North West Leicestershire District Council

Settlement Study 2021

October 2021

Contents

1. Introduction & purpose of the study

1.1   The purpose of this settlement study is to provide a comparative assessment of the relative sustainability of the settlements within the district. This evidence will help to inform a review of the settlement hierarchy which, along with a range of evidence, will inform the Substantive Review of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.

1.2   The settlement hierarchy is a way of categorising the settlements in North West Leicestershire and grouping those settlements together that have similar characteristics in terms of the services and facilities their residents have access to. This assessment has used a desk-based approach to detail and assesses the sustainability of settlements within the district primarily using:
- Services and facilities present within settlements including convenience stores, schools, library service, GP and pharmacies, post office, community venues, pubs and places of worship together with informal and formal recreation;
- The accessibility to higher order centres using public / sustainable transport; and
- The accessibility to employment opportunities.

1.3   Following the assessment, at the top of the hierarchy would be the settlements which have the greatest range of facilities and services accessible to their communities, including public transport provision. Smaller settlements with the least facilities, services and accessibility to public transport will be at the bottom of the hierarchy.

1.4   In addition to providing evidence which will assist in the development of the local plan and the settlement hierarchy this study will also provide evidence which can be used by communities preparing neighbourhood plans.

1.5   The Council has previously prepared a Settlement Hierarchy in 2016. This Settlement Study builds upon that earlier evidence and considers the full range of settlements across the district.

1.6   The current settlement hierarchy is set out at Appendix A of this paper.

2. Policy context

<u>National policy context</u>

2.1   The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in July 2021 and sets out national planning policies for England. Several of the NPPFs key principles are relevant when considering the sustainability of settlements in the district. The NPPF places great importance on the delivery of sustainable development and the promotion of healthy and safe communities.

2.2   The NPPF emphasises the importance of minimising the length and number of journeys to work, shopping and leisure activities and increasing the opportunities for sustainable forms of transport to be used to make such trips. Further to this the NPPF is clear that authorities should avoid isolated development in rural areas where access to facilities is more limited. The key parts of the NPPF which relate to this study are:

Paragraph 8 (Achieving sustainable development):
Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways:
- *A social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, 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 well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health social and cultural well-being.*

Paragraph 92 (Promoting healthy and safe communities):
Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which:
- *Enable and support healthy lifestyle, especially where this would address identified local health and wellbeing needs – for example 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.*

Paragraph 93 (Promoting healthy and safe communities):
To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:
- *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; and*
- *Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.*

Paragraph 95 (Promoting healthy and safe communities):
It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities.

Paragraph 105 (Promoting sustainable transport):
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.

Paragraph 106 (Promoting sustainable transport):
Planning policies should:
- *Support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.*

Local Policy Context

2.3   The North West Leicestershire Local Plan was adopted in March 2021 following a Partial Review and sets out the spatial strategy for the district. The spatial strategy of the local plan is set out in Policy S1(Future housing and economic development needs) and is supported by the housing and economic policies of the local plan. These policies set out the council's approach towards the achievement of sustainable development within the

district. Policy S2 (Settlement Hierarchy) contains the current settlement hierarchy established in the 2016 study referred to above.

2.4   The Council has already begun the Substantive Review of its local plan and consulted upon the Emerging Options between November 2018 and January 2019.

3. Methodology

Setting parameters

3.1   The following section sets out the methodological approach which has been used to assess the sustainability of settlements within the district. The study has used a desk-based approach along with local knowledge of the settlements to understand which facilities and services are present within the settlement. Once these were identified the relevant Parish Councils or local Members were contacted to provide a local check of the services and facilities identified.

3.2   Settlements were identified as groups of dwellings with an identifiable core or distribution that tied them together and that were named on the Ordnance Survey map. If an area of dwellings was considered to be too few and / or dispersed to form a cohesive group, then they were not included in the assessment. The adopted Limits to Development have been used to assist the process. Consistent with the approach taken in the adopted Local Plan, the Coalville Urban Area incorporates Coalville, Donington-le-Heath, Greenhill, Hugglescote, Snibston, Thringstone and Whitwick as well as the Bardon Employment Area.

