



JOINT CORE STRATEGY RURAL AREA SETTLEMENT AUDIT July 2017 Refresh

CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Policy context**
- 3. Methodology**
- 4. Results – settlement profiles**

Appendix 1: Full (A3) settlement profile
Appendix 2: Access to 10 Key Services Map
Appendix 3: Access to Major Employer (Public Transport)
Appendix 4: Access to Major Employer (Drive)



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The nature of settlements

Services are often located within settlements. Large settlements tend to provide more services, be more accessible and have a greater population of users, while smaller settlements often contain few services aimed at provision for more local communities. Over time, settlement hierarchies emerge and evolve on a local, regional and national basis.

1.2 The settlement hierarchy within the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) area is no different; Gloucester and Cheltenham are at the top of the hierarchy and relatively remote rural villages such as Stanton and Prescott are towards the bottom. While it is usually easy for anyone to identify settlements at either end of a hierarchy, those in between are often less clear. This paper reports on a study to audit the services within, and access to settlements within the JCS area and thereby inform the discussion of each settlement's role within the study area. The settlement audit was originally undertaken in 2010/2011 and subsequently updated in 2013 and 2015.

1.3 The current audit has sought to update these earlier findings and present a more up to date picture of the services and facilities available within each settlement.

1.4 The results of this revised audit helps inform a detailed hierarchy based on each settlement's level of service provision and accessibility. In turn, this forms part of the evidence base that helps to inform where new development may be directed by the JCS and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan – encouraging close proximity of housing, jobs and services in pursuit of a more sustainable development pattern.

1.5 A settlement's position within the service hierarchy does not mean that development is appropriate and deliverable, or that it is to be avoided. Other factors must be considered such as environmental constraints, available development sites and local character. This audit must therefore be viewed within the context of the wider JCS evidence base.

1.6 Settlements in the JCS area

The JCS area is dominated by three settlements: Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury.

1.7 Gloucester and Cheltenham are major centres providing services to the sub-region and beyond. As such, they fall outside of the scope of the settlement audit since their dominant position is clear and they will continue to play key roles in meeting the needs of the JCS area. Gloucester and Cheltenham both have administrative boundaries drawn tightly around their urban areas, with urban fringe settlements such as Brockworth, Hucclecote, Churchdown, Innsworth and Longford located just beyond. These urban fringe settlements fall within the administrative area of Tewkesbury Borough.

1.8 With the exception of the urban fringes to Gloucester and Cheltenham, Tewkesbury Borough is predominantly rural. Its major settlements include Tewkesbury town, Winchcombe town and Bishops Cleeve, together with the urban fringe settlements previously mentioned. Tewkesbury town also has separate fringe settlements at Wheatpieces, Newtown, Northway and Ashchurch. Consultation work to date reveals that many residents of the larger settlements in Tewkesbury Borough view them as villages with limited services, essentially rural in nature, and separate and distinct from the urban areas. The original audit and current revision do not account for character or location but identifies that many such settlements are in fact significant and accessible service providers in the area.

1.9 In common with other parts of Britain, many urban areas and urban fringe areas within the JCS area have expanded significantly in recent years, while some rural settlements have struggled to

retain their services as increased population mobility leads residents to obtain services more conveniently and with more choice elsewhere.

