

**Background Paper**

**Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy report**

**August 2023**



**Background Paper: Spatial Strategy for new development  
August 2023**

**Contents**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
National Policy Context.....	3
Local Policy Context .....	6
Other Policy Considerations.....	7
<b>3. CONTEXT AND MONITORING .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Local Policy Context .....	9
Other Policy Considerations.....	9
Monitoring past performance .....	10
<b>4. Consultation Responses.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Issues and Options Consultation .....	11
<b>5. Review of the Methodology.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Reviewing the approach of other rural councils.....	14
Assessment of Settlement Sustainability.....	15
<b>6. THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY .....</b>	<b>17</b>
The Settlement Hierarchy .....	17
A new approach.....	17
<b>7. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>19</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This background paper has been prepared to support the emerging Local Plan, which covers the period from 2021-2041, and specifically the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. The spatial strategy indicates in broad terms which settlements are best placed to deliver sustainable development and accommodate Rutland's housing and employment land requirements, thereby underpinning the approach to the scale and location of development in the Local Plan.
- 1.2. The preparation of the new local Plan allows for a reconsideration of the adopted settlement hierarchy included in the adopted Core Strategy and the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. This Evidence Report provides background information and justification for Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy for new development, which seeks to concentrate growth on the main urban areas of Oakham (with Barleythorpe); Uppingham and Stamford (which is out-with Rutland County Councils administrative area but adjoins the county boundary and is considered to be a sustainable location for development). The policy also identifies 21 Larger Villages with Planned Limits to Development (PLDs) where some small-scale allocations will be made and where windfall sites within the PLDs will be acceptable in principle.
- 1.3. The settlement hierarchy does not in itself determine the appropriate level of growth a particular settlement can support but does seek to identify the most sustainable places where growth could be directed.

## 2. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

### National Policy Context

3.1. Since the Core Strategy and Site Allocation and Policies DPDs were adopted the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been introduced and updated. (July 2018, February 2019 and July 2021).

3.2. Paragraph 11, of the NPPF states:

*Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.*

*For plan-making this means that:*

- a) plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change;*
- b) strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless:
  - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area; or*
  - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.**

3.3. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states:

*The development plan must include strategic policies to address each local planning authority's priorities for the development and use of land in its area [Footnote: Section 19(1B-1E) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004]. These strategic policies can be produced in different ways, depending on the issues and opportunities facing each area.*

3.4. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF states:

*Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision [Footnote: In line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development] for:*

- a) *housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;*
- b) *infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);*
- c) *community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and*
- d) *conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.*

3.5. These paragraphs set out a requirement for the Council’s development plan to establish the strategic approach to the delivery of the development and growth required for the area. Rutland County Council is preparing a new Local Plan for the county which will cover the period 2021-2041. It is important that this plan sets out the scale of development required and the spatial strategy for the location of development for the plan period.

3.6. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was first introduced in 2014. The PPG provides guidance to help the implementation of policy in the NPPF and provides ‘live’ government guidance.

3.7. Planning Practice Guidance states:

*The development plan is at the heart of the planning system with a requirement set in law that planning decisions must be taken in line with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Plans set out a vision and a framework for the future development of the area, addressing needs and opportunities in relation to housing, the economy, community facilities and infrastructure – as well as a basis for conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment, mitigating and adapting to climate change, and achieving well designed places. It is essential that plans are in place and kept up to date.*

*Section 19(1B) - (1E) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that each local planning authority must identify their strategic priorities and have policies to address these in their development plan documents (taken as a whole).*

*The development plan for an area is made up of the combination of strategic policies (which address the priorities for an area) and non-strategic policies (which deal with more detailed matters).*

3.8. The most relevant aspects of the NPPF (2023) in relation to settlement strategy and hierarchy matters are summarised below:

- *Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area. (paragraph 9)*
- *To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It goes on to state that planning policies should identify 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 (paragraph 79).*
- *New housing development should be avoided in isolated locations except in particular circumstances (paragraph 80).*
- *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. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making. (paragraph 105)*
- *Planning policies should ensure 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 (paragraph 84).*
- *Planning policies should ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services (paragraph 93).*

3.9. The PPG provides practice guidance in support of the NPPF and reiterates many of the objectives set out in national policy.

3.10. In respect of rural housing , the PPG recognises the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. It goes on to state that a wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas and the use of blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlement need to be supported by robust evidence.