3.3   Two settlements in this study have been included which are not wholly within the North West Leicestershire boundary. Woodville is part of the South Derbyshire district. However, part of a recent expansion of Woodville that has occurred was within North West Leicestershire. This is clearly a part of Woodville, rather than being a standalone settlement. It is considered appropriate, therefore, to include it in the study as Woodville (part) with the services and facilities in the rest of Woodville supporting it. The second settlement is appropriately called Boundary and is positioned either side of the A511 with the majority within North West Leicestershire and the remainder in South Derbyshire.

3.4   To measure the comparative sustainability of settlements a number of criteria have been identified to enable settlements to be assessed against the services and facilities which are considered key for a sustainable settlement. These have been chosen to reflect the criteria in the NPPF for sustainability and community facilities as can be seen in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Identified services and facilities and NPPF sustainability criteria

NPPF paragraph	Service or Facility	
Paragraph 8 (Achieving sustainable development)	Convenience Store Primary Education Secondary Education Library Service GP Surgery Pharmacy	Post Office Service Community Venues Public House Place of Worship Informal Recreation Formal Recreation
Paragraph 92 (Promoting healthy and safe communities)	Convenience Store GP Surgery Pharmacy	Informal Recreation Formal Recreation
Paragraph 93 (Promoting healthy and safe communities)	Convenience Store Community Venues Public House Place of Worship	Informal Recreation Formal Recreation Employment within 2km
Paragraph 95 (Promoting healthy and safe communities)	Primary Education Secondary Education	
Paragraph 105 (Promoting sustainable transport)	Public Transport	
Paragraph 106 (Promoting sustainable transport)	Public Transport Employment within 2km	

3.5   In addition to the NPPF, the Department for Transport National Travel Survey 2019 produces data which demonstrates the main reasons people make trips as can be seen in Table 3.2. The data demonstrates that shopping, commuting and education account for the highest number of trips on average, this has helped to group services and facilities for scoring purposes into categories.

Table 3.2: Number of trips taken for this purpose on average per person

Purpose of trip	Average number of trips (trip rates) per person per year by trip purpose
Commuting	140
Business	28
Education	68
Escort education	58
Shopping	181
Other escort	83
Personal business	88
Visiting friends at private home	82
Visiting friends elsewhere	48
Entertainment / public activity	59
Sport: participate	13
Holiday: base	13
Day trip	32
Other including just walk	61

3.6   Analysis of this data would suggest that where communities have better access to these services and facilities locally or by sustainable modes of transport then this will assist in reducing the number of trips made.

3.7   The key services and facilities can be grouped into categories as set out below and will be used to indicate the sustainability of a settlement within North West Leicestershire District:
- Access to convenience stores for food shopping;
- Access to education facilities, both primary and secondary;
- Access to employment locations.
- Public transport access to higher order services outside of the settlement; and
- Range of accessible community services and facilities (libraries, GPs, pharmacies, post offices, community venues, pubs, places of worship, and recreation facilities);

3.8   These criteria will give a consistent high-level indication of the services and facilities accessible to existing settlements. Each of these key services areas are considered in greater detail in the following sections. This will provide justification and an explanation as to how each settlement has been assessed against the specific criteria.

Access to convenience stores:

3.9   The Department for Transport travel data (Table 3.2) identifies accessing shopping destinations as the largest cause for trip generation and accounted for around 181 trips on average per person in 2019. Access to supermarkets and convenience stores are increasingly important to ensure that residents can meet their regular shopping needs as our shopping habits change with more people nationally choosing to shop several times a week rather than undertaking one large shop. Notwithstanding the increase in supermarket deliveries, where there is limited or no access to either a supermarket or a convenience store then residents may need to undertake numerous trips out of the settlement to fulfil their shopping needs greatly increasing the number of car journeys.

