity for day to day needs. It is considered that super broadband connection is a key element of ensuring a settlement's sustainability. This was added to the list of services and facilities and was been classified as a 'very important'.

4.5 The responses also highlighted that some other services and facilities should be re-classified.

- Play areas, sports pitches, wildlife sites etc. were considered to be very beneficial and make positive contributions to settlements. These facilities were grouped under recreational facilities and their level of importance was raised from 'less important' to 'very important'.
- Village halls/church halls etc. as places to gather were considered an important part of community life. These facilities offer a multi- functional space which is value to the community. These facilities were grouped together under 'community facilities' and their level of importance became 'very important'.
- Public houses although can provide a resource where people can gather and socialise, it is not considered a fundamental facility for a settlement and the presence of a pub does not directly imply a settlement is more sustainable than other. The level of importance changed from 'very important' to 'important'.
- Although local employment is important there was concern that it did not necessarily make a settlement more sustainable as it does not automatically give rise to employment opportunities for residents living nearby. On balance it was determined that local employment be reclassified as 'Important' and scoring would be based on the distance of the employment to a settlement and would only include employment sites that contained 20 or more business units.
- The WNJCS indicated that a bus service (quality of service) should be scored as one of the 'most important' service and facility. The options consultation raised that the quality and frequency of a bus service was an important consideration and had a bearing on how a settlement functions. In light of the comments made, settlements with bus services that are non-subsidised and operate as a minimum an hourly Monday – Saturday

service to an urban centre or a rural service centre will accrue a score. Services which operate less than hourly, and are subsidised, or services that are demand responsive such as county connect are not considered to contribute sufficiently to sustainability and therefore a score has not been given.

- Population – The size of a settlement clearly plays a part in its significance and in general terms the larger the population the more likely it is to have a range of services and facilities bought about by a larger demand. In general respondents to the options consultation did not feel that the size of the population was a reliable indicator of sustainability. It was therefore decided not to include population as a sustainability factor. It was considered that a settlement should be assessed for their sustainability based on what they provide and not on the number of people who live within a settlement. The use of population will be used for contextual purposes and not to inform the final settlement hierarchy.

#### 4.6 Revised categorisation of services and facilities

4.7 The revised services and facilities assessment included the following. This was subsequently subject to consultation as part of the pre-submission preferred options consultation.

<b>Table 3: Services and facilities included in the settlement hierarchy and their suggested importance</b>		<b>Indicative score</b>
Secondary schools	Most important	10
GP surgery / Health centre	Most important	10 / 5 depending on availability of service
Primary school	Most Important	10
Bus to urban area	Very important	5
General store	Very important	5
Post office	Very important	5
Broadband	Very important	5
Recreational facilities	Very important	5
Pre-school / nursery	Very important	5
Community facilities	Very important	5

Public house	Very important	3
Local employment	Very important	1-4
Restaurant / takeaway	Less important	2
Allotments	Less important	2
Social club	Less important	2
Wildlife site	Less important	2
Adult education	Less important	2
Permanent library	Important	2
Distance to urban area	Other considerations	0-6
Distance to rural service centre (Towcester and Brackley)	Other considerations	0-6
Distance to GP surgery	Other considerations	0-6
Distance to rail station	Other consideration	2-8

#### **4.8 Settlement classifications**

4.9 The revised scoring matrix was established taking into account the changes made following the options consultation and representations received. At this point it was also necessary to establish the settlement categories, and which settlements fall within each category.

4.10 The descriptions of the settlement categories are set out in para 16.12 of the WNJCS and this was used to guide the process.

### **5 PRE-SUBMISSION PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

5.1 The pre-submission preferred options consultation took place from 4 September 2017 to 12 noon 10 November 17. This consultation provided the opportunity to receive feedback following the changes made to the level of importance assigned to each service and facility and the scoring mechanism. This consultation also allowed feedback on the draft categorisation of settlements in terms of whether settlements were considered as a Primary service village, Secondary Service village or Other villages depending on the

level of service and facilities provision within or in close proximity to a settlement.

5.2 The representations received on the settlement hierarchy assessment highlighted a number of points, these are summarised below:

- Some services and facilities in particular settlements did not exist in a settlement
- The level of importance/weight attributed to some services/facilities should be reconsidered
- The settlement categorisation of particular settlements were considered incorrect
- The settlement hierarchy should be revised to reflect their connectivity with other settlements

5.3 Where appropriate changes were made to the assessment.

5.4 In addition it was determined that following local financial constraints at the County Council level and the reduction in budgets, the appraisal has removed the provision of bus services, library services and adult learning provision. In terms of the removal of the library service this was applicable to Deanshanger, Middleton Cheney and Roade.

5.5 Wildlife sites had been part of the assessment and although they provide a community value, it was considered that as a category for 'recreational' facilities already existed in the appraisal, the removal of 'wildlife sites' would not be detrimental to the assessment.

