

# Settlement Hierarchy Assessment

Draft Local Plan 2040 – Regulation 18 Stage 2

February 2024

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1 A key part of the Local Plan is to identify an overarching spatial strategy, which will set out the overall direction of growth of development in Test Valley. A key part of implementing the spatial strategy, is a settlement hierarchy to ensure the distribution of development reflects the spatial strategy and the sustainability of settlements.
- 1.2 The purpose of this assessment is to provide evidence on the sustainability of the settlements in the Borough in order to inform the settlement hierarchy. This involves identifying and grouping together settlements (towns and villages) that perform a similar role and function within the Borough. It also identifies the access to services and facilities present within each settlement.
- 1.3 Settlements that are in a higher tier of the hierarchy are more sustainable, as residents are able to access a greater range of services and facilities more easily without the need to travel as far by car.
- 1.4 The appendix to this assessment contains a range of tables that show the data collected for the study, and the outcomes of the position in the hierarchy depending on their role and function, the range of facilities and accessibility by public transport.
- 1.5 The data used to inform this assessment, has been collected in Autumn-Winter 2021 and updated in 2023 in response to the Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 1 Consultation. This is of a snapshot in time. As preparation of the Local Plan continues, the level of facilities and services may change. We will update this assessment accordingly.
- 1.6 The first Settlement Hierarchy Assessment was published to inform the Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 1 consultation. This update has been prepared to show how the methodology has changed and how this has changed the Settlement Hierarchy in the Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 2 consultation.

## 2 Policy Context

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 2.1 A framework is given in the 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to developing strategies for delivering housing and other growth.
- 2.2 Choosing criteria to judge sustainable locations is not a precise science. The approach taken is based on advice in the NPPF, however the NPPF does not define sustainability in terms of settlements, or how this should be assessed in terms of a hierarchy of settlements. It outlines the key objectives that need to be taken into consideration by plan makers to ensure that our communities have a range of facilities and services so that they can support its residents. Table 1 outlines these in the context of creating and supporting sustainable communities, and the relevant text pertinent to this assessment have been highlighted in bold.

**Table 1: Key NPPF Paragraphs**

Key NPPF Paragraph Numbers
<p><b>Paragraph 8:</b> Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways [...] b) a social objective – to support <b>strong, vibrant and healthy communities</b>, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with <b>accessible services and open spaces</b> that reflect current and future needs and <b>support communities' health social and cultural well-being</b>.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 11.</b> Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making this means that: <b>a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects;</b></p>
<p><b>Paragraph 83.</b> To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will <b>enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities</b>. Planning policies should identify <b>opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.</b></p>
<p><b>Paragraph 88:</b> Planning policies and decisions should enable: [...], d) the <b>retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities</b>, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.</p>

<p><b>Paragraph 96:</b> Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which a) promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other [...]; c) enable and support healthy lifestyle, especially where this would address identified local health and wellbeing needs – for example <b>through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.</b></p>
<p><b>Paragraph 97:</b> To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should <b>a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments [...]</b> e) ensure an <b>integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services;</b></p>
<p><b>Paragraph 99:</b> It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 102:</b> Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 108.</b> Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that: a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed; b) <b>opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure</b>, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated; c) <b>opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;</b> d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph 109:</b> Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. [...] However, <b>opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solution will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan- making and decision-making.</b></p>
<p><b>Paragraph 110:</b> Planning policies should: a) support an <b>appropriate mix of uses across an area</b>, and within larger scale sites, <b>to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.</b></p>
<p><b>Paragraph 118:</b> Advanced, high quality and <b>reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being.</b> Planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections.</p>

2.3 Given the range of considerations to be taken into account in Local Plans, including to plan positively for the provision of community facilities such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship, and other local services to enhance

the sustainability of rural communities, the NPPF has been used as a starting point in formulating the methodology to assess our settlements. This includes identifying the key facilities that meet the daily needs of communities when assessing settlements sustainability.

- 2.4 National guidance for rural areas states that planning policies should be responsive to local circumstances, support housing developments that reflect local needs, identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Given this drive for sustainable rural communities it is appropriate to look at our rural communities in the Borough to see how this can be achieved.
- 2.5 The way that communities access facilities and services has changed over time, and this may have been amplified by the recent Coronavirus pandemic. This includes the rise in online shopping, a sense of community, and the importance now attached to the accessibility of local facilities including outdoor recreational space.