3.10   The Association of Convenience Stores (ACS) 2021 rural shop report highlights usefulness of a rural convenience shop with many offering additional services to the convenience goods, including mobile phone top ups (80%) and cash back (70%) to parcel collection point (28%) which help in people staying local for small tasks. The report also highlighted that there was an increase in people using their local shop with 37% more using them than last year, and although this may be due COVID, habits will be formed.

3.11   A settlement will be considered to have access to food shopping where a convenience store is available within the settlement. With the trend towards more frequent top up shopping size of store has not been differentiated. However, within the 6 main settlements (Coalville Urban Area, Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham) the recording of convenience stores has been limited to those supported by a retail group or franchise, whilst in the other settlements all convenience stores have been recorded. It is recognized that there could be additional independent convenience provision in the 6 main settlements, but it is not considered necessary to formally record these where there is a Town / Local Centre.

3.12   A score of 1 is also added for settlements that have an identifiable core of town centre services such as other retail or business uses that serve a wider area, these are not the

services considered in the services and facilities section below. This will assist in defining the higher order settlements.

3.13   Therefore, settlements will be assessed for this category as follows:

No Convenience Store within or adjacent to the settlement	0
One or more Convenience Stores within or adjacent to the settlement	Score = number of convenience stores
An identifiable core of town centre uses	+1

Access to education facilities:

3.14   Education was the third biggest generator of trips in 2017 according to Department for Transport research (Appendix A). Therefore, the location of schools is important when considering development to reduce avoidable trips by private transport. Paragraph 95 of the NPPF highlights the importance of meeting the needs of existing new communities by ensuring a sufficient choice of school places.

3.15   These criteria include both primary and secondary education provision. For the primary age range of up to 11 years of age, which typically has a local catchment area, Ibstock and Woodville both have separate infant and junior schools. However, these have been counted as one so that the primary school provision is therefore comparable with other settlements. In the case of the schools serving Appleby Magna and Appleby Parva and the Coleorton area, they are positioned outside and between the identifiable built up areas, therefore, both these schools have been recorded as serving two settlements as they are within the acceptable walking distance for "*commuting/school*" set out in the Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) *Providing for Journeys on Foot (2000)* the maximum has not been used to allow for the primary school age of walkers.

3.16   Therefore, settlements will be assessed for this category as follows:

No school within or adjacent to the settlement	0
Primary education within or in close proximity to the settlement	1
Primary and Secondary education within or close proximity to the settlement	2

Access to employment locations:

3.17   The travel data prepared by the Department of Transport identifies that commuting journeys account for the second largest number of trips per person (Table 3.2). As such where residents have access to employment and jobs within or accessible to their communities then this will increase the sustainability of the settlement.

3.18   Many of the other services and facilities considered as part of this study provide employment opportunities (for example, shops, schools etc). However, this aspect has been assessed by focussing on the proximity of an employment site (for example industrial and business estates or large employers, to a settlement. These were identified through a map search and local knowledge. Locations such as offices or small businesses within residential areas have not been included.

3.19   The Limits to Development have been used as one factor as settlements with these have been identified as sustainable locations under the previous settlement study. The distance of 2km has also been used as this corresponds to the CIHT preferred maximum walking distances for commuting and schools (as employees would all walk from different locations, a simple straight line measured from the edge of the employment area to the middle of the settlement has been used)

3.20   Any employment site within the existing Limits to Development will score the maximum 2 for that settlement. Any employment site that is outside of the Limits to Development will score 1 for a settlement if it is also within 2km of the settlement. Any settlement that does not have any employment sites either within their Limits to Development or are within 2km of an employment site will not achieved a score under this category.

3.21   Therefore, settlements will be assessed for this category as follows:

No employment sites within Limits to Development or within 2km	0
Employment sites outside Limits to Development but within 2km	1
Employment sites within Limits to Development	2

Public transport access to main centres:

3.22   Paragraph 103 of the NPPF highlights the importance of focusing development at locations which can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.

3.23   Any bus service that passes through a settlement is identified by service number and the terminal stops of that service. If there is no service directly through a settlement but there is a service accessible via a pedestrian footway and it is within a 1.2km walking distance this is noted. The distance of 1.2km has been used as it corresponds to the CIHT preferred maximum walking distance for 'elsewhere', as the motivation for making the journey could be a wide range of reasons, and not just going to work or school. If there is no pedestrian route or nearby service, then these are noted as such.