5.6 The assessment also scored settlements based on 'other considerations' this included a settlement's distance to urban areas and rural service centres; this helps to reflect the sustainability of particular settlements. In addition, further urban and rural service centres were added to the assessment, this included Stony Stratford and Olney. The scores for distances from urban areas and rural service centres were adjusted to ensure that appropriate weighting was accorded for the relative sustainability of a settlement due to its proximity to an urban area. Furthermore Wolverton Banbury railway station were also included along with Kings Sutton railway station.

## 6 APPRAISAL AND POSITION OF SETTLEMENTS IN HIERARCHY

6.1 Following the 3 stage process of consultation and iterative changes to the settlement hierarchy resulted in a final scoring mechanism – Table 4.

**Table 4: Final scoring mechanism**

Sustainability Indicator	Assumption	Level of importance	Scoring mechanism
Secondary schools	<p>There are 7 secondary schools in the District. For this exercise specialist schools/colleges have not been included as a provision, due to their specific nature which is not catchment specific and caters for students in a wider geographical area.</p> <p>The district also has a number of independent private schools across academic age range. These schools have not been included as attendance as such institutions are determined by those that wish to do so at a personal cost and are not usually geographically restrictive.</p> <p>The level of importance has remained at 'Most important' due to their scarcity.</p>	Most Important	10
GP Surgery	<p>Information regarding this indicator has been gathered using the parish survey and <a href="http://www.nhs.uk">www.nhs.uk</a>.</p> <p>It is considered that the provision of a full-time GP surgery in a settlement is 'Most Important'. Access to a GP and the presence of one within a realistic catchment must be considered when determining how sustainable a</p>	'Most Important'	<p>Daily GP service = 10 points</p> <p>Limited hours service = 5 points</p> <p>No GP service = 0 points</p>

	<p>settlement is.</p> <p>The assessment is based on current provision and does not attempt to make adjustments based on future changes.</p> <p>Scoring of this indicator has been considered in terms of whether a GP surgery exists within a settlement and operates a daily service. A reduced score has been given where a GP surgery exists but does not operate on a daily basis.</p>		
Primary schools	<p>Following on from consultations and comments received on the importance of primary schools in the local community, the level of importance was raised from 'very important' to 'most important'</p> <p>If a school was further than 1km from a settlement then this was not counted as it would not add to the sustainability of the settlement.</p>	Most Important	10
General store	<p>Information on this indicator was gathered from the parish survey and online resource.</p> <p>Often considered to be an essential service for local communities these shops sell goods such as food and drinks. Even though online grocery shopping is continuing to rise popularity, the unexpected need to buy basic provisions will always exist.</p>	Very important	5
Post office	<p>This information was primarily gathered through the parish surveys, options consultation and</p>	Very Important	5

	<p>online resources.</p> <p>In scoring, no distinction is made between stand-alone post offices and those which are within other premises.</p>		
Broadband access	<p>The Options Consultation responses strongly suggested that the availability of superfast broadband should be used in any Settlement sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Information relating to broadband access was gained from: <a href="http://www.superfastnorthamptonshire.net">www.superfastnorthamptonshire.net</a> Ofcom's maps online resource (<a href="http://maps.ofcom.org.uk/">http://maps.ofcom.org.uk/</a>, and Tove Valley Broadband (where applicable) <a href="https://www.tovevalley.com/">https://www.tovevalley.com/</a></p> <p>Changing working practices, an increase in homeworking, online shopping and many other day-to-day activities have all contributed to an increase in online activity which in some cases reduces the needs for communities and businesses to travel as frequently. It is considered that broadband connection is a key element of ensuring a settlement's sustainability. Therefore this service has been categorised as a 'very' important service/facility.</p> <p>Scoring is based simply upon whether super broadband exists throughout a settlement. The data relating to this is updated regularly and relates to a postcode area and not an individual premises level.</p>	Very Important	5
Recreational Facilities	This information was primarily gathered through the parish survey	Very	5



<p>(Sport pitches / recreation grounds / play equipment / wildlife sites)</p>	<p>and online resources.</p> <p>Recreational facilities are a key contribution to community life and it is considered that recreational facilities are important to the sustainability of a settlement and play an important health and social role.</p> <p>During the options consultation sport pitches, play equipment and wildlife sites were scored separately, however they all offer recreational facilities and therefore it was decided to combine into one category.</p> <p>Following on from the Options consultation representations the level of importance of this facility was increased from 'less important' to 'very important'. To recognise the importance that recreational facilities play in health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Important</p>	
<p>Pre-school /nursery</p>	<p>Information on this was primarily gathered from the parish survey and the options consultation. Although an important community facility is it not considered on a par with primary or secondary schools.</p>	<p>Level of importance increased from important to 'very important'.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Community facilities (to include village halls /churches)</p>	<p>Information on this was primarily gathered from the parish survey and options consultation.</p> <p>Facilities such as village halls / community centres / churches etc. can offer a multi- functional space which is of value to the community. It should be recognised that these</p>	<p>Very important</p>	<p>5</p>

	facilities help towards social sustainability and can support a communities' quality of life.		
Public House	<p>Information on this was primarily gathered from the parish audit and online resource.</p> <p>Public houses can provide a key means for community cohesion where local people and others can gather and socialise. As public houses have diversified, they often now service food. Whilst it is not a fundamental facility for a settlement and the presence of a pub does not directly imply a settlement is more sustainable than another, they arguably play a role in the social sustainability of a settlement.</p>	Important	3
Local employment (Local Business parks)	<p>Information regarding this indicator has been gathered using the Council's 'Guide to Business Accommodation in South Northants'.</p> <p>Scoring of this indicator is based upon whether employment premises exist within 2km of a settlement and includes 11 or more business units.</p>	Important	4
Restaurant /takeaways	This information was gathered from the parish audit and the options consultation.	Less important	2
Allotments	This information was gathered from the parish audit. This facility helps support social and environmental wellbeing of an area.	Less important	2
Social Club	This information was gathered from the parish audit.	Less important	2