### **Adopted Local Plan 2016**

- 2.6 The Adopted Revised Local Plan 2016 contains the current settlement hierarchy, and is shown in Table 4. This was underpinned by evidence gathered at the time, which was scrutinised through that Local Plan Examination. This included a study of the facilities in the settlements including:
- Access to a food store
  - Access to other shops/services
  - Primary school.
  - Secondary school
  - Health facility.
  - Community facility.
  - Leisure facility.
  - Local job opportunities.
  - Public transport provision.
  - Public House
- 2.7 The settlements were then ranked depending on the overall number of facilities that they had. The assessment did not differentiate between whether a settlement had essential or key facilities that are central to its sustainability or those facilities that would be considered as desirable but not essential.

### 3 Methodology used for Regulation 18 Stage 1

- 3.1 A review of the methodology was carried out including up to date research on the facilities in each settlement and the public transport provision, in order to review the sustainability of the settlements. When formulating a hierarchy there were multiple aspects which could be used to determine how sustainable a settlement was and therefore where in the hierarchy it was placed. Therefore, choosing criteria to assess sustainable locations was not a precise science.
- 3.2 Local facilities and services within the Borough are important for communities and support the daily needs of residents, especially for those members of the population who may not have access to a car or where the availability of public transport is limited. The NPPF places weight on development being located at places that can or are sustainable which offer public transport choices.
- 3.3 The retention of such local facilities and shops has become more difficult as patterns of shopping have changed with the internet having a significant impact. A key issue for Test Valley is how to support the viability of key facilities in villages to maintain and potentially improve their sustainability. Enabling an appropriate level of growth at our more sustainable rural settlement can help to do this.
- 3.4 A community's ability to access services such as shopping, education, good transport links and community facilities is important for maintaining their quality of life. Long distance travel to access these services is undesirable as this inevitably involves increased car use and reduces a settlement's sustainability. Given this, a key part of the assessment is undertaking a technical exercise to assess the number of facilities within the settlement.
- 3.5 The assessment firstly undertook a numerical appraisal of the existing facilities and services within each settlement. The facilities and services were split to determine those settlements that have key facilities to meet daily needs. This reflected the rural nature of the area, to help distinguish the sustainability between our rural settlements. This was then supplemented by a judgement on the role and function of the settlements, which was informed by the full range of facilities and services on offer and the accessibility to these by public transport to and from neighbouring settlements.
- 3.6 Of the eleven facilities used in the original assessment, six are considered to be 'key facilities' along with a good provision of public transport. It is considered these provide the basic facilities to aid a settlements sustainability and are shown below. These key facilities are:
- Food Store, such as a village shop.
  - Outdoor sports facility, such as a playground or sports pitch
  - Village or Community Hall
  - Primary School
  - Public house or Social club
  - Place of Worship plus a
  - Good level of public transport.

- 3.7 For a town or village to be assessed as having have a high level of public transport, this included at least an hourly bus service or a journey to work service. This provides the ability to travel to a larger destination such as Andover, Romsey, Basingstoke, Newbury Winchester, Southampton and Salisbury where there are a range of employment opportunities.
- 3.8 The consideration of other facilities was widened in the assessment and included:
- Shop with post office
  - Post office only
  - Other Shop
  - Café/ restaurant
  - Takeaway
  - Early years
  - Secondary school
  - Further education
  - Other education facility
  - Doctors
  - Dentist
  - Chemist
  - Other medical facility
  - Allotment
  - Parks and open space
  - Indoor sport
  - Bank
  - Cashpoint
  - Superfast broadband<sup>1</sup>
- 3.9 Facilities such as broadband and electric car infrastructure are becoming more important and are evolving in terms of provision. As the roll out improves this will be kept under review as to whether these become part of our key facilities.
- 3.10 Consideration was also given to facilities and services within settlements located in an adjacent local authority area that Test Valley residents have access to and use. This includes Andover and the large neighbouring urban areas of Southampton, Eastleigh / Chandler's Ford in the south of the Borough.