3.24   Parts of the district are also served by Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) which is a bookable seat in a taxi service on set times in a day, which must be booked sometime in the preceding week. These have been included where they are available for a settlement.

3.25   The times for the bus services have only been shown for the Monday – Saturday daytime service as this covers the greatest proportion of the working pattern. Where there are multiple services the times are in the corresponding order to the list of services. The details have been sourced from the https://www.choosehowyoumove.co.uk/public-transport/bus-routes-and-timetables/ website.

3.26   For a settlement to achieve a score in this criteria the public transport must access a higher order settlement, the 6 main settlements within the District (Coalville Urban Area, Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham) or a higher order settlement in a neighbouring area such as Burton upon Trent, Clifton, Derby, Hinckley, Leicester, Loughborough, Nottingham, Swadlincote.

3.27   A higher score is achieved for those settlements with a higher frequency of public transport, as an at least hourly bus service provides a better level of connectivity and therefore ability to commute or access to other settlements. Conversely, a lower score is achieved for those settlements with an infrequent service that may not allow for commuting or other errands without the need to use a car.

3.28   Therefore, settlements will be assessed for this category as follows:

No Public Transport access to a higher order settlement	0
Public Transport access to a higher order settlement at least infrequent, a DRT service or a service within 1.2km walking distance of the settlement (Monday to Saturday)	1
Public Transport access to a higher order settlement less than hourly but more than infrequent (Monday to Saturday)	2
Public Transport access to a higher order settlement at least hourly (Monday to Saturday)	3

Range of accessible community services and facilities:

3.29   In addition to shops, schools and employment, it is recognised that there many other services and facilities which help to make a settlement more sustainable as they provide local access. When assessing the comparative sustainability of a settlement it is important, therefore, to understand the range of community services and facilities which are accessible to the residents of the settlement. Their availability is considered within these criteria of the assessment and will differ greatly across the settlements, but generally the greater level and variety of community facilities and services present the more sustainable the location will be.

3.30   Library Services for the district are a mixture of fixed buildings and mobile services. The mobile service is limited to one visit per month and so has not been included due to infrequency. (https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/libraries on 22/2/2021)

3.31   GP Surgeries are General Practices that provides front line healthcare to the resident population as identified by the NHS website (https://www.nhs.uk/service-search/ on 23/02/2021)

3.32   Pharmacies have been identified using the NHS website. (https://www.nhs.uk/service-search/ on 23/02/2021) as with GP surgeries they are not necessarily a day to day requirement but do provide part of the basic medical service for a community.

3.33   Post Offices, it should be noted that not all post office services are available at all branches and the hours a service is open per day varies by branch, with some branches being a mobile service, but they all offer Everyday Banking Services. As identified on the Post Office website https://www.postoffice.co.uk/branch-finder on 24/02/2021.

3.34   There are a number of services and facilities which are important from a social sustainability point of view and which support community networks. These include community venues, public houses places of worship and opportunities for recreation.

3.35   Community Venues include Community and Village Halls. However, as the basic criteria for this resource is that there are rooms that are available to be hired by local residents, other types of venues are also included, such as the Community Hub at Castle Donington and the Old School Room at Blackfordby. These have been included as they represent a communal resource for the settlement which allows group activities to occur.

3.36   The Public House section lists all the public houses and includes facilities such as social clubs which require a small annual fee.

3.37   Places of Worship have been identified for a settlement, this includes all those that are active on a daily / weekly basis to those that are less active as part of a cycle of worship in a larger group.

3.38   Recreation is split between formal recreation and informal recreation

3.39   Formal Recreation facilities are those that need are for organised activities and which have to be prearranged, booked or paid for to use. For example, a marked football pitch with a pavilion where the access to the pavilion or pitch needs to be arranged in advance; sports clubs with controlled access to their facilities; leisure centres where pre arrangement / booking may not be required but the use is paid for. It includes the marked pitches which have additional facilities such as changing room / pavilion, but the pitch is still freely accessible.