3.11. Aligned to this guidance, the new Local Plan will need to set out the spatial strategy for delivering sustainable growth for Rutland, including identifying those settlements where development will be focussed and those where it will be controlled.

**Local Policy Context**

2.12. The existing settlement hierarchy is set out in Policy CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011) and Policy CS4 sets out the scale of development and how it is expected to be delivered within the hierarchy. The settlement hierarchy includes six tiers as below:

**Policy CS3 - The Settlement Hierarchy**

The Settlement Hierarchy for Rutland is:

**Main Town** – Oakham. This is the main town with a range of job opportunities, higher order services including retail, leisure and health facilities for the surrounding rural area and has good public transport links.

**Small Town** – Uppingham. This is the second largest town with a range of job opportunities, convenience shopping, education, community and health facilities but with more limited public transport links.

**Local Service Centres** – Cottesmore, Edith Weston, Empingham, Greetham, Ketton, Market Overton, Ryhall. These comprise of seven of the largest villages with a range of facilities and access to public transport .

**Smaller Service Centres** – Barrowden, Belton-in-Rutland, Caldecott, Essendine, Exton, Glaston, Great Casterton, Langham, Lyddington, Manton, Morcott, North Luffenham, South Luffenham, Tinwell, Whissendine, Wing. These comprise of sixteen of the smaller villages with a more limited range of facilities than the Local Service Centres.

**Restraint Villages** – Ashwell, Ayston, Barleythorpe, Barrow, Belmesthorpe, Bisbrooke, Braunston-in-Rutland, Brooke, Burley, Clipsham, Egleton, Hambleton, Little Casterton, Lyndon, Pickworth, Pilton, Preston, Ridlington, Seaton, Stoke Dry, Stretton, Teigh, Thistleton, Thorpe by Water, Tickencote, Tixover, Toll Bar, Wardley, Whitwell. These comprise of the smallest villages with few services and facilities.

**Countryside** – Open countryside and villages not identified in settlement categories.

2.13. These policies were developed in line with national planning policy in place at the time that plan was prepared and pre-date the introduction of the NPPF in 2012. Although the approach predated the first publication of the NPPF, the approach of focusing development in locations with the most opportunities to access facilities and to use non-car modes of travel was considered to generally accord with the objectives of the NPPF

and remained an appropriate approach for identifying suitable locations for development and helping promote sustainable development in Rutland.

2.14. The Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014) was prepared in the context of the NPPF (2012) and provided (through policy SP5) policy guidance on what was considered sustainable development in the towns and villages. This introduced and defined Planned Limits of Development (PLDs) which define the limit to the built-up area of the towns and villages, and within which development would be supported in principle.

2.15. The preparation of the new Local Plan provides an opportunity to review the approach to spatial strategy, settlement hierarchy and how development can be delivered sustainably in Rutland.

2.16. The remainder of this background paper sets out details of the review and the methodology proposed for determining the spatial strategy in the new Local Plan.

### **Other Policy Considerations**

2.17. Whilst the allocations that will be made in the Rutland Local Plan to deliver the required amount of housing and other development for the County will be made in accordance with the new spatial strategy, Neighbourhood Plans can choose to allocate more development in their settlement(s) if the community decide this is appropriate. However, paragraph 29 of the NPPF sets out that Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine strategic policies.



### 3. CONTEXT AND MONITORING

- 3.1. At 382 km<sup>2</sup> Rutland County Council is the smallest unitary authority in England with a population size (at 2021) of just over 41,381<sup>1</sup> it has a low population density of 108 people per km<sup>2</sup>. About 40% of the County's population live in the towns of Oakham (population 11,227.<sup>2</sup>) and Uppingham (population 5001<sup>3</sup>, the remaining 60% live in villages, hamlets and the countryside.
- 3.2. The County has a wide range of settlement sizes ranging from Oakham which has a good range of education, community, health and leisure facilities and is a centre for employment and shopping and Uppingham which has more limited range of facilities, employment and shopping, a weekly market, through to the 52 villages which range in size from small hamlets with a few houses and no facilities to larger villages with facilities such as a school, a convenience store, a post office, general medical practice, employment opportunities, community and leisure facilities and bus links to the towns and neighbouring villages. The six largest villages account for around a quarter of Rutland's population.
- 3.3. Establishing a settlement strategy and hierarchy which consistently categorises the variance in size, make up and facilities of the villages has in the past proved complex and, in many cases, divisive across different communities, As demonstrated by the consultation responses summarised in the next section of this report.
- 3.4. One of the key objectives of the new Local Plan is to deliver sustainable development and facilitate the delivery of a net-zero county by 2050. Section 182 of the Planning Act (2008) places a legal duty on local planning authorities to ensure that their development plan documents include policies to secure the contribution of development and the use of land in the mitigation of climate change.
- 3.5. A key element of this must be to lower and limit overall carbon emissions. A key contributor to carbon emissions is transport, and in a sparsely populated rural county such as Rutland transport is dominated by the use of private cars which have higher associated carbon emissions - at least until the majority of cars on the road are ultra-low emissions, which is not likely to happen within the plan period. This supports the need to continue to focus development in the larger, better served locations.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Office for National Statistics](#) (2023) *Mid-2021 Estimates of the population for the UK, England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland*, Accessed: April 2023