<p>Distance to urban area (Northampton, Milton Keynes, Banbury)</p>	<p>The Council's Geographical Information System (GIS) provided information on the distances from settlements to urban areas.</p> <p>A settlements proximity to an urban area improves its overall sustainability as urban areas provide a wide variety of services and facilities.</p>	<p>Other considerations</p>	<p>Less than 10km = 10 points</p> <p>10-12km = 6 points</p> <p>12-14km = 2 points</p> <p>More than 14km = 0</p>
<p>Distance to rural service centres (Towcester and Brackley). In addition outside of the boundary the following service centres will be including Stony Stratford and Olney.</p>	<p>The Council's Geographical Information System (GIS) provided information on the distances from settlements to a rural service centre.</p> <p>Although Towcester and Brackley are located within the district, there are other similar sized 'service centres' with services and facilities that are close to the district's boundary, which are likely to support settlements.</p> <p>A settlement's proximity to a rural service centre can help support its sustainability.</p> <p>Banbury and Stony Stratford have therefore been included in this assessment.</p>	<p>Other considerations</p>	<p>Less than 2km = 10 points</p> <p>2km-4km = 6 points</p> <p>4-6km = 2 points</p>
<p>Distance to 'most' important service or facility (GP surgery only)</p>	<p>Distance to GP – to be retained for only full time surgeries. Those settlements with a full time GP surgery will not be given this additional score.</p> <p>Scoring the distance to secondary school has been removed from this assessment. The options consultation raised the issue that</p>	<p>Other considerations</p>	<p>Less than 1km = 6 points</p> <p>1-2km = 4 points</p> <p>2-3km = 2 points</p>

	<p>children of secondary school age in the majority of cases tend to get school transport and therefore are not necessarily reliant on parents / caregivers to take them to school.</p> <p>The importance of primary schools in a settlement's sustainability has been recognised by increasing its weighting to 'Most' important. However as primary schools are predominantly located in a settlement, and those living outside are likely to need to drive their children to school, adding additional scores to settlement in proximity to a primary school does not necessarily make that settlement more sustainable as it encourages car use etc. Therefore scoring on the proximity to a primary school does not form part of this assessment.</p>		
Distance to rail station	<p>There is only one rail station within the district (Kings Sutton).</p> <p>However due to the proximity of other railway station close to the district border it was considered appropriate to include Wolverton and Banbury station.</p> <p>The Council's Geographical Information System (GIS) provided information on the distances from settlements to the rail station.</p> <p>A settlement's proximity to a rail station can help support its sustainability.</p>	Other considerations	<p>Settlement with railway station = 8 points</p> <p>0-1km = 6 points</p> <p>1-3km = 4 points</p> <p>3-5km = 2 points</p>

## 6.2 The Rural Hierarchy

6.3 An important consideration when determining a settlement hierarchy is that it should not be looked at in isolation to other policies. The hierarchy will have a bearing on what is developed in each tier of the hierarchy as policies will be set against the different settlement hierarchy classifications to assist with determining planning applications. The hierarchy shows that there were a number of settlements in the Secondary Service Village category, however the level of services and facilities varied considerably from those settlements that were placed near the top of the Secondary Service Village Hierarchy and those near the bottom. Due to this disparity, it was deemed appropriate to incorporate a further tier within the Secondary Village category. The WNJCS states that the 'detailed hierarchy' will be undertaken through Part 2 Local Plans which will be prepared for the rural areas, which provides some flexibility for the hierarchy with each area to be tailored to reflect specific local circumstances. Therefore the Secondary Service Villages have been refined to reflect the relative difference in the level and provision of services, facilities and proximity to larger urban and rural areas.

- Rural Service Centres (First Tier)

Towcester and Brackley

- Primary Service villages (Second Tier):

There were 5 settlements classified as Primary service villages. These settlements are expected to have the highest level of service provision and serve a wider catchment area. They have the majority of the 'Most' important services and facilities and a high level of 'very' important services and facilities, but are not expected to have them all. The policies within this Plan, especially the housing policies, primarily direct development to these more sustainable settlements.

- Secondary service villages (Third Tier):

There were 29 settlements classified as secondary villages. There is recognition that there is some variation on the level of services and facilities available between those secondary service villages with scores nearing the top of the scoring matrix and those nearing the bottom. The settlements at the lower end of the scoring matrix, have generally scored well for their location to larger sustainable locations, but do not necessarily have the full range of services and facilities within the settlement. To reflect these sustainability scores and to be able to direct development appropriately, secondary service villages have been split into two groups; Secondary service villages (a) (13) and Secondary Service Villages (b) (16).