3.40   The Informal Recreation section records informal recreation facilities and includes everything that is not classed as formal recreation (defined above). This includes provision from grassed kick about areas and equipped play areas (LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs), including skate parks and Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs), to unmarked pitches with goal posts. Informal provision has also been used to cover marked pitches that do not have additional facilities available such as a changing room / pavilion or facilities that do not require prearrangement or booking.

3.41   Therefore, settlements will be assessed for this category as follows:

There are no Services or Facilities within or adjacent to the settlement	0
One or more Services and Facilities within or adjacent to the settlement	Score = number of **types** of Service / Facility available (maximum of 9)

4   The Results

4.1   Taking account of the methodology, the results for each settlement are set out at table 4.1 on the next page. The settlements are in alphabetical order.

.

Table 4.1 Comparative settlement scoring from the assessments.

settlement	Convenience Shop Score	Education Score	Employment Score	Connectivity Score	S & F Score
Acresford	0	0	1	3	**3**
Albert Village	0	1	1	3	2
Appleby Magna	0	1	1	1	5
Appleby Parva	0	1	1	0	1
Ashby de la Zouch	6	2	2	3	9
Battram	0	0	1	1	2
Belton	1	1	1	1	6
Blackfordby	0	1	1	3	5
Boothorpe	0	0	1	0	0
Boundary	0	0	1	3	1
Breedon on the Hill	1	1	2	1	5
Castle Donington	3	2	2	3	9
Cavendish Bridge	0	0	1	3	1
Chilcote	0	0	0	0	1
Coalville Urban Area	16	2	2	3	9
Coleorton (Lower Moor Road Area)	1	0	1	3	2
Coleorton (Outside the Lower Moor Road Area)	0	1	1	1	3
Diseworth	0	1	1	3	4
Donisthorpe	1	1	1	3	5
Ellistown	2	1	2	3	5
Farm Town	0	0	1	0	0
Griffydam	0	1	1	1	2
Heather	1	1	1	1	5
Hemington	0	1	1	1	3
Ibstock	2	2	2	3	9
Isley Walton	0	0	1	3	1
Kegworth	1	1	2	3	9
Lockington	0	0	1	1	2
Long Whatton	2	1	2	3	5
Lount	0	0	1	3	2
Measham	2	1	2	3	9
Moira (including Norris Hill)	2	1	2	3	6
New Packington	0	0	1	1	0
Newbold	0	1	1	1	2
Newton Burgoland	0	1	0	1	3
Normanton le Heath	0	0	0	0	1
Oakthorpe	1	1	1	3	4
Osgathorpe	0	0	0	1	3
Packington	1	1	1	3	5
Peggs Green	0	0	0	3	4
Ravenstone	1	1	1	3	5
Sinope	0	0	1	3	1
Snarestone	0	1	0	2	4
Spring Cottage	0	0	1	0	1
Stretton en le Field	0	0	1	0	0
Swannington	0	1	1	3	4
Swepstone	0	0	1	0	2
Tonge	0	0	1	1	0
Wilson	0	0	0	1	1
Woodville (part)	1	1	1	1	9
Worthington	1	1	1	1	4

5   Defining a Hierarchy

5.1   Having established the range or services and facilities available in each settlement, the next steps is to define what, in the context of this study, is considered to be a sustainable settlement?

5.2   In simple terms, a sustainable settlement is one which has a range of services and facilities within it, so as to provide an opportunity to meet as many of the needs of the local community as possible without having to travel elsewhere or when travel elsewhere is necessary it can be done by using means other than a car.

5.3   In the context of this study, and using the information collected, it was determined that a sustainable settlement should be one that:

- Has each of the 3 Core Services of a convenience shop, school, and access to employment as identified in the DfT survey in Table 3.2, as on a daily basis these services are available without the need to travel beyond the settlement;

OR

- Has 2 out of the 3 Core Services of a convenience shop, school, or access to employment AND either an hourly bus service to a higher order settlement (a score of 3 in table 4.1) OR has at least 5 out of the 9 community services and facilities (again from Table 4.1).