### **Facilities Survey**

- 3.11 Settlements may have lost or gained facilities and services since they were assessed as part of the evidence informing the Adopted Local Plan and therefore need to be reviewed and updated. These included the closure of post offices and public houses, and bus and rail services that may have changed since that time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Superfast broadband is more than 24mbs within the town or village

- 3.12 The information was compiled from a parish rural facilities survey as the Parish Councils had up to date information on the facilities in their areas. The updated 2021 Parish Profiles<sup>2</sup> were used to fill in any gaps or where parishes had not responded. Council Officer's local knowledge, Parish profiles, along with internet searches for any gaps and for bus and train timetables. As for broadband, this data was a snapshot in time and available on a Post Code basis, which may not cover whole settlements<sup>3</sup>.
- 3.13 For those parishes that were unable to return the survey, the data for their villages was completed by Officers and sent to them to confirm whether the information was correct and updated where required<sup>4</sup>
- 3.14 All of the information gathered was a snapshot in time and if the data changes during the plan preparation, this will be updated. As the assessment has also assessed the role and function of settlements, this will help to aid the robustness of the assessment.

### **Grouping of Settlements**

- 3.15 There are settlements which benefit from and have access to services and facilities within a nearby settlement. This can have an impact on the sustainability of the settlements. An assessment was carried out as which settlements share facilities and then a judgement made about whether they should be considered as a collective due to their close proximity and sharing of facilities. On this basis, the following were grouped together and thus the facilities between the settlements were considered for both. Please see Table 6 in the Appendix for the assessment.

The grouped settlements are:

- Monxton and Amport
- Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford
- Over Wallop, Middle Wallop and Nether Wallop
- Palestine, Grateley Station and Grateley
- Ibthorpe and Hurstbourne Tarrant

---

<sup>2</sup> [Parish Profiles | Test Valley Borough Council](#)

<sup>3</sup> <https://labs2.thinkbroadband.com/local/uso-map#15/51.3129/-1.4726/hampshire/nonsuperfast/>

<sup>4</sup> Consultation with Parishes from Friday 17 September until Friday 1 October and for those that didn't respond, information was sent to the parish clerk on 27 October 2021 to be returned by Friday 5<sup>th</sup> November

## 4 Updated Methodology for Regulation 18 Stage 2

### Updated data

- 4.1 Since the consultation on the draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Stage 1 other factors need to be considered in the review of the settlement hierarchy including the Local Plan consultation comments and the publication of the draft Local Transport Plan 4. These matters and the impact they have had on the methodology are summarised in Table 2.
- 4.2 The data used to inform the assessment was collected in Autumn-Winter 2021, and was updated in 2023 as a result of the Local Plan Regulation 18 Part 1 Consultation. Table 7 shows the data collected for the study, and the outcomes of the position in the hierarchy on the settlements assessed depending on their role and function and the range of key facilities.

**Table 2: Key factors influencing the review of the Settlement Hierarchy**

Key Matter	Impact on Methodology
<p><b>Draft Local Transport Plan (consultation took place between April and June 2022)</b> Hampshire County Council published their draft LTP4 which sets out the County's proposed key policies and priorities for transport. While maintaining aspirations for a modal shift, LTP4 acknowledges that rural bus services face significant viability challenges and the level of future service provision is uncertain. For villages there is a focus on walking and cycling with bus services being generally poor. Proposed Policy RT1 supports working with public services to villages however recognises that the car is likely to remain the dominant form of transport. Emphasis on supporting community demand and led public transport.</p>	<p>The provision of public transport and sustainable modes of transport remains an important part of national policy and guidance however reflecting the challenges identified in Hampshire County Council's draft LTP4 regarding viability of public services and the subsequent reduction, there is future uncertainty over the provision of bus services.</p>
<p><b>Reduction in Bus Services</b> A report was published by Hampshire County Council Executive Lead Member for Transport and Environment Strategy regarding Passenger Transport (SP23) Savings Proposal on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2022. This identifies how savings will be made from the County Council's passenger transport budget. This includes 26%</p>	