<sup>2</sup> [Office for National Statistics](#) (2023) *Population Estimates for 2020 Wards in England and Wales by Single Year of Age and Sex - Experimental Statistics*, Accessed: April 2023

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

- 3.6. The Spatial Strategy for the new local plan must therefore balance the need to ensure sustainable patterns of development and the requirements for net zero with the need to sustain communities and keep them vibrant into the future. This can be supported by ensuring there is a mix and balance of homes, population and opportunities to live our day-to-day life without depending upon the car.

### **Local Policy Context**

- 3.7. The existing settlement hierarchy is set out in Policy CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011) and was developed in line with national planning policy in place at the time.
- 3.8. Although this predated the first publication of the NPPF in 2012, the approach of focusing development in locations with the most opportunities to access facilities and to use non-car modes of travel was considered to generally accord with the objectives of the NPPF and remained an appropriate approach for identifying suitable locations for development and helping promote sustainable development in Rutland.
- 3.9. The current settlement hierarchy is based upon the availability of community services and facilities within settlements at a fixed point in time (2009). Whilst the hierarchy was set in stone through the Core Strategy the availability of the community facilities on which it was based has changed over the years as shops, pubs and schools have opened and closed. Several reviews of community facilities have been undertaken over the period between 2009 and this paper, however the hierarchy set out in CS3 has remained unchanged.
- 3.10. To support the preparation of the emerging Local Plan the methodology, including sustainability criteria used, and the settlement hierarchy categories have been reviewed.

### **Other Policy Considerations**

- 5.12. Whilst the allocations that will be made in the Rutland Local Plan to deliver the required amount of housing and other development for the County will be made in accordance with the spatial strategy, Neighbourhood Plans can choose to allocate more development if the community decide this is appropriate. However, paragraph 29 of the NPPF sets out that Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine strategic policies. The Local Plan provides more detail on the housing requirement and Neighbourhood Plans.

## **Monitoring past performance**

- 5.13. The Scoping the Issues Report (January 2021) used data from the Councils' Authority Monitoring Reports to demonstrate that approximately 60% of all dwellings completed over the Core Strategy plan period were completed in Oakham and Uppingham, which is below Core Strategy Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy target of 70%. About 13% of all completions occurred in Local Service Centres against an intended target of 20%, with nearly 27% of all dwellings being completed in all other villages, classified a small service centres and restraint villages. This is against an expected provision of 10% for these settlements as set out in the Core Strategy.
- 5.14. The report concluded that it is necessary to review the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy for Rutland to ensure suitable locations for development are identified and to review the pattern and distribution of new development.

## 4. Consultation Responses

### Issues and Options Consultation

- 6.1. Issues and Options consultation took place in the summer and autumn of 2022. The consultation did not specifically ask about the settlement hierarchy or the methodology used to determine it. It did however ask about the spatial strategy for distributing housing growth. The majority of respondents (41%) on this issue opted for the option to continue with the Core Strategy apportionment of growth between the towns and the villages, although a number of these responses were made with caveats and provisos.
- 6.2. In Issue 6 of the Issues and Options consultation we also asked whether the PLDs should be reviewed. 65% of those responding to this question agreed that they should be reviewed. Respondents also told us that reviewing the PLDs should provide some flexibility to allow for some organic growth and to include new allocations.
- 6.3. As a result, the Council commissioned a review of the methodology and criteria for establishing and reviewing PLDs and a full review of PLDs for the two towns and the 21 Larger Villages.
- 6.4. Following on from the Issues and Options consultation we undertook some additional engagement with Town and Parish Councils on the details and criteria used in the settlement hierarchy methodology. Councils were asked to respond to a set of questions designed to help us understand what they think are key facilities, what makes a community sustainable and how we might assess the relative sustainability of settlements in the county.
- 6.5. Of the 55 Parishes/Town Councils and Parish Meetings 15 responses were received from parishes which include a range of villages spanning the existing settlement hierarchy tiers. Within the responses there was a diverse mix of opinions about what is considered the most essential factors to ensure sustainable development and what should be included within the list of facilities or about how they should be assessed, scored or ranked.
- 6.6. As a result, there was no clear consensus about how the methodology should be structured or applied.
- 6.7. A modest level of agreement indicated that an 'important' or 'key' facility might include:
- School,
  - Community Hall/Village Hall/Church and