5.4   This approach recognises that sustainable settlements will not all have exactly the same type and range of services and facilities hence including those settlements which have only 2 out of 3 Core Services or 5 out of 9 community services and facilities. However, where this is the case, this is then balanced by requiring that there be good public transport accessibility to higher order settlements so as to provide an opportunity to be able to access a wider range of services and facilities without the need to use a private vehicle, consistent with the NPPF.

5.5   Applying these tests to the results in Table 4.1 identifies the settlements which can be regarded as being sustainable, the next step was to put those settlements in to a hierarchy. This was done by adding up all of the points from the 5 categories outlined earlier. The results are shown in Table 5.1 below.

North West Leicestershire District Council Settlement Hierarchy Survey 2021

Table 5.1 The sustainable settlements

Settlement	Convenience Shop Score	Education Score	Employment Score	Connectivity Score	Service & Facility Score	Total Score
Coalville Urban Area	17	2	2	3	9	33
Ashby de la Zouch	7	2	2	3	9	23
Castle Donington	4	2	2	3	9	20
Ibstock	3	2	2	3	9	19
Measham	3	1	2	3	9	18
Kegworth	2	1	2	3	9	17
Moira (including Norris Hill)	2	1	2	3	6	14
Ellistown	2	1	2	3	5	13
Long Whatton	2	1	2	3	5	13
Woodville (Part)	1	1	1	1	9	13
Donisthorpe	1	1	1	3	5	11
Packington	1	1	1	3	5	11
Ravenstone	1	1	1	3	5	11
Belton	1	1	1	1	6	10
Breedon on the Hill	1	1	2	1	5	10
Oakthorpe	1	1	1	3	4	10
Blackfordby	0	1	1	3	5	10
Diseworth	0	1	1	3	4	9
Swannington	0	1	1	3	4	9
Heather	1	1	1	1	5	9
Appleby Magna	0	1	1	1	5	8
Coleorton (Lower Moor Road Area)	1	1	1	3	2	8
Worthington	1	1	1	1	4	8
Albert Village	0	1	1	3	2	7

5.6   As set out in Table 5.1, it is clear that the Coalville Urban Area is the most sustainable settlement having regard to the range of services and facilities available. Next come Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington followed by Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth. Most score the maximum points that they can in each category, with the exception of Ibstock and Measham which do not have full education provision (although Ibstock does go up to age 14). In addition, all have a clearly defined service centre.

5.7   After these 6 settlements there is a gap to Moira followed by scores which fall in small increments down to 7 points at Albert Village.

5.8   On the basis of the above it was concluded that the current hierarchy categories of Principal Town, Key Service Centre, Local Service Centre and Sustainable Villages was justified and should be retained. Having regard to the above results the following is therefore proposed.

Table 5.2 The sustainable hierarchy

Settlement Category	Settlement
Principal Town	Coalville Urban Area
Key Service Centre	Ashby de la Zouch
	Castle Donington
Local Service Centre	Ibstock
	Kegworth
	Measham
Sustainable Villages	Moira (including Norris Hill)
	Ellistown
	Long Whatton
	Woodville (Part)
	Donisthorpe
	Packington
	Ravenstone
	Belton
	Breedon on the Hill
	Oakthorpe
	Blackfordby
	Diseworth
	Swannington
	Heather
	Appleby Magna
	Coleorton (Lower Moor Road Area)
	Worthington
	Albert Village

6. The remaining settlements

6.1   As part of the review of the Local Plan, the Council is proposing to allow a limited amount of development for local needs in settlements which are not appropriate for general market housing. This will help to address issues relating to social sustainability in smaller settlements.

6.2   Therefore, the remaining settlements have been further assessed to determine if they should be a Local Housing Need Village. Those settlements which do not meet the criteria for a Local Housing Need Village would be an Other Village / Settlement and be subject to the Countryside Policy as they are now.