- Small villages (Fourth Tier):

There were 41 villages classified as small villages. These settlements have a much more limited range of services and facilities and rely more heavily on more sustainable settlements for local services and facilities.

- Countryside/hamlets:

There are 31 settlements classified as countryside/hamlets. The settlements have almost no services or facilities. These settlements do not have confines and for the purposes of this plan are considered as 'countryside'.

## **7 ISSUES RAISED AT REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION**

7.1 The submission draft consultation took place from 4 October 2018 until 12 noon on the 16 November 2018.

7.2 23 responses were made to the Regulation 19 document specifically addressing the Settlement Hierarchy. A summary of the main issues raised, together with the officer response has been published<sup>ii</sup>. Respondents specifically commenting on the settlement hierarchy and proposing changes are:

003 – Ross Middleton (Grand Union Housing Ltd)

006 – Richard Crosthwaite (Gladmans)

009 – Ross Middleton (Georgian House Development)

014 – Sue Green (Home Builders Federation)

018 – Pegasus Planning Group (Cureton Trust)

020 – Boddington Parish Council

023 – Fisher German (David Usher Trust)

031 – Deverill (Turley – Land to the West of Brackley)

032 – Ward (Persimmon – Furnace Lane, Nether Heyford)

032 – Ward (Persimmon – Harpole)

032 – Ward (Persimmon – Paulerspury)

034 – Ross Middleton (Northall Developments; Chipping Warden)

037 – Hunt (Aitchison Raffety; Greens Norton)

039 – Martin (Brown and Co)

055 – Paul Johnson (Francis Jackson)  
004 – Barwood Homes (Marrons Planning)  
017 – Rainier Development (Pegasus)  
040 – Bidwells (Davidsons Developments)  
054 – Waller  
056 – Bidwells (Catesby Estates)  
066 – Hollins Strategic Land (Emery Planning)  
074 – Tom Hutchinson (Land and Partners)  
112 – Phillip Scott (Obsidian Strategic)  
113 – Manor Oak Homes (Armstrong Rigg Planning)

7.3 The representations raised a range of different points, these are addressed below. Where it was considered that there were anomalies to the settlement hierarchy in terms of adjusting the availability of a service / facility etc. these amendments have been made accordingly. There were two settlements where there were changes to their level of services and facilities, these were:

- Harpole – inclusion of a pre-school further to comments made on Representation 032; this increases the score from 47 to 52; and
- Rothersthorpe, which now includes additional points to take into account this settlements proximity to business/employment park further to comments made on Representation 066; this increases the score from 37 to 40.

7.4 These adjustments however have not changed the category of settlements that each of these settlement were initially placed.

### **7.5 Split of Secondary villages**

7.6 One of the key issues raised in relation to Policy SS1, was Limb C, and the decision to split secondary service villages into a further 2 categories.

7.7 Some of the representations received are as follows:

7.8 Reps 003 / 009/ 034 stated that *‘it is considered that the sub-categories within Section C of the Settlement Hierarchy are overly onerous, particularly given that the policy states ‘Secondary Villages (A) are likely to be more sustainable for limited development. Therefore to ensure the effective application of the strategy it is suggested that the categories be removed from*

*this element of the policy and site suitability be assessed on a site by site basis through the development control process’.*

- 7.9 Rep 023 – *‘Objections are however raised to material changes which have been made to the settlement hierarchy. The classification of ‘Secondary Service Villages’ has been extended to take into account the level of services and facilities available in the higher scoring settlements compared to those who score lower. The Secondary Service Village classification has been divided into Secondary Service Village (a) and Secondary Service Village (b). The split appears to have been made arbitrarily. There is no evidence provided which analyses how the settlements should be split between the two classifications’.*
- 7.10 Rep 032 – *‘Persimmon objects to the approach which has seen an additional tier introduced in the settlement hierarchy (Secondary Villages B) because this is plainly not consistent with the Policy R1 of the WNJCS 2014 (the parent plan) which sets out a three tier hierarchy for the rural area – Primary Service Villages, Secondary Service Villages, and Other Villages. The distinction between two categories of secondary service villages should be deleted as it is not supported by clearly stated policy in the WNJCS thereby rendering it unsound’.*
- 7.11 The justification for splitting the secondary service villages into 2 further categories;, namely A and B takes into account the variation in the levels of service and facilities and the proximity of settlements to larger rural and urban centres. To ensure that there was a recognition of these differences it was deemed appropriate that there was a demarcation between the higher scoring settlements within the Secondary service village and the lower scoring settlement.
- 7.12 The representations cited that it was felt that the additional tier within the settlement hierarchy was not consistent with Policy R1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy,. The WNJCS states that the approach for the detailed hierarchy in Part 2 plans will provide ‘some flexibility for the hierarchy within each are to be tailored to reflect specific local circumstances’ therefore it is considered legitimate to retain the split of Secondary Villages into tiers A and B. The Secondary village category continues to exist as set out in the WNJCS, but has been refined further to reflect local circumstances, and therefore it is not considered to be contrary to the WNJCS in any substantial way.
- 7.13 Inconsistencies with the settlement hierarchy assessment**
- 7.14 018 – *‘the hierarchy was generated using the WNJCS ‘Village Services and Facilities Technical Paper’ (2011), Pre-2010 Village Services Questionnaires*



and the undated 'Settlement Hierarchy in South Northamptonshire'. While the documents contain useful data, these documents are somewhat outdated and do not adequately factor-in future growth opportunities'.