Key Matter	Impact on Methodology
<p>decrease spend in local bus services serving the Andover area, 50% decrease for local bus services serving Romsey (services 36 and 39) and 19% decrease in spend on community transport services in Test Valley.</p>	
<p><b>Local Plan Public Consultation Responses on Regulation 18 Stage 1 Document (Feb 2022)</b>  The main issues raised through the consultation are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The distinction between Tier 3 and 4 villages is marginal (one facility), could become outdated quickly and is not sufficiently distinct to justify a difference in classification. Grouping these tiers could provide greater opportunity and flexibility for the role of neighbourhood plans in providing sustainable development.</li> <li>• The weight to be applied to public transport is an important consideration but too much weight is given as a determining factor in view of the general level of rural bus service provision and uncertainty in future provision. However some comments suggest more weighting should be applied where settlements don't have all key facilities.</li> <li>• Constraints are not considered as they hinder the capacity of a settlement to provide growth.</li> <li>• Places of worship and public houses should not be considered 'key facilities' to determine the place of a rural settlement in the hierarchy.</li> </ul>	<p>Consideration has also been given to whether the difference between tiers is marginal.</p>

4.3 Given the uncertainty in the future provision of public transport in rural areas, and the feedback from the public consultation about the key facilities, these factors have resulted in changes to the methodology. The key facilities are proposed to be changed to provide a clearer distinction between the role and sustainability of settlements and the uncertainty around the future of public transport provision in rural areas, has led to the removal of this from the assessment.

4.4 Therefore, the key facilities have been updated to 4 Key Facilities in the methodology assessment as shown in Table 5 and are as follows:

- **Primary School;**
- **Food Store** such as a village shop;
- **Outdoor sports facility**, such as a playground or sports pitch;
- **Community facility** including Village or Community Hall, Public house or Social club, Place of Worship.

4.5 In determining whether a settlement falls within Tier 3, the starting point has been settlements that have these key facilities as they comprise those key facilities which make a rural village sufficiently sustainable to support proportionate growth. Primary schools have been given more weight in the updated assessment, as villages with primary schools are usually served by the other key facilities as well as a range of other facilities. There may be some settlements where shared facilities exist and this will be considered accordingly. Also there may be some settlements where other factors may need to be considered to determine whether they are in Tier 3.

#### **Changes to Tier 3 and 4**

4.6 The main change to the Settlement Hierarchy (from Regulation 18 Stage 1 draft) is the merging of the proposed Tier 3 and Tier 4 rural villages into a single settlement tier. If settlements do not meet the criteria explained above, they will be considered in the open countryside.

## 5 Outcomes

- 5.1 The settlements have been assessed based on the updated 4 key facilities, the range of other facilities they contain and in terms of their role and function. Below are the outcomes of the second assessment showing the settlements and their position within each relevant tier in the hierarchy.

### Tier 1 Settlements

- 5.2 Andover and Romsey still stand out as being the most sustainable, each with a full range of services and a high level of accessibility by public transport. There are no other settlements within the Borough which offer such a complete range of facilities, with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.
- 5.3 Both score the highest in the Borough, and they are also the largest in terms of population with both above 10,000 people.

### Tier 2 Settlements

- 5.4 After Andover and Romsey, there are a number of sustainable settlements that sit below Tier 1, and due to their role and function and broad range of facilities they are more sustainable than the more rural settlements in the Borough. The accessibility to facilities and services in large neighbouring urban areas, such as Andover, Southampton, Eastleigh and Chandler's Ford have also been taken into account in formulating the hierarchy.
- 5.5 These settlements have:
- All the four key facilities,
  - have a broad range of the other facilities which demonstrates their wider role in the local area.

Given the role of these settlements, the NPPFs requirement to retain accessible local services and community facilities, these warrant being in a separate tier in the hierarchy.

- 5.6 **Charlton** has all key facilities and a good range of other facilities. Given this level of sustainability the village qualifies as a Tier 2 settlement. It also benefits from the extensive level of services and facilities in the neighbouring Andover
- 5.7 **Chilworth** does score lower than the other settlements in this tier. However, the role and function of Chilworth due to its proximity to the University of Southampton Science Park and neighbouring settlement of Eastleigh, Chandler's Ford and Southampton, justifies it being in Tier 2. It benefits from accessing the facilities and services at these neighbouring settlements.
- 5.8 **Valley Park, North Baddesley and Nursling and Rownhams** are positioned on the edge of Chandler's Ford and Southampton and thus benefit from the wider range of services in these adjacent settlements. These settlements score highly in terms of their access to facilities and

services. The facilities that they provide and their geographical relationship to settlements at the south eastern part of the Borough have warranted them being within the Tier 2 category.

