

**Subject:** **Proposed Revisions to the Local Service Villages Methodology**

**Lead Officer:** **Paul Harris**  
*Contact on 01789 269314*  
*paul.harris@stratford-dc.gov.uk*

**Lead Member/  
Portfolio Holder:** **Councillor C Saint**

---

### **Summary**

The report provides an update to the previously agreed methodology for identifying Local Service Villages which play a key role in delivering the dispersal approach to providing future housing development in the District.

### **Recommendation**

**That The Cabinet be recommended to endorse the proposed revisions to the methodology informing the identification of Local Service Villages and to reflect the resultant revised categorisation when preparing the Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy.**

---

## **1 Background**

- 1.1 The District Council is pursuing a dispersal approach to the provision of future housing development in its Local Development Framework. This approach was carried through into the Intended Proposed Submission Core Strategy endorsed by Full Council on 22 July 2013.
- 1.2 A key component of the dispersal approach is the role of villages in taking a proportion of the overall District housing requirement. In order for this to take effect, a methodology was devised to identify which settlements should be designated as Local Service Villages (LSVs).
- 1.3 The methodology has been refined in response to concerns expressed at previous consultation stages. As a result, four groups of LSVs are now proposed with a different scale of housing development proposed for each.

## **2 Evidence Base**

- 2.1 Due to the nature of the criteria used to identify LSVs and their categorisation, it is important to make sure that the application of the methodology is carried out accurately and consistently.
- 2.2 Since July 2013, a fresh round of assessment has taken into account four specific matters:

1. To make it clear that the size of the settlement is the overriding criterion, ie. to be a LSV a settlement has to have at least 100 dwellings regardless of the presence of key facilities. This has not been made explicit in the methodology before now. However, it is appropriate and logical to do so in order to avoid a situation where a very small settlement could be identified as a LSV solely, for example, by being on a frequent public transport route.
2. A check of current bus timetables has been undertaken as services are prone to change.
3. The score of one point for a 'fair' level of public transport service has been adjusted as follows:

Less than two hourly (Mon-Sat) to include a morning and afternoon work service

This specific provision is appropriate as the availability of a work service is an important aspect of public transport for rural communities.

4. The availability of a public transport service close to a village has been taken into account, not just those that run through or adjacent to a village. A maximum distance of 500 metres between the edge of a village and the service has been applied. In doing this, only the score for Bearley changes, with an additional point being given for the availability of a frequent bus service along Birmingham Road.

2.3 The following table shows the resultant changes to the scores from those given in Appendix 2 in the Intended Proposed Submission Core Strategy (July 2013). The adjusted scores are shown in red/bold. The table also shows where the LSV categorisation would be revised as a result of these adjusted scores.

Settlement	Size	Shop	School	Public Trans.	Total	Current Category	Revised Category
Alderminster	1	0	0	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	4	
Alveston	1	0	0	3	4	4	
Aston Cantlow	1	0	0	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	-	<b>4</b>
Bearley	2	0	0	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	4	<b>3</b>
Binton	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Bishops Itchington	3	2	3	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	1	
Brailes	2	2	2	2	8	2	
Broom	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Butlers Marston	<b>0</b>	0	0	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	-	
Cherington/Stourton	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Claverdon	2	1	3	0	6	3	
Clifford Chambers	1	0	0	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	4	
Earlswood	2	2	0	3	7	3	
Ettington	2	2	2	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	2	<b>3</b>