- 7.15 032 – 'The presence of regular bus services to urban areas and proximity to urban areas should be given full weight as a "most important" criterion along with the presence of schools and a GP surgery. The settlement hierarchy should be reconsidered along these lines'.
- 7.16 The revised Settlement Hierarchy was subject to a quantitative assessment to understand the services and facilities available in each of the settlements across the district. A settlement audit took place in October 2013-2014, the outcome of this assessment has been subject to consultation, initially during the options consultation (2016) to test the accuracy of the information and to determine whether the split in categorisation in terms of the services and facilities were suitable. The subsequent pre-submission preferred options consultation (2017) provided an opportunity to comment and make changes to the level of importance assigning to each service and facility and the scoring mechanism. It is therefore considered that the Settlement hierarchy is a robust and up-to-date assessment. It was clear within the assessment that the services and facilities would be based on current provision at the time of writing and would not take into account whether they may be anticipated services in new or as a result of new developments.
- 7.18 Based on the changes made to the scoring of Harpole and Rothersthorpe, a revised scoring mechanism was implemented and the settlement hierarchy updated accordingly. This resulted in a final settlement hierarchy being determined (Table 5).

**Table 5: Final settlement hierarchy including settlement categorisations**

Settlement	Settlement Hierarchy	Overall matrix score
Bugbrooke	Primary Service village	77
Roade	Primary Service village	77
Deanshanger (including Puxley)	Primary Service village	76
Middleton Cheney	Primary Service village	76
Kings Sutton (including Little Purston)	Primary Service village	74
Greens Norton (including	Secondary service village	69

Duncote)	(a)	
Blisworth	Secondary service village (a)	68
Old Stratford (including Passenham)	Secondary service village (a)	65
Grange Park	Secondary service village (a)	61
Nether Heyford	Secondary service village (a)	59
Paulerspury (including Heathencote and Pury End)	Secondary service village (a)	58
Silverstone	Secondary service village (a)	58
Cogenhoe (including Whiston)	Secondary service village (a)	57
Hackleton (including Piddington, Horton and Preston Deanery)	Secondary service village (a)	57
Potterspury (including Furtho)	Secondary service village (a)	57
Charlton and Newbottle	Secondary service village (a)	55
Kislingbury	Secondary service village (a)	55
Yardley Gobion	Secondary service village (a)	55
Little Houghton	Secondary Service village (b)	53
Yardley Hastings	Secondary Service village (b)	52
Harpole	Secondary Service village	52

	(b)	
Hartwell	Secondary Service village (b)	51
Denton	Secondary Service village (b)	50
Blakesley	Secondary Service village (b)	49
Milton Malsor	Secondary Service village (b)	49
Brafield on the Green	Secondary Service village (b)	49
Cosgrove	Secondary Service village (b)	47
Farthinghoe (including Great Purston and Steane)	Secondary Service village (b)	47
Culworth	Secondary Service village (b)	46
Greatworth	Secondary Service village (b)	45
Croughton	Secondary Service village (b)	43
Pattishall (including Astcote, Dalscote, Eastcote and Fosters Booth)	Secondary Service village (b)	43
Chacombe	Secondary Service village (b)	42
Stoke Bruerne	Secondary Service village (b)	42
Evenley	Small villages	40
Syresham	Small villages	40

Rothersthorpe	Small Village	40
Upper and Lower Boddington	Small villages	39
Chipping Warden	Small villages	38
Gayton	Small villages	37
Helmdon	Small villages	37
Rothersthorpe	Small villages	37
Litchborough	Small villages	35
Tiffield	Small villages	35
Weedon Lois (including Weston)	Small villages	35
Whittlebury	Small villages	34
Aynho	Small villages	32
Ashton	Small villages	31
Shutlanger	Small villages	29
Aston le Walls	Small villages	27
Marston St Lawrence	Small villages	27
Sulgrave	Small villages	26
Thorpe Mandeville	Small villages	25
Eydon	Small villages	24
Wicken	Small villages	23
Caldecote	Small villages	20
Hinton in the Hedges	Small villages	20
Quinton	Small villages	20
Courteenhall	Small villages	19
Moreton Pinkney	Small villages	19

Abthorpe (including Foscote)	Small villages	17
Wood Burcote	Small villages	17
Adstone	Small villages	16
Maidford	Small villages	16
Wootton Fields	Small villages	16
Radstone	Small villages	15
Thenford	Small villages	15
Wappenham	Small villages	15
Castle Ashby (including Chadstone)	Small villages	14
Overthorpe	Small villages	14
Warkworth	Small villages	14
Whitfield	Small villages	14
Bradden	Small villages	12
Grafton Regis	Small villages	12
Slapton	Small villages	12
Upper Heyford	Small villages	12
Alderton	Countryside	10
Edgcote	Countryside	10
Cold Higham (including Grimscote)	Countryside	9
Woodend	Countryside	5

### Policy SS1: The Settlement Hierarchy

**1. Proposals for new development will be directed towards the most sustainable locations in accordance with the District's settlement**

hierarchy.