- 5.9 **Stockbridge** is in the centre of the rural Borough and has access to all of the key facilities and a good range of other facilities and services that the surrounding rural communities rely on. This includes a wide variety of shops, secondary school, doctor's surgery and police and fire station. Given its broader role of servicing the more rural settlement, this enhances the role of Stockbridge as a Tier 2 settlement.

### **Tier 3 Settlements**

- 5.10 The remaining settlements varied considerably in terms of their overall sustainability. A number of settlements are centres for a wider rural community and contain a concentration of facilities that are relatively accessible.
- 5.11 The assessment shows that the settlements vary in the amount and type of facilities that they offer, and as identified in the methodology, there is a need to distinguish between those rural settlement that have some facilities opposed to those that have limited facilities. Using the four key facilities provides a starting point and reasonable basis to distinguish between the sustainability of the rural settlements in the current hierarchy. Those villages that have the four key facilities but not an extensive range of other facilities, such as those in Tier 2, fall into Tier 3.
- 5.13 Although Weyhill, Thruxton, Chilbolton and Enham Alamein do not have a primary school within the village, in terms of settlement scale, population, range of other facilities (including employment) they are considered Tier 3 villages. All three of the villages have good accessibility to local / shared primary school nearby in an adjacent town or village. There are a few other settlements where there are fewer key facilities however there is a primary school. Reflecting the methodology above, it has been considered whether these should be in Tier 3.

### **Tier 4 Settlements**

- 5.14 The other rural settlements within the Borough, which have not been identified in the settlement hierarchy, are considered the least sustainable. It is evident that these should not be in Tier 3, due to the lack of any or most of the key facilities, and limited other facilities and services. These very rural settlements are not included in the settlement hierarchy and are considered as part of the countryside in the Local Plan.

## 6 Settlement Hierarchy

- 6.1 The settlement hierarchy will be a key delivery mechanism for the spatial strategy. Based on the methodology and updated data from the rural facilities survey, and an assessment about the role and function of our towns and villages, this has led to the Settlement Hierarchy as set out below in Table 3.
- 6.2 Given the distinction between those villages that have all four key facilities and a range of other facilities, and those that do not, following Government guidance about promoting sustainable patterns of development, especially in rural communities, and a judgment about the role and function of our towns and villages, this has led to the draft settlement hierarchy.
- 6.3 This data represents a snapshot in time. As preparation of the Local Plan continues towards Regulation 19, the level of facilities and services may change. We will update this assessment accordingly.

**Table 3: Settlement Hierarchy**

Hierarchy Designation	Settlements	Justification
<b>Tier 1</b>	Andover and Romsey	Andover and Romsey are the largest in terms of population with both above 10,000 residents and have a full range of services and a high level of accessibility by public transport. There are no other settlements within the Borough which offer such a complete range of facilities, with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.
<b>Tier 2</b>	Charlton, Chilworth, North Baddesley, Nursling and Rownhams, Stockbridge, Valley Park,	Due to their role and function, these settlements have a broad range of facilities and are more sustainable than the more rural settlements in the Borough. Chilworth is home to the University of Southampton Science Park which is an important asset to the economy of the area. Most are accessible to facilities and services in large neighbouring urban areas, such as Andover, Southampton, Eastleigh and Chandler's Ford. They have all the key facilities, good public transport links, and have a broad range of the other facilities which demonstrates their wider role in the local area.