1.10 There are 75 named settlements in Tewkesbury Borough which have been included within the audit, as follows:

Alderton	Elmstone Hardwicke	Sandhurst
Alstone	Fiddington	Shuthonger
Apperley	Forthampton	Shurdington
Ashchurch	Gotherington	Snowshill
Ashleworth	Great Washbourne	Southam
Aston Cross	Great Witcombe	Stanton
Aston-on-Carrant	Greet	Stanway
Badgeworth	Gretton	Staverton
Barrow	Hardwicke	Stoke Orchard
Bishop's Cleeve	Hasfield	Teddington
Bentham	Hawling	Tewkesbury
Boddington	Highnam	The Leigh
Brockhampton	Hucclecote	Tirley
Brockworth	Innsworth	Toddington (incl. New Town)
Buckland	Laverton	Tredington
Chaceley	Little Witcombe	Twigworth
Chargrove	Longford	Twyning
Charlton Abbots	Maisemore	Uckington
Churchdown	Minsterworth	Walton Cardiff
Coombe Hill	Northway	Wheatpieces
Deerhurst	Norton	Winchcombe
Deerhurst Walton	Oxenton	Wood Stanway
Didbrook	Pamington	Woodmancote
Down Hatherley	Prescott	Woolstone
Dumbleton	Priors Norton	Wormington

1.11 However, it should be noted that there are other small settlements/hamlets within the borough, in addition to those settlements mentioned above. For the purposes of the audit, these settlements have not been included, due to their very modest scale, and/or remote location within the open countryside.

1.12 Settlements outside the JCS area

The JCS area adjoins Cotswold, Forest of Dean and Stroud Districts in Gloucestershire, as well as Malvern Hills and Wychavon Districts in Worcestershire. In view of this, several important settlements outside the JCS area play a role in meeting the needs of the JCS population.

1.13 Such settlements were not audited through, either the previous work, or the current revision, but their influence on settlements within the JCS area is considered in terms of access to jobs and services. Accessibility data used in the audit incorporates access to services located across local authority boundaries in neighbouring settlements such as those listed above.

1.14 The wider relationship of neighbouring settlements with the JCS area will be considered in greater detail through on going work and the Duty to Co-operate.

2. POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 National Guidance

The planning system has changed significantly in the period since the original settlement audit was undertaken. The introduction of the Localism Act (2011) now provides local communities with the power to deliver development to meet local needs, through the production of neighbourhood plans. The revocation of regional spatial strategies and county structure plans in 2013 has meant that plan making by districts has needed to include an element of strategic guidance, achieved by working collaboratively with other statutory agencies under the duty to co-operate.

2.2 The publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 set out the Government's consolidated planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF also provides a framework within which local communities and Local Planning Authorities can develop their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, with the overarching guiding principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

2.3 The key principles contained within the NPPF, of particular relevance to the settlement audit and any hierarchy subsequently developed based on it, are:

- Patterns of growth should be actively managed. Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable (para.17).
- In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality and should also define a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes (para.23).
- To promote a strong rural economy local and neighbourhood plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. (para.28).
- Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. (para.30).
- Sustainable development should be promoted in rural areas by locating new housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby (para.55).

2.5 Local guidance

The development plan is the starting point for planning decision making. The NPPF provides that "Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved unless material circumstances indicate otherwise" (NPPF, para.12).

2.6 The development plan for Tewkesbury Borough consists of the saved policies of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 (Adopted 2006) together with an Affordable Housing SPD adopted in 2006, and the Flood and Water Management SPD adopted in 2014.

2.7 The Borough Council is working to update these policies through the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan (2011 to 2031). As such, Tewkesbury Borough is currently in the process of preparing the new Borough Plan alongside the Joint Core Strategy, in order to guide future planning decisions within the borough up to the year 2031.

2.8 Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan (2011) currently lists “larger settlements containing a primary level of community services and facilities” (Policy HOU2) as follows:

- Ashchurch
- Bishops Cleeve
- Brockworth
- Churchdown
- Hucclecote
- Innsworth
- Longford
- Northway
- Farm Lane / Leckhampton Lane (Shurdington Parish)
- Tewkesbury
- Hayden Road (Uckington Parish)
- Winchcombe
- Woodmancote

“Other villages” identified as suitable for “infilling only” (Policy HOU3) include:

- Alderton
- Apperley
- Ashleworth
- Dumbleton
- Gotherington
- Gretton
- Highnam
- Maisemore
- Shurdington
- Twyning

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Settlement profiles

Settlement profiles were compiled for each of the identified 75 settlements within Tewkesbury Borough, via desk research of 24 key services/facilities and accessibility criteria. The measures audited and the scoring system used were based on the approach employed by neighbouring Wychavon District Council, which has much in common with the study area and whose methods were commended by the Planning Inspectorate. Amendments were made to this approach according to local circumstances and data available.