2. **Settlement boundaries for first, second, third and fourth category settlements are defined on the proposals maps. New development should be within the settlement boundaries of these settlements in accordance with their scale, role and function unless otherwise indicated in the local plan.**

**A. Rural Service Centres – first category**

**Brackley and Towcester**

**B. Primary Service Villages – second category**

**Bugbrooke, Deanshanger, Kings Sutton, Middleton Cheney and Roade**

**C. Secondary Service Villages – third category**

**Secondary Villages are split into two categories. This reflects their respective level of services and proximity to other higher order settlements. Secondary Villages (A) are likely to be more suitable for limited development.**

**Secondary Villages (A)**

**Blisworth, Charlton, Cogenhoe, Grange Park, Greens Norton, Hackleton (with Horton and Piddington), Kislingbury, Nether Heyford, Old Stratford, Paulerspury (with Pury End), Potterspury, Silverstone and Yardley Gobion.**

**Secondary Villages (B)**

**Blakesley, Brafield On The Green, Chacombe, Cosgrove, Croughton, Culworth, Denton, Farthinghoe, Greatworth, Harpole, Hartwell, Little Houghton, Milton Malsor, Pattishall (with Ascote and Eastcote), Stoke Bruerne and Yardley Hastings.**

**D. Small Villages – fourth category**

**Abthorpe, Adstone, Ashton, Aston Le Walls, Aynho, Boddington (Lower And Upper) Bradden, Caldecote, Castle Ashby, Chipping Warden, Courteenhall, Evenley, Eydon, Gayton, Grafton Regis, Helmdon, Hinton In The Hedges, Litchborough, Maidford, Marston St Lawrence, Moreton Pinkney, Overthorpe, Quinton, Radstone, Rothersthorpe, Shutlanger, Slapton, Sulgrave, Syresham, Thenford, Thorpe Mandeville, Tiffield, Upper Heyford, Wappenham, Warkworth, Weedon Lois (with Weston), Whitfield, Whittlebury, Wicken, Wood Burcote, and Wootton Fields**

**3. All areas outside defined confines including hamlets and isolated groups of buildings are 'open countryside.**

**Plans showing the settlement confines can be viewed in Annex 1 of this plan**

**Contributes to Objectives: 4, 5, 6,7,8**

---

<sup>i</sup> Options consultation questionnaire available from:

<https://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/downloads/download/250/local-plan-options-consultation-documents>

<sup>ii</sup> Summary of Representations to Proposed Submission Plan and suggested response available from:

<https://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/5557/lp2sd01-15-summary-of-representations-to-regulation-19-plan-consultation.pdf>



**South  
Northamptonshire  
Council**

Village Services Questionnaire 2015



## **Introduction**

South Northamptonshire Council is currently gathering information to complete an audit of village services. This information will form the basis of the Village Directory, which provides information on the type and number of services available in each village within the District.

This information is not only useful to companies and individuals looking to relocate in South Northamptonshire, but will also be used as part of the evidence base for the Rural Settlements and Development Management Policies Local Plan which we are preparing for the District. Once adopted this will set Planning Policy for the District including the rural areas.

### **The survey has been broken down into 7 Categories:-**

- 1. General**
- 2. Financial**
- 3. Leisure and Recreation**
- 4. Food**
- 5. Education**
- 6. Religious**
- 7. Mobile services**

We need your assistance to gather the information and would be grateful if you would complete this questionnaire and return it to the Economic Development Department by Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015. We would be grateful if you would complete the questionnaire on behalf of each village represented within your Parish.

### **Once completed please return the form to:-**

**South Northamptonshire Council  
C/O Julia Raven  
The Forum  
Moat Lane  
Towcester  
Northamptonshire  
NN12 6AD**

**Or you can email your response to:  
Email: [julia.raven@southnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:julia.raven@southnorthants.gov.uk)**

If you require any assistance or information regarding the questionnaire please contact **Julia Raven in the Economic Development Team (tel. 01327 322 087)**

**Thank you for your time and cooperation in completing this questionnaire.**

Parish Council .....

Village .....