- Healthcare
- General Store with a post Office.
- importance of broadband
- Sports ground/play areas

6.8. Careful consideration has been given to the consultation responses and the feedback from Town and Parish Councils to determine whether any changes were needed to the existing settlement hierarchy or the methodology previously used. It is clear that there is little consensus about the current approach and that one's view tends to be focussed on one's own location. The most recent parish survey of facilities undertaken in 2019 demonstrated that some degree of change in the presence of facilities had been experienced over the plan period and that the Local plan making process was unable to respond to these changes in an effective way. Therefore, consideration needed to be given to an alternative approach which might not be so affected by changes outside the control of the Local Plan.

6.9.

## 5. Review of the Methodology

- 5.1. In reviewing the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy methodology a number of potential issues were identified relating to the criteria used to classify settlements, particularly over a period of time and the need to ensure that changes to the national policy context since the adoption of the Core Strategy were addressed, so that the approach taken in the new plan is consistent with national policy.
- 5.2. Specifically, the following drawbacks have been identified:
- changes to the provision of services and facilities within a settlement can fluctuate significantly over a short period of time.
  - Because the villages in Rutland are generally small (other than 3-4 villages) most have few facilities to consider.
  - The use of a weighted scoring system which places a different value on different facilities adds a layer of complexity which can significantly alter the position of a settlement within the hierarchy when a single facility is lost or created.
  - The lack of a quick and easy review mechanism for the Local Plan means that the hierarchy has been fixed at a point in time and may no longer reflect the situation on the ground.
  - The actual difference in policy terms of what can be permitted by policy CS4 in the lower tiers was actually very limited, particularly the case for Local Service Centres and Smaller Service Centres
  - The category of “restraint village” no longer met the requirements of national policy in terms of blanket restrictions of new development
  - Indications from some communities that they would like to have some flexibility to support small scale local development to provide an injection of new people into the village and meet housing need, such as to facilitate downsizing, within the village
- 5.3. The approach to the settlement hierarchy cannot be viewed in isolation as it is linked closely with the spatial strategy and the draft policies and sites to be included in the plan. The implementation of the spatial strategy will be dependent upon policies on new homes, employment opportunities and the site allocations.
- 5.4. In reviewing the Settlement Hierarchy consideration must be given to the effectiveness of the policy structure which applies the hierarchy. As such it is clear from the monitoring that whilst policy CS4 has been effective in restricting development in the restraint villages it has not been successful in focussing development on the Local Service Centres, or in limiting the scope of development in the Smaller Service Centres.

- 5.5. The approach to defining PLDs is widely supported and seen as a good mechanism for determining where development is likely to be acceptable, however it is recognised that the boundaries to PLDs have not been reviewed since the early 2000's and are in some cases out of date. As a result, a full review of PLDs would be required for the new Local Plan.
- 5.6. Some of the county's smaller villages (previously identified as restraint villages) have indicated the need to have a more flexible approach to allowing very small-scale development to sustain them and to provide opportunities to meet changing housing needs within their community.

### **Reviewing the approach of other rural councils**

- 5.7. There are a range of different approaches used across the midlands to develop settlement hierarchy, for example
- Central Lincolnshire use a dwelling number threshold
  - SKDC base their approach on an audit of village services and facilities using the availability of a primary facility (pub, village hall, shop and primary school) as key to determining which tier a settlement sites within.
  - Melton Borough apply an assessment in which service and facilities are divided into essential and other categories
  - Harborough prepare settlement profiles which bring together existing information and evidence relating to each settlement in order to understand how it functions, its key characteristics and its level of services and facilities, to classify each settlement into a hierarchy according to its relative sustainability.
- 5.8. Policy approach to considering development within the settlement hierarchy also varies with the following examples of how development can be directed and controlled:
- SKDC do not have any defined village boundaries or envelopes, instead they rely on policy criteria and professional judgement in the determination of applications.
  - Bolsover apply village envelopes to all settlements in their hierarchy
  - the Cotswolds have identified development boundaries only for those settlements identified within their development strategy as places for growth – smaller settlements and the countryside have a criteria-based policy to allow professional judgement of the impact and/or support a proposal may have on the village.