3.2 Each settlement was audited against the following criteria:

Primary services – score 3 if present (maximum score 18)

- Post office (including outreach / mobile services)
- Food shop / general store
- Community centre / village hall
- GP surgery
- Primary school
- Local employment opportunities, defined as: industrial estate, Business Park or rural business centre or other significant employment sites. This excludes low intensity uses such as caravan parks, agriculture or sewage farms.

Secondary services – score 1 if present with the exception of broadband connections, whereby a maximum score of 2 points is available (maximum score 15)

- Petrol station / garage (may be located immediately outside traditional settlement boundary)
- Bank
- Public house
- Public leisure centre
- Public sports pitch (any of: football, rugby, cricket, hockey or tennis)
- Children's play area
- Library (including mobile service)
- Place of worship
- Pharmacy
- Hospital
- Broadband connections (score based upon estimated speeds: 0mbps – 4mbps = score 0; 5mbps – 16mbps = score 1; over 16mbps = score 2)
- Secondary school
- Shops 2-9
- Shops 10+

*NB: if a settlement contained multiple examples of a service, the score was given as if only one was present (e.g. two GP surgeries score three points, not six; and three public houses score one point, not three). This approach places an emphasis on **range** of services in line with sustainability principles, and reduces the impact of anomalies where a cluster of similar services is available in one location.*

3.3 For the purposes of the current revision, each parish council was asked to comment on the audit data held for each of the settlements within its parish. The settlement form listed each of the above mentioned primary and secondary services and each parish council was invited to comment on the audit findings for each facility within each settlement. The completed parish settlements forms proved invaluable in adding to the services/facilities information obtained via the desk-top study.

3.4 Accessibility

An accessibility score was derived for each settlement using four elements: general accessibility to key destinations, access to major employment areas by both private car and public transport and distance to a railway station. Census Output Areas (COAs) were used in order to provide a fine grained view of the accessibility of the borough. The accessibility maps are shown in the appendices for information. Data supporting the Gloucestershire Accessibility toolkit was also used to support the assessment. The Inform Accessibility Toolkit is available to check using postcodes on the Gloucestershire County Council's Inform website using the following link:

<https://inform.gloucestershire.gov.uk/viewpage.aspx?c=page&page=Accessibility-Transport> A

maximum score of 15 points was achievable for accessibility under the following measures:

- General accessibility (based on access to the following 10 key destinations by the June 2017 Gloucestershire Accessibility Toolkit : Post office, Supermarket, Library, Primary School, Secondary School, Children's Centre, GP, Pharmacy, Accident & Emergency or Minor Injuries Unit, Fitness Facility. Score 0-4 for quality of access within the JCS area by public transport, with 0 being the least accessible and 4 the most accessible.
- Access to major employment areas (offering minimum 500 jobs) by public transport: score 0-4 for quality of access within the JCS area, with 0 being the least accessible census output area, and 4 being the most accessible census output area
- Access to major employment areas (offering minimum 500 jobs) by road/car: score 0-4 for quality of access, with 0 being the least accessible 20% of settlements, and 4 being the most accessible 20%
- Access to railway station: score 3 if walking distance (800m), score 2 if within 2km, score 1 if within 5km, score 0 if more than 5km (all straight line distances).

3.5 Population of settlements – population estimates are not a reliable indicator of service provision and may mask opportunities for development: it is not uncommon for settlements to provide more or fewer services than their resident population would indicate. However, population estimates have been included in Section 5 for reference to give an indication of the size of a settlement.