6.3   In determining which should be Local Housing Needs Villages, the first criteria looked at was size as the pressure for additional dwellings would increase with the size of population. The figures for the settlement size are based on the Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2011 Census for number of households which has then been increased by the number of new dwellings built since 2011. The Census data is based on ONS Output Areas, these cover more than the settlement itself and therefore the figures will include some outlying dwellings.

6.4   The bands were set at 50 and 100 dwellings with under 50 being considered small enough to remain under the Countryside Policy and over 100 large enough to have a reasonable quantum to support the Local Housing Need Policy.

6.5   The second criteria for those settlements that were between 50 and 100 was their distance to a sustainable settlement. If they were within 2km (the maximum CIHT walking distance) then it was considered that any additional Local Housing Need could be supported by that larger sustainable settlement without being detrimental from a social sustainability point of view. Therefore, these settlements would remain as being subject to the Countryside Policy. If the settlement was over 2km from a sustainable settlement, then it was considered that they became a Local Housing Need Village.

6.6   Therefore, remaining settlements will be assessed for Local Housing Needs status as follows:

Size of Settlement	Proximity to a Sustainable Settlement	Local Housing Needs Village
Less than 50	N/A	No
51 – 100	Within 2km	No
51 – 100	More than 2km	Yes
101 and above	N/A	Yes

Table 6.2 Comparative Local Housing Needs Scoring

Settlement	Settlement size	distance to nearest Sustainable Settlement (km)	Name of nearest Sustainable Settlement	Proposed Category
Newbold	242			LHNV by virtue of size
Coleorton (Outside the Lower Moor Road Area)	219			LHNV by virtue of size
Osgathorpe	197			LHNV by virtue of size
Newton Burgoland	178			LHNV by virtue of size
Griffydam	158			LHNV by virtue of size
Snarestone	143			LHNV by virtue of size
Boundary	135			LHNV by virtue of size
Hemington	133			LHNV by virtue of size
Peggs Green	128			LHNV by virtue of size
Battram	112			LHNV by virtue of size
Swepstone	96	2.4 - 2.8	Heather	LHNV by virtue of distance from a sustainable settlement
Lockington	88	2.0 - 2.4	Castle Donington	LHNV by virtue of distance from a sustainable settlement
Sinope	87	2.0 - 2.4	Swannington/ Coleorton (Lower Moor Road Area)	LHNV by virtue of distance from a sustainable settlement
Lount	79	3.6 - 4.0	Coleorton (Lower Moor Road Area)	LHNV by virtue of distance from a sustainable settlement
Wilson	69	2.0 - 2.4	Breedon on the Hill	LHNV by virtue of distance from a sustainable settlement
Normanton le Heath	66	2.4 - 2.8	Heather	LHNV by virtue of distance from a sustainable settlement
Acresford	65	1.6 - 2.0	Netherseal	Other Village / Settlement
Spring Cottage	64	1.2 - 1.6	Overseal	Other Village / Settlement
Appleby Parva	52	1.2 - 1.6	Appleby Magna	Other Village / Settlement
Chilcote	48			Other Village / Settlement
Tonge	47			Other Village / Settlement
New Packington	38			Other Village / Settlement
Cavendish Bridge	25			Other Village / Settlement
Boothorpe	18			Other Village / Settlement
Isley Walton	15			Other Village / Settlement
Farm Town	14			Other Village / Settlement
Stretton en le Field	9			Other Village / Settlement

7. Settlement Study results

7.1   Each settlement was audited using the approach detailed at section 3. The full assessments are set out at Appendix B, these detail the full range of services and facilities identified within and accessible to each settlement, together with the scores for each section on the proforma.

7.2   The findings of the current study in Table 4.1 are mostly consistent with the findings of the previous settlement hierarchy study carried out in June 2016. The current study confirms the sustainable settlements and their position in the hierarchy in Table 5.1, to this end the top 4 tiers of the existing settlement hierarchy would only be changed by the addition of Woodville (part) as a Sustainable Village.