**Please complete the following update of services and facilities for each village.**

**Section 1: - General Services** - Within the village do you have the following services (please provide as much information as you are able to. If there are more than one service please provide details in a blank box at the end of the questionnaire)

Service	Name	Contact Details	
Public House		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

Service	Name	Contact Details	
General Store/ Village Shop/ Supermarket (including where incorporated in a petrol station)		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Social Club or Working Men's Club		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Permanent Library		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Permanent Police Station		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

Bus Service to urban area	<b>Yes/No</b>	
	Hourly Service	
	Evening Service	
	Daily Service	
	Weekend Service	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Doctors Surgery / Health Centre		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	
	Prescription collection point	<b>Yes/No</b>	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Dentist		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Petrol Station		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Residential Home / Day Care Centre		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

**Section 2: - Financial Services -** Within the village do you have the following services

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Bank / Building Society		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	
		Mobile Service	<b>Yes / No</b>
		Cash Point / ATM	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Post office (including where incorporated with a village shop)		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	
			<b>Yes / No</b>
		Cash Point / ATM	

**Section 3: Leisure and Recreation** - Within the village do you have the following leisure and recreation services.

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Park/Pocket Park/Community Woodland/Local Wildlife site		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Sports Pitches/ Private or public		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Equipped Play Area/ public open space		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Village Hall / Community Centre / Youth Club/Other (please specify)		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

**Section 4: - Food** - Within the village do you have the following leisure and recreation services.

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Restaurant / Café / Take Away		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	



**5: - Education** - Within the village do you have the following education services.

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Nursery / Pre-School		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Primary School		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Secondary School		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Adult Education – courses / facilities		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
Other (please specify)		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

**Section 6: - Religious**

Within the village do you have the following religious services.

Service	Name	Contact Details	
Chapel		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

Service	Name	Contact Details	
Church		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

Service	Name	Contact Details	
Other Religious (please specify)		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

**Section 7: - Mobile Services** - Within the village do you have the following mobile services.

Mobile Service	Yes/No	
	Hot Food Take Away	
Fish/ Meat/ Fresh Food van		
Library		
Bank		
Doctors		

**Section 8: - Other Services: - Please provide details of any Other services available in the village.**

Service	Name	Contact Details	
		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

<b>Service</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Contact Details</b>	
		Address:	
		Telephone Number:	
		Website:	

Service /facility	Settlement category	Most Important	Secondary school	GP surgery	Primary school	Very Important	General store	Post office
			10	10 or 5	10		5	5
Score								
Parish								
Abthorpe (including Foscoate)			0	0	0		0	0
Adstone			0	0	0		0	0
Alderton			0	0	0		0	0
Ashton			0	0	10		0	0
Aston le Walls			0	0	10		0	0
Aynho			0	0	0		0	5
Blakesley (including Foxley)			0	0	10		5	5
Blisworth			0	10	10		5	5
Bradden			0	0	0		0	0
Brafield on the Green			0	0	0		5	5
Bugbrooke			10	10	10		5	5
Caldecote			0	0	0		0	0
Castle Ashby (including Chadstone)			0	0	0		0	0
Chacombe			0	0	10		0	0
Charlton and Newbottle			0	0	10		5	5
Chipping Warden			0	0	10		0	0
Cogenhoe (including Whiston)			0	0	10		5	5
Cold Higham (including Grimscote)			0	0	0		0	0
Cosgrove			0	0	10		0	0
Courteenhall			0	0	0		0	0
Croughton			0	0	10		5	0
Culworth			0	0	10		5	0
Deanshanger (including Puxley)			10	5	10		5	5
Denton			0	10	10		0	0
Edgcote			0	0	0		0	0
Evenley			0	0	0		5	5
Eydon			0	0	0		0	0
Farthinghoe (including Great Purston and Steane)			0	0	10		5	0
Gayton			0	0	10		0	0
Grafton Regis			0	0	0		0	0
Grange Park			0	10	10		5	0
Greatworth (including Halse and Stuchbury)			0	0	0		5	5
Greens Norton (including Duncote)			0	10	10		5	5
Hackleton (including Piddington, Horton and Preston Deanery)			0	0	10		5	5
Harpole			0	0	10		5	0
Hartwell			0	0	10		5	5
Helmdon (including Falcutt and Astwell)			0	0	10		0	0
Hinton in the Hedges			0	0	0		0	0
Kings Sutton (including Little Purston)			0	5	10		5	5
Kislingbury			0	0	10		5	5
Litchborough			0	0	0		5	0
Little Houghton			0	0	10		5	5

Maidford	0	0	0	0	0
Marston St Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0
Middleton Cheney	10	5	10	5	5
Milton Malsor	0	0	10	5	0
Moreton Pinkney	0	0	0	0	0
Nether Heyford	0	0	10	5	5
Old Stratford (including Passenham)	0	0	10	5	0
Overthorpe	0	0	0	0	0
Pattishall (including Astcote, Dalscote, Eastcote and Fosters Booth)	0	0	10	0	0
Paulerspury (including Heathencote and Pury End)	0	10	10	5	0
Potterspury (including Furtho)	0	0	10	5	5
Quinton	0	0	0	0	0
Radstone	0	0	0	0	0
Roade	10	10	10	5	5
Rothersthorpe	0	0	10	0	0
Shutlanger	0	0	0	0	0
Silverstone	0	10	10	5	5
Slapton	0	0	0	0	0
Stoke Bruerne	0	0	10	0	0
Sulgrave	0	0	0	5	0
Syresham (including Crowfield and Pimlico)	0	0	10	5	5
Thenford	0	0	0	0	0
Thorpe Mandeville	0	0	0	0	0
Tiffield	0	0	10	0	0
Upper and Lower Boddington	0	0	10	0	0
Upper Heyford	0	0	0	0	0
Wappenham	0	0	0	0	0
Warkworth	0	0	0	0	0
Weedon Lois (including Weston and Plumpton)	0	0	10	0	0
Whitfield	0	0	0	0	0
Whittlebury	0	0	10	0	0
Wicken	0	0	0	0	0
Wood Burcote	0	0	0	0	0
Woodend	0	0	0	0	0
Wootton Fields	0	0	0	0	0
Yardley Gobion	0	0	10	5	5
Yardley Hastings	0	0	10	5	5