3.6 Sources

A wide range of data sources were used for the audit, including but not exclusively:

Primary and secondary services

- Tewkesbury Borough Council public leisure provision records
- Gloucestershire County Council website
- NHS Direct
- The Post Office
- Google.co.uk
- Google Earth mapping
- Parishes own websites if available
- Fastershire.com (Faster broadband for Herefordshire and Gloucestershire)

4. RESULTS – SETTLEMENT PROFILES

4.1 The profiles provide an understanding of the characteristics and roles of settlements and a simple, quantitative means to distinguish between them.

4.2 The revised audit table is shown at Appendix 1 of this report and a supporting MS Excel workbook has been published alongside the audit for ease of use.

4.3 To interpret the results, hierarchies can be presented according to the Overall Score, or by its constituent parts (e.g. by Primary Services or Accessibility only). This allows policy-makers to better understand a settlement's role. For example:

- Churchdown: ranks 4th overall, and also ranks highly on each individual measure (e.g. Primary Services, All Services and Accessibility).
- Brockhampton: is relatively middle-ranking (39th overall) it has relatively good accessibility but poor services (scores 0 for primary and 2 for secondary services).

4.4 Overall Score and Rankings of all settlements in the JCS area, presented alphabetically (on the left) and by rank (on the right):

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICE & ACCESS SCORES (Max 48)	OVERALL RANK
Alderton	18	20
Alstone	4	58
Apperley	11	32
Ashchurch	28	9
Ashleworth	17	22
Aston Cross	8	37
Aston-on-Carrant	4	58
Badgeworth	5	50
Barrow	1	68
Bentham	5	50
Bishop's Cleeve	44	2
Boddington	4	58
Brockhampton	7	39
Brockworth	37	6
Buckland	2	64
Chaceley	5	50
Chargrove	9	36
Charlton Abbots	1	68
Churchdown	39	4
Coombe Hill	17	22
Deerhurst	6	47
Deerhurst Walton	7	39
Didbrook	4	58
Down Hatherley	13	27
Dumbleton	8	37
Elmstone Hardwicke	12	29

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICE & ACCESS SCORES (Max 48)	OVERALL RANK
Tewkesbury	45	1
Bishop's Cleeve	44	2
Winchcombe	41	3
Churchdown	39	4
Northway	38	5
Brockworth	37	6
Highnam	34	7
Innsworth	29	8
Ashchurch	28	9
Stoke Orchard	24	10
Woodmancote	24	10
Longford	23	12
Shurdington	23	12
Twyning	23	12
Wheatpieces	23	12
Maisemore	22	16
Gotherington	22	16
Hucclecote	21	18
Twigworth	19	19
Alderton	18	20
Greet	18	20
Ashleworth	17	22
Minsterworth	17	22
Coombe Hill	17	22
Tredington	15	25
Toddington (inc New Town)	15	25

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICE & ACCESS SCORES (Max 48)	OVERALL RANK
Fiddington	11	32
Forthampton	7	39
Gotherington	22	16
Great Washbourne	0	74
Great Witcombe	6	47
Greet	18	20
Gretton	12	29
Hardwicke	7	39
Hasfield	1	68
Hawling	1	68
Highnam	34	7
Hucclecote	21	18
Innsworth	29	8
Laverton	3	63
Little Witcombe	7	39
Longford	23	12
Maisemore	22	16
Minsterworth	17	22
Northway	13	27
Norton	8	37
Oxenton	12	29
Pamington	11	32
Prescott	7	39
Priors Norton	22	16
Sandhurst	0	74
Shurdington	6	47
Shuthonger	38	5
Snowhill	12	29
Southam	5	50
Stanton	5	50
Stanway	2	64
Staverton	2	64
Stoke Orchard	7	39
Teddington	23	12
Tewkesbury	45	1
The Leigh	5	50
Tirley	10	34
Toddington (inc New Town)	5	50
Tredington	2	64
Twigworth	10	34
Twynning	24	10
Uckington	6	47
Walton Cardiff	45	1
Wheatpieces	7	39
Winchcombe	41	3
Wood Stanway	0	74
Woodmancote	24	10
Woolstone	1	68