7.3   With the proposed addition of a new policy relating to Local Housing Needs the bottom two tiers were looked at with the previous Small Village designation being replaced with the Local Housing Needs Village designation and the Hamlet designation being replaced with Other Village / Settlement. Again, these results were very similar to the existing settlement hierarchy with 1 village (Boundary) moving into the Local Housing Need Village designation[1] and 2 villages (Spring Cottage and Tonge) moving to the Other Village/ Settlement designation.

7.4   The Local Housing Needs designation allows for some villages to grow and thrive and it is important to note that the provision of services and facilities is not fixed and can evolve over time according to market forces or changing work and travel patterns, so this hierarchy represents the current position. Table 7.1 shows the proposed Settlement Hierarchy for North West Leicestershire District for 2021.

Table 7.1: Proposed Settlement Hierarchy Results

Tier	Settlements included
Principal Town	Coalville Urban Area which comprises of Coalville, Donington-le-Heath, Greenhill, Hugglescote, Snibston, Thringstone and Whitwick as well as the Bardon employment area.
Key Service Centre	Ashby de la Zouch Castle Donington
Local Service Centre	Ibstock Kegworth Measham
Sustainable Villages	Albert Village, Appleby Magna, Belton, Blackfordby, Breedon on the Hill, Coleorton (the Lower Moor Road area only), Diseworth, Donisthorpe, Ellistown, Heather, Long Whatton, Moira (including Norris Hill), Oakthorpe, Packington, Ravenstone, Swannington, Woodville (part), Worthington.
Local Housing Needs Village	Battram, Boundary, Coleorton (the part not considered to be a Sustainable Village), Griffydam, Hemington, Lockington, Lount, Newbold, Newton Burgoland, Normanton le Heath, Osgathorpe, Peggs Green, Sinope, Snarestone, Swepstone, Wilson

---

[1] In the adopted Local Plan the text makes it clear that Normanton le Heath was included as a Small village in but was inadvertently missed from policy S2.

Other Villages / Settlements	Those not listed above

Appendix A: Current Settlement Hierarchy

Settlement Classification	Settlement(s)
Principal Town The primary settlement in the district which provides an extensive range of services and facilities including employment, leisure and shopping and which is accessible by sustainable transport from surrounding areas and to other large settlements outside the district. The largest amount of new development will be directed here, including retail development, to support the regeneration of Coalville Town Centre.	Coalville Urban Area which comprises of Coalville, Donington-le-Heath, Greenhill, Hugglescote, Snibston, Thringstone and Whitwick as well as the Bardon employment area.
Key Service Centre Smaller than the Principal Town in terms of population and also the range of services and facilities they provide, they play an important role providing services and facilities to the surrounding area and are accessible by some sustainable transport. A significant amount of development will take place in these settlements but less than that in the Principal Town.	Ashby de la Zouch Castle Donington
Local Service Centre Settlements which provide some services and facilities primarily of a local nature meeting day-to-day needs and where a reasonable amount of new development will take place.	Ibstock Kegworth Measham
Sustainable Villages Settlements which have a limited range of services and facilities where a limited amount of growth will take place within the defined Limits to Development.	Albert Village, Appleby Magna, Belton, Blackfordby, Breedon on the Hill, Coleorton (the Lower Moor Road area only), Diseworth, Donisthorpe, Ellistown, Heather, Long Whatton, Moira (including Norris Hill), Oakthorpe, Packington, Ravenstone, Swannington, Worthington.

Small Village Settlements with very limited services and where development will be restricted to conversions of existing buildings or the redevelopment of previously developed land (as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework) or affordable housing in accordance with Policy H5 (Rural Exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing).	*Battram, Coleorton (the part not considered to be a Sustainable Village), Griffydam, Hemington, Lockington, Lount, Newbold, Newton Burgoland, Osgathorpe, Peggs Green, Sinope, Snarestone, Swepstone, Spring Cottage, Tonge, Wilson.*
Hamlets Small groups of dwellings with no services and facilities and where development will be considered in the context of the countryside policy (Policy S3).	

Appendix B: Settlement proformas and maps

To be inserted.

Not included at this time due to size of document.