Hierarchy Designation	Settlements	Justification
<b>Tier 3</b>	<p>Abbotts Ann, Ampfield, Appleshaw, Awbridge, Barton Stacey, Braishfield, Broughton, Chilbolton, Enham Alamein, Goodworth Clatford, Upper Clatford and Anna Valley, Grateley, Palestine and Grateley Station, Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorpe, King's Somborne, Lockerley, Longparish, Monxton and Amport, Nether Wallop, Middle Wallop and Over Wallop, Shipton Bellinger, Thruxton, Vernham Dean, Wellow, West Tytherley, Weyhill, Wherwell</p>	<p>A number of settlements are of a size and population with a range of facilities that make them centres for the wider rural community. These settlements are served by a key range of facilities including primary schools which make them more sustainable villages capable of supporting small scale growth. Settlements with primary schools are usually served by other key facilities such as local shop, village hall, recreation ground, public house and church.</p> <p>(Weyhill, Thruxton, Chilbolton and Enham Alamein do not have a primary school but in terms of settlement scale, population, range of other facilities (including employment) they are considered Tier 3 villages. Also all three settlements have good accessibility to local primary schools nearby in an adjacent town or village.</p>
<b>Tier 4</b>	All other settlements	<p>These settlements are generally of a smaller scale, lower population and have limited 'Key facilities' without a primary school (in the settlement or nearby) and/or shop are therefore considered countryside settlements.</p>

# Appendix Tables

**Table 4 Settlement Hierarchy as set out the Adopted Local Plan 2016**

Hierarchy Designation	Settlement
Major Centres	Andover
	Romsey
Key Service Centres	Charlton
	Chilworth
	North Baddesley
	Nursling & Rownhams
	Stockbridge
	Valley Park
Rural Villages	Abbotts Ann, Ampfield, Amport, Appleshaw, Awbridge, Barton Stacey, Braishfield, Broughton, Chilbolton, Enham Alamein, Fyfield, Goodworth Clatford, Grateley, Hatherden, Houghton, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Ibthorpe, Kimpton, King's Somborne, Leckford, Lockerley, Longparish, Longstock, Michelmersh & Timsbury, Monxton, Nether Wallop, Over Wallop, Palestine, Penton Grafton/Mewsey, Shipton Bellinger, Thruxton, Upper Clatford/Anna Valley, Vernham Dean, West Tytherley, West Wellow, Weyhill, Wherwell
Countryside	All other villages

**Table 5 Stage 2 Methodology - List of Facilities**

List of facilities including the 4 key facilities (in bold) used to assess the sustainability of settlements. The key facilities are considered to meet the daily needs of our communities. See Table 11 for the summary assessment for each settlement.

Criteria	Description
<b>Key Facilities</b>	
<b>Convenience store</b>	<b>Access to a food store within the town or village - includes supermarkets, village stores, farm shops or petrol stations with a shop selling fresh food</b>
<b>Primary school</b>	<b>Primary school within the town or village</b>
<b>Outdoor sports facility</b>	<b>A sports/ recreation ground and / or a children's play area within the town or village</b>
<b>Community facilities</b>	<b>Including Village or Community Hall, Public house or Social club, Place of Worship.</b>
<b>Other Facilities</b>	
Food	
Café/ restaurant or takeaway	A café/ restaurant or takeaway within the town or village
Post office	Either in a shop or a standalone Post Office or a mobile service – these have been assessed individually.
Other Shop	Shops within the town or village providing for other daily needs. Examples include newsagents, greengrocer and butcher.
Education	
Early Years provision	A play group / nursery / early years / pre-school within the town or village
Secondary school	Secondary school within the town or village
Further education	Further education within the town or village
Other education facility, including private schools	Other education facility, including private schools within the town or village
Health	
Health facility	A General Medical Practice. Pharmacy / chemist, Dentist or other medical facility within the town or village – these have been assessed individually.
Recreation	
Allotment	An allotment within or adjacent to the town or village
Parks or other public open space	Parks or other public open space within or adjacent to the town or village
Indoor Sports Facility	Leisure or sports centre within the town or village
Other	
Bank	A bank within the town or village

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Description</b>
Transport	A good level of public transport including bus or rail to access services, facilities and employment not found within the town or village. This includes at least one service per day to and from a Town
Cashpoint/ ATM	A cashpoint / ATM within the town or village
Superfast broadband	Superfast broadband of more than 24mbs within the town or village

**Table 6: Shared facilities in the Villages**

Table showing the assessment of the shared facilities in the villages. 'Yes' denotes that the facility is shared. If both settlements have their own facility for example both villages have a pub then this is scored 'No' as they are not shared.