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICE & ACCESS SCORES (Max 48)	OVERALL RANK
Down Hatherley	13	27
Uckington	13	27
Elmstone Hardwicke	12	29
Norton	12	29
Gretton	12	29
Fiddington	11	32
Apperley	11	32
Southam	10	34
Staverton	10	34
Chargrove	9	36
Dumbleton	8	37
Aston Cross	8	37
Hardwicke	7	39
Deerhurst Walton	7	39
Brockhampton	7	39
Forthampton	7	39
Walton Cardiff	7	39
The Leigh	7	39
Sandhurst	7	39
Little Witcombe	7	39
Teddington	6	47
Great Witcombe	65	47
Deerhurst	6	47
Bentham	5	50
Oxenton	5	50
Snowhill	5	50
Stanton	5	50
Tirley	5	50
Chaceley	5	50
Pamington	5	50
Badgeworth	5	50
Didbrook	4	58
Shuthonger	4	58
Aston-on-Carrant	4	58
Boddington	4	58
Alstone	4	58
Laverton	3	63
Prescott	2	64
Buckland	2	64
Priors Norton	2	64
Stanway	2	64
Wormington	1	68
Charlton Abbots	1	68
Hasfield	1	68
Hawling	1	68
Barrow	1	68
Woolstone	1	68
Great Washbourne	0	74

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICE & ACCESS SCORES (Max 48)	OVERALL RANK
Wormington	1	68

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICE & ACCESS SCORES (Max 48)	OVERALL RANK
Wood Stanway	0	74

4.5 Scoring breakdowns of all settlements in the Tewkesbury Borough for Primary Services (left), All Services (centre) and Access (right), each presented in rank order

Settlement	TOTAL PRIMARY SERVICE SCORE / 18
Tewkesbury	18
Bishop's Cleeve	18
Churchdown	18
Brockworth	18
Winchcombe	18
Highnam	18
Northway	15
Shurdington	15
Innsworth	12
Ashchurch	12
Wheatpieces	12
Gotherington	12
Toddington (inc New Town)	12
Alderton	12
Ashleworth	12
Minsterworth	12
Twyning	12
Uckington	9
Hucclecote	9
Woodmancote	9
Norton	9
Longford	6
Maisemore	6
Elmstone Hardwicke	6
Twigworth	6
Coombe Hill	6
Little Witcombe	6
Down Hatherley	6
Apperley	6
Gretton	6
Dumbleton	6
Tredington	6

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICES SCORE / 33
Tewkesbury	33
Bishop's Cleeve	32
Churchdown	32
Brockworth	31
Winchcombe	30
Northway	24
Highnam	24
Shurdington	20
Wheatpieces	18
Gotherington	17
Innsworth	17
Ashchurch	17
Ashleworth	17
Minsterworth	17
Alderton	16
Twyning	16
Woodmancote	15
Toddington (inc New Town)	14
Longford	12
Hucclecote	12
Norton	12
Maisemore	11
Twigworth	11
Coombe Hill	11
Little Witcombe	11
Apperley	10
Gretton	10
Uckington	10
Dumbleton	8
Greet	8
Elmstone Hardwicke	8
Forthampton	7

Settlement	TOTAL ACCESSIBILITY SCORE / 15
Northway	14
Tewkesbury	12
Innsworth	12
Bishop's Cleeve	12
Ashchurch	11
Maisemore	11
Winchcombe	11
Longford	11
Highnam	10
Greet	10
Woodmancote	9
Hucclecote	9
Fiddington	8
Tredington	8
Aston Cross	8
Twigworth	8
Stoke Orchard	8
Twyning	7
Churchdown	7
Down Hatherley	6
Staverton	6
Coombe Hill	6
Brockworth	6
Walton Cardiff	5
Brockhampton	5
Gotherington	5
Wheatpieces	5
The Leigh	5
Southam	4
Elmstone Hardwicke	4
Pamington	4
Toddington (inc New Town)	4