Settlement	Size	Shop	School	Public Trans.	Total	Current Category	Revised Category
Farnborough	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Fenny Compton	2	3	2	1	8	2	
Forshaw Heath	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Gaydon	1	1	0	2	4	4	
Great Alne	1	0	2	3	6	3	
Halford	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Hampton Lucy	1	0	2	0	3	4	
Harbury	3	3	3	3	12	1	
Ilmington	2	0	2	1	5	3	
Kings Coughton	0	0	0	3	3	4	-
Ladbroke	1	0	0	1	2	4	
Lighthorne	1	0	0	1	2	-	4
Lighthorne Heath	2	2	1	3	8	3	2
Little Compton	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Little Kineton	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Long Compton	2	2	1	1	6	3	
Long Itchington	3	2	2	3	10	1	
Long Marston	1	2	0	1	4	3	4
Loxley	1	0	1	1	3	4	
Mappleborough Gr.	1	0	2	0	3	4	
Moreton Morrell	1	0	2	1	4	4	
Napton-on-the-Hill	2	3	2	2	9	2	
Newbold-on-Stour	1	1	1	3	6	3	
Northend	1	0	0	1	2	4	
Oxhill	1	0	0	1	2	4	
Pillerton Priors	1	0	0	1	2	4	
Priors Marston	1	0	1	0	2	4	
Quinton	3	2	3	2	10	1	
Radway	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Ratley	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Salford Priors	2	2	2	3	9	2	
Sambourne	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Shotteswell	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Snitterfield	2	2	2	1	7	2	3
Stockton	2	1	2	2	7	2	3

Settlement	Size	Shop	School	Public Trans.	Total	Current Category	Revised Category
Stretton-on-Fosse	1	0	0	0	1	4	-
Tanworth-in-Arden	1	0	3	0	4	3	4
Temple Grafton	0	0	2	0	2	4	-
Temple Herdewycke	2	0	2	1	5	3	
Tiddington	3	3	2	3	11	1	
Tredington	1	0	1	3	5	3	
Tysoe	2	2	3	1	8	2	
Ullenhall	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Warmington	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Welford-on-Avon	2	2	3	1	8	2	
Whichford	1	0	0	0	1	-	
Wilmcote	2	2	2	3	9	2	
Wood End	1	0	0	3	4	4	
Wootton Wawen	2	2	2	3	9	2	

2.4 From the table it will be seen that the category of a small number of villages changes as a result of the matters now taken into account. Of particular note is:

- Kings Coughton, Stretton-on-Fosse and Temple Grafton would be deleted as LSVs.
- Aston Cantlow and Lighthorne would be designated as LSVs, each in Category 4.

### **3 Options available to the Panel**

3.1 The following options should be considered:

1. To recommend to The Cabinet that the proposed revisions to the identification and categorisation of Local Service Villages is endorsed.
2. Not to recommend to The Cabinet that the proposed revisions are endorsed and to propose an alternative approach.

### **4 Members' Comments**

4.1 To be considered at the meeting.

### **5 Implications of the Proposal**

#### **5.1 Legal/Human Rights Implications**

5.1.1 There are no specific implications of this nature relating to this report.

#### **5.2 Financial**

5.2.1 There are no specific implications of this nature relating to this report.

### **5.3 Environmental**

- 5.3.1 The proposed approach to providing housing development in LSVs will take into account environmental issues when specific sites are considered.

### **5.4 Corporate Strategy**

- 5.4.1 All aspects of the Core Strategy, including the provision of housing in LSVs, will reflect the Council's corporate priorities and will be linked as necessary to the Sustainable Community Strategy. The Core Strategy relates particularly to Aims 1, 2 and 4 of the Corporate Strategy.

### **5.5 Analysis of the effects on Equality**

- 5.5.1 The provision of further housing in LSVs, including a proportion of affordable dwellings, will provide opportunities for people to live where they would prefer to due to their circumstances.

## **6 Risk Assessment**

- 6.1 It is essential that the Core Strategy is based on robust evidence and proposes the most appropriate approach to future development given the District's characteristics and circumstances. The identification and implementation of a settlement hierarchy must be applied in an appropriate and consistent manner to avoid the risk of the credibility of the proposed approach being undermined.

## **7 Conclusion**

- 7.1 The methodology for identifying Local Service Villages, and its application to the District Council's proposed dispersal approach to future development, is well-established. The report explains a further refinement of the methodology so that it can be applied appropriately and consistently in and through the Core Strategy.
- 7.2 It should be noted that nothing in this report is considered to have a material impact on the overall scale of development expected to be delivered in the LSVs over the plan period, which remains at 1800. It is intended that the situation set out above, subject to any further updates, will be incorporated into the Proposed Submission Core Strategy to be considered by the Council in May.

Paul Lankester  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Background papers:

*None*