Villages	Shared Facilities					Comments
	Shop	PH	Primary school	Sports facility	Hall	
Monxton and Amport	None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Both villages' boundaries are contiguous with the settlements in close proximity and facilities are shared between both. There is no shop in either village.
Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Shop and school are used by both villages but are located in Goodworth Clatford. Although separated by countryside, the linear nature of the villages flow from one into the other.
Over Wallop Middle Wallop and Nether Wallop	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	The school in Nether Wallop is for both villages and one of the halls is on the boundary of both. The village boundaries are contiguous with each other.
Palestine, Grateley Station and Grateley	None	No	Yes	None	Yes	Also share the train station with the settlements in close proximity. There is no shop in either village.
Ibthorpe and Hurstbourne Tarrant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All the facilities are in Hurstbourne Tarrant with both settlements in close proximity.

**Table 7: Updated Settlement Assessment**

Summary of level of facilities and services in settlements

Village	Key Facility: Primary school	Key Facility: Shop	Key Facility: Sports facility	Key Facility: Community facility (including a pub, hall or church)	Total Key Facilities	Other facilities Total	Draft Settlement Hierarchy Tier
Andover	1	1	1	1	4	17	1
Romsey	1	1	1	1	4	16	1
Charlton	1	1	1	1	4	5	2
Chilworth	0	0	1	1	2	2	2
North Baddesley	1	1	1	1	4	11	2
Nursling and Rownhams	1	1	1	1	4	7	2
Stockbridge	1	1	1	1	4	12	2
Valley Park	1	1	1	1	4	8	2
Abbotts Ann	1	1	1	1	4	4	3
Ampfield	1	0	1	1	3	3	3
Appleshaw	1	0	1	1	3	2	3
Awbridge	1	0	1	1	3	2	3
Barton Stacey	1	1	1	1	4	4	3
Braishfield	1	1	1	1	4	3	3
Broughton	1	1	1	1	4	7	3
Chilbolton	0	1	1	1	3	4	3
Enham Alamein	0	1	1	1	3	6	3
Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford, Anna Valley, Red Rice	1	1	1	1	4	5	3
Grateley Station, Palestine and Grateley	1	0	0	1	2	2	3
Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorpe	1	1	1	1	4	6	3
King's Somborne	1	1	1	1	4	5	3
Lockerley	1	1	1	1	4	5	3
Longparish	1	1	1	1	4	4	3
Monxton and Amport	1	0	1	1	3	2	3
Nether Wallop and Middle Wallop	1	1	1	1	4	6	3
Over Wallop and Middle Wallop	1	1	1	1	4	7	3
Shipton Bellinger	1	1	1	1	4	5	3
Thrupton	1	0	1	1	3	4	3
Vernham Dean	1	0	1	1	3	3	3
Wellow	1	1	1	1	4	7	3
West Tytherley	1	1	1	1	4	1	3
Weyhill	0	1	0	1	2	6	3
Wherwell	1	0	1	1	3	4	3
Ashley	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Bossington	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Bullington	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
East Dean	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
East Tytherley	0	0	0	0	0	2	4
Facombe	0	0	1	1	2	0	4

Village	Key Facility: Primary school	Key Facility: Shop	Key Facility: Sports facility	Key Facility: Community facility (including a pub, hall or church)	Total Key Facilities	Other facilities Total	Draft Settlement Hierarchy Tier
Fyfield	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
Houghton	0	0	1	1	2	2	4
Kimpton	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
Leckford	0	0	1	1	2	2	4
Linkenholt	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
Little Somborne	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
Longstock	0	0	1	1	2	2	4
Michemersh & Timsbury	0	0	1	1	2	4	4
Mottisfont and Dunbridge	0	0	1	1	2	3	4
Penton Grafton / Mewsey	0	0	1	1	2	2	4
Plaitford	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
Quarley	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
Sherfield English	0	1	1	1	3	4	4
Smanell	1	0	0	1	2	1	4
Tangley, Hatherden, Wildhern and Charlton Down	1	0	1	1	3	3	4
Up Somborne	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Upton	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
West Dean	0	0	0	1	1	1	4