Settlement	TOTAL PRIMARY SERVICE SCORE / 18
Forthampton	6
Chargrove	3
Fiddington	3
Greet	3
Hardwicke	3
Sandhurst	3
Southam	3
Stoke Orchard	3
Staverton	3
Badgeworth	3
Great Witcombe	3
Bentham	3
Teddington	3
Chaceley	3
Deerhurst Walton	3
Didbrook	3
Oxenton	3
Snowhill	3
Stanton	3
Tirley	3
Laverton	3
Brockhampton	0
Walton Cardiff	0
Alstone	0
Boddington	0
Deerhurst	0
Pamington	0
Aston Cross	0
Aston-on-Carrant	0
Priors Norton	0
Stanway	0
Barrow	0
Buckland	0
Shuthonger	0
The Leigh	0
Wormington	0
Charlton Abbots	0
Hasfield	0
Hawling	0
Prescott	0
Woolstone	0
Great Washbourne	0
Wood Stanway	0

Settlement	TOTAL SERVICES SCORE / 33
Stoke Orchard	7
Down Hatherley	7
Tredington	7
Chargrove	6
Sandhurst	6
Southam	6
Great Witcombe	6
Hardwicke	5
Bentham	5
Teddington	5
Chaceley	5
Deerhurst Walton	5
Snowhill	5
Stanton	5
Tirley	5
Deerhurst	4
Staverton	4
Badgeworth	4
Didbrook	4
Oxenton	4
Alstone	3
Fiddington	3
Laverton	3
Brockhampton	2
Walton Cardiff	2
Boddington	2
Priors Norton	2
Stanway	2
The Leigh	2
Pamington	1
Aston-on-Carrant	1
Buckland	1
Shuthonger	1
Wormington	1
Charlton Abbots	1
Hasfield	1
Hawling	1
Prescott	1
Woolstone	1
Aston Cross	0
Barrow	0
Great Washbourne	0
Wood Stanway	0

Settlement	TOTAL ACCESSIBILITY SCORE / 15
Chargrove	3
Shurdington	3
Uckington	3
Shuthonger	3
Aston-on-Carrant	3
Deerhurst	2
Alderton	2
Boddington	2
Deerhurst Walton	2
Hardwicke	2
Gretton	2
Prescott	1
Apperley	1
Badgeworth	1
Teddington	1
Sandhurst	1
Barrow	1
Oxenton	1
Alstone	1
Buckland	1
Minsterworth	0
Wood Stanway	0
Norton	0
Priors Norton	0
Didbrook	0
Bentham	0
Little Witcombe	0
Great Witcombe	0
Forthampton	0
Chaceley	0
Stanway	0
Stanton	0
Tirley	0
Snowhill	0
Laverton	0
Wormington	0
Charlton Abbots	0
Hasfield	0
Hawling	0
Ashleworth	0
Woolstone	0
Great Washbourne	0
Dumbleton	0

4.6 Population

Gloucestershire County Council does not maintain population records by settlement, but uses the census geography produced by the ONS to provide estimates by parish. Of Tewkesbury Borough's 50

parishes, 33 contain only one significant settlement, therefore the parish population can be assumed to broadly match that of the associated settlement. These figures are presented for reference and future interpretation only, and do not play a part in the audit, they are the Gloucestershire County Council Modelled Local Geography Population Estimates for mid-2016 and are available to view on the Gloucestershire County Council's Inform website in the neighbourhood profile section via the following link: <https://inform.gloucestershire.gov.uk/viewpage.aspx?c=page&page=Population>