5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
5	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	0
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	2	2	10	0
5	5	0	5	3	4	0	0	0	10	0
5	5	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	0
0	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	2	10	0
0	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	10	10
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	2	2	6	2
5	5	5	5	3	4	0	2	2	0	2
0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	2	2	2	6
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	10	0
0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0	6	6
5	0	5	5	3	4	0	0	2	0	2
5	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	2
5	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	2	6	0
0	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
5	0	5	5	3	0	0	2	0	10	0
0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	6	6
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	6	0
0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	5	3	0	0	2	0	10	0
5	0	5	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	2	2	6	2
5	5	0	5	3	0	0	2	2	6	2
5	5	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
5	5	5	5	3	0	0	2	2	6	2
5	5	0	5	3	0	0	2	2	6	2



Distance to 'Most' important service or facility (GP surgery only)

Distance to rail station

Totals

Distance to 'Most' important service or facility (GP surgery only)	Distance to rail station	Totals	
	2	0	17
	0	0	16
	2	0	10
	2	0	31
	0	0	27
	0	2	32
	0	0	49
	0	0	68
	0	0	12
	2	0	49
	0	0	77
	4	0	20
	4	0	14
	0	2	42
	0	2	55
	0	0	38
	2	0	57
	0	0	9
	2	2	47
	4	0	19
	0	0	43
	0	0	46
	0	0	76
	0	0	50
	0	0	10
	0	0	40
	2	0	24
	0	0	47
	2	0	37
	0	0	12
	0	0	61
	0	0	45
	0	0	69
	0	0	57
	0	0	52
	0	0	51
	0	0	37
	0	0	20
	0	8	74
	2	0	55
	0	0	35
	0	0	53

0	0	16
0	0	27
0	2	76
2	0	49
0	0	19
4	0	59
4	2	65
0	4	14
0	0	43
0	0	58
0	0	57
0	0	20
2	0	15
0	0	77
0	0	40
2	0	29
0	0	58
0	0	12
2	0	42
0	0	26
0	0	40
0	0	15
0	0	25
0	0	35
0	0	39
2	0	12
0	0	15
0	4	14
0	0	35
0	0	14
2	0	34
0	0	23
2	0	17
0	0	5
6	0	16
0	0	55
2	0	52

Bugbrooke	77
Roade	77
Deanshanger (including Puxley)	76
Middleton Cheney	76
Kings Sutton (including Little Purston)	74
Greens Norton (including Duncote)	69
Blisworth	68
Old Stratford (including Passenham)	65
Grange Park	61
Nether Heyford	59
Paulerspury (including Heathencote and Pury End)	58
Silverstone	58
Cogenhoe (including Whiston)	57
Hackleton (including Piddington, Horton and Preston Deanery)	57
Potterspury (including Furtho)	57
Charlton and Newbottle	55
Kislingbury	55
Yardley Gobion	55
Little Houghton	53
Yardley Hastings	52
Harpole	52
Hartwell	51
Denton	50
Blakesley (including Foxley)	49
Brafield on the Green	49
Milton Malsor	49
Cosgrove	47
Farthinghoe (including Great Purston and Steane)	47
Culworth	46
Greatworth (including Halse and Stuchbury)	45
Croughton	43
Pattishall (including Astcote, Dalscote, Eastcote and Fosters Booth)	43
Chacombe	42
Stoke Bruerne	42
Evenley	40
Syresham (including Crowfield and Pimlico)	40
Rothersthorpe	40
Upper and Lower Boddington	39
Chipping Warden	38
Gayton	37
Helmdon (including Falcutt and Astwell)	37
Litchborough	35
Tiffield	35
Weedon Lois (including Weston and Plumpton)	35
Whittlebury	34
Aynho	32
Ashton	31
Shutlanger	29
Aston le Walls	27
Marston St Lawrence	27

Sulgrave	26
Thorpe Mandeville	25
Eydon	24
Wicken	23
Caldecote	20
Hinton in the Hedges	20
Quinton	20
Courteenhall	19
Moreton Pinkney	19
Abthorpe (including Foscothe)	17
Wood Burcote	17
Adstone	16
Maidford	16
Wootton Fields	16
Radstone	15
Thenford	15
Wappenham	15
Castle Ashby (including Chadstone)	14
Overthorpe	14
Warkworth	14
Whitfield	14
Bradden	12
Grafton Regis	12
Slapton	12
Upper Heyford	12
Alderton	10
Edgcote	10
Cold Higham (including Grimscote)	9
Woodend	5