## Assessment of Settlement Sustainability

- 5.9. It must be remembered that the settlement hierarchy does not in itself determine the appropriate level of growth a particular settlement can support, it is designed to identify the most sustainable places where growth could be directed.
- 5.10. The previous assessment focussed on three main criteria:
- The level of services and facilities available in each settlement, including local employment;
  - The accessibility of each settlement to services and facilities in nearby higher order settlements; and
  - Public transport availability and frequency.
- 5.11. It is apparent that all three criteria are subject to changes which are beyond the control of the Local Plan, and where a change arises it may significantly impact on the role of the settlement and how it might be scored using the previous methodology. This is particular the case for the availability of services and facilities within settlements. Whilst the local plan can influence the change of use or re-use of premises, subject to viability of a business, it cannot prevent the closure of a shop, public house or businesses. Similarly, whilst the Council oversees the provision of public transport it cannot require the provision of bus services, particularly where routes are shown to be unviable.
- 5.12. In order to develop the settlement hierarchy and assess the sustainability of settlements Parish Councils and Meetings have been requested periodically to complete a village facilities and services survey form. Parish Councils and Meetings were asked in July 2019 to review and update the information held on the availability of services and facilities and the level of public transport provision. Responses were received from 16 Parish Councils and Meetings. Where necessary the survey information was supplemented by a desk-based resources. These updates have demonstrated the changes to facilities over the plan period.
- 5.13. It is recognised that some villages and hamlets are very small and have no or very few services and facilities. Consequently, it is not appropriate to categorise these settlements as being sustainable locations for growth.
- 5.14. Taking into consideration the above and having reviewed consultation responses and policy approach taken in other rural areas of the country it is recommended that the settlement hierarchy is simplified to include fewer tiers and that a different policy approach should be used for each tier.



- 5.15. Further, that the mixed policy approach such as that used in the Cotswolds is most appropriate to Rutland.
- 5.16. Retaining Planned Limits of Development for the two higher order tiers of towns and Larger Villages which will be the focus for development and growth and a criteria-based policy approach to development in small villages and hamlets where development should be limited to small scale infill and redevelopment. These locations will not have PLDs to allow for the flexibility to consider development proposals on their own merits, subject to defined policy criteria and a limit on scale and number of units being proposed.

## **6. THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY**

### **The Settlement Hierarchy**

- 6.1. A Settlement Hierarchy is used to guide the location of development. The existing hierarchy identifies the most sustainable locations based on their provision of facilities and accessibility to services at a fixed point in time.
- 6.2. It is not the role of this background paper to set a description of the capacity of each settlement, or to advise on the likely quantum of growth which each settlement should accommodate as there may be other factors that will influence the scale of development considered suitable and appropriate for individual settlements. For example, the availability of suitable sites within each of the settlements and taking account of the various technical studies that underpin the Local Plan such as sustainability appraisal, landscape sensitivity, assessment of transport capacity, flood risk and other key constraints or opportunities. This will ensure the scale of any new development identified in the Local Plan is suitable for the settlement and supported by the necessary physical infrastructure.
- 6.3. This paper will however help determine sustainable locations for future development and ensure the scale of any new development proposed in the Local Plan will be appropriate to the role and function of the settlement, can be adequately supported by physical infrastructure, and will contribute to wider aims for carbon reduction.
- 6.4. The amount of new development directed to each settlement will be a separate discussion for a later stage in the plan making process once the evidence base is complete and the site assessment work has been undertaken.
- 6.5. It will not follow, therefore, that every settlement within each category of the hierarchy will accommodate an allocated site as opportunities for development will vary and a number of the smallest settlements in Rutland with no services and facilities will not be considered appropriate locations for taking further development.

### **A new approach**

- 6.6. The new local plan provides the opportunity to explore a new approach to determining the spatial strategy for new development. As set out above the approach to determining a settlement hierarchy has historically proved complex and difficult to implement and contentious in local communities.

- 6.7. What is important is that the Local Plan delivers a sustainable approach to the location of growth and that change and development in communities is appropriate to the scale and location of a settlement. To this end it is proposed that settlements will be included within the spatial strategy based upon their size – both in terms of population size and number of houses, and therefore whether they have the critical mass to support community facilities such as a village hall, shop or public house, regardless of whether there is already one within the settlement. This will prevent the approach becoming out of date as soon as a shop opens or closes and ensure that the plan does not become out of date.
- 6.8. Analysis of the results of the last parish survey of facilities (undertaken in 2019) indicates that the 6 largest villages in the county with a population of more than 1000, each have a school, community meeting place, open space and a public house, access to post office services and/or a general store. However, villages with a population of 300 or more and at least 140 houses also appear to be able to support a community meeting place/village hall, open space and either a shop, post office service or public house. These facilities were identified as being key by most of the Town and Parish Councils responding to the questionnaire at the end of 2022.
- 6.9. 21 villages have a population of more than 300 people and at least 140 houses are therefore considered to be “larger villages” where some growth could be accommodated to help support and sustain the village and the facilities within them.
- 6.10. Villages with a population of less than 300 people and fewer than 140 houses may have a community meeting space and some formal open space, but only a few seem to support a public house and only Caldecott has access to post office services.
- 6.11. This analysis indicates that the smaller villages with populations of less than 300 fewer than 140 houses may not be suitable for any growth and therefore development should be limited.
- 6.12. It is therefore proposed that the settlement hierarchy is replaced with a single spatial strategy policy which identifies those locations where growth (of different scale and nature) will be acceptable and those locations where development will need to be limited or may not be acceptable.
- 6.13. The spatial strategy will then be supported by a review of PLDs for those locations where development and growth will be directed (Towns and Larger Villages) and separate criteria-based policies prepared to set out how planning applications for development within each tier will be determined.

## **7. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS**

7.1. The results of the 2021 survey, have been used together with the data on number of houses and population and the results of this work are shown in the tables below.

<b>Villages which meet the threshold of Larger Village with a PLD</b>									
	Households 2021	pop 2021	Access to Post Office services	General Store	School & extended school service	Public House	Community hall /meeting place	Formal public open space facility	<b>Core Strategy Settlement Category</b>
Cottesmore**	840	3,100	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
Ketton	830	2,000	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
Ryhall	730	1,600	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
Langham	640	1,400	1		1	1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Whissendine	540	1,200	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Edith Weston **	380	1,100	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
Empingham	400	880	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
Greetham	340	840				1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
North Luffenham	340	740			1	1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Great Casterton	210	600			2	1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Exton	260	580			1	1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Market Overton	240	560	1	1		1	1	1	<b>LSC</b>
Barrowden	220	480		1		1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
South Luffenham	210	470	1			1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Braunston	220	470				1	1	1	<b>RV</b>
Essendine	180	450	1				1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Lyddington	170	380				1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>
Manton	170	370				1	1	1	<b>RV</b>
Belton	160	370				1	1	1	<b>RV</b>
Morcott	150	320	1	1			1		<b>RV</b>
Wing	140	310	1	1		1	1	1	<b>SSC</b>

\*\* population includes military personnel

Smaller Villages and hamlets without a PLD									
Village	Households 2021	pop 2021	Access to Post Office services	General Store	School & extended school service	Public House	Community hall /meeting place	Formal public open space facility	Core Strategy Settlement Category
Burley *	No info	No info							RV
Caldecott	130	290	1			1	1	1	RV
Stretton**	180	290				1	1		RV
Seaton	110	260				1	1	1	RV
Ashwell	120	250					1		RV
Little Casterton	100	250						1	RV
Tinwell	90	240					1	1	SSC
Ridlington	110	240					1	1	RV
Bisbrooke	100	220							RV
Glaston	90	200				1	1	1	SSC
Hambleton	90	200				1	1		RV
Preston	90	200					1	1	RV
Clipsham	80	200				1			RV
Lyndon	60	120					1		RV
Whitwell*	No info	No info				1			RV
Brooke*	No info	No info					1		RV
Egleton*	No info	No info					1		RV
Gunthorpe	No info	No info				1			
Tixover	No info	No info					1		RV

Pickworth*	No info	No info				1			RV
Pilton*	No info	No info				1			RV
Barrow*	No info	No info							RV
Ayston*	No info	No info							RV
Thorpe by Water*	No info	No info							RV
Belmesthorpe*	No info	No info							RV
Stoke Dry*	No info	No info							RV
Teigh*	No info	No info							RV
Thistleton*	No info	No info							RV
Tickencote*	No info	No info							RV
Wardley*	No info	No info							RV

\* no population data available for individual village

\*\* Prison may distort population numbers