Parish Name	Population Estimate November 2016 Based
Alderton	745
Ashchurch Rural	1145
Ashleworth	555
Badgeworth	1630
Bishop's Cleeve	11315
Boddington	270
Brockworth	7630
Buckland	210
Chaceley	105
Churchdown	11275
Deerhurst	940
Down Hatherley	420
Dumbleton	560
Elmstone Hardwicke	345
Forthampton	145
Gotherington	1000
Great Witcombe	80
Gretton	475
Hasfield	125
Hawling	140
Highnam	1865
Hucclecote	1985
Innsworth	2625
Leigh	320
Longford	1205
Maisemore	515
Minsterworth	470
Northway	5190
Norton	435
Oxenton	165
Prescott	100
Sandhurst	475
Shurdington	1920
Snowhill	170
Southam	1080
Stanton	210
Stanway	345
Staverton	620

Parish Name	Population Estimate November 2016 Based
Stoke Orchard	545
Sudeley	105
Teddington	385
Tewkesbury	11090
Tirley	440
Toddington	415
Twigworth	340
Twyning	1650
Uckington	605
Wheatpieces	3910
Winchcombe	4615
Woodmancote	2895

4.7 The following 17 parishes have a population split across multiple settlements:

PARISH	NUMBER OF SETTLEMENTS IN PARISH	NAMES OF SETTLEMENTS IN PARISH
Ashchurch Rural	6	Ashchurch, Aston Cross, Aston-on- Carrant, Fiddington, Pamington, Walton Cardiff
Badgeworth	2	Badgeworth, Little Witcombe
Bishop's Cleeve	2	Bishop's Cleeve, Brockhampton
Boddington	2	Barrow, Boddington
Buckland	2	Buckland, Laverton
Deerhurst	3	Deerhurst, Apperley, Deerhurst Walton
Dumbleton	4	Dumbleton, Wormington, Great Washbourne
Elmstone Hardwicke	2	Elmstone Hardwicke, Hardwicke
Leigh	2	The Leigh, Coombe Hill
Norton	2	Norton, Prior's Norton
Oxenton	2	Oxenton, Woolstone
Shurdington	2	Chargrove, Shurdington
Stanway	3	Stanway, Didbrook, Wood Stanway
Stoke Orchard	2	Stoke Orchard, Tredington
Teddington	2	Teddington, Alstone
Twyning	2	Shuthonger, Twyning
Winchcombe	2	Winchcombe, Greet

4.7 Major urban areas and urban fringe settlements

The settlements on the fringes of Gloucester and Cheltenham that lie within Tewkesbury Borough may be excluded from the hierarchy on the grounds that, in strategic planning terms, they are part of the immediate hinterland of the major urban areas. Relative to others, these settlements are inherently accessible and well-served due to their locations, and could be argued to skew the results when included in the overall audit. Similarly, Tewkesbury town has Ashchurch, Northway and Wheatpieces, which may be considered as a whole, in strategic planning terms. Based on geographical proximity and physical connection to the urban centres, a further ranking of the settlements is shown that removes the following settlements from separate consideration:

- Brockworth, Churchdown, Hucclecote, Innsworth and Longford – considered to form part of the urban fringe of Gloucester and its immediate hinterland
- Uckington - considered to be part of Cheltenham and its immediate hinterland
- Ashchurch, Northway, Walton Cardiff and Wheatpieces – considered to be part of Tewkesbury Town and its immediate hinterland

4.8 Further research may be required to define which settlements could be treated in this way. However, adopting this approach as an example, the overall hierarchy of 65 settlements would appear as follows:

Overall score and rankings (excluding urban fringe settlements listed above), presented alphabetically (on the left) and by rank (on the right):

Settlement	TOTAL SCORE / 48	URBAN FRINGE MODIFIED RANK	OVERALL RANK
Alderton	18	13	20
Alstone	4	49	58
Apperley	10	24	32
Ashleworth	17	15	17
Aston Cross	8	29	37
Aston-on-Carrant	8	49	58
Badgeworth	5	41	50
Barrow	1	59	68
Bentham	5	41	50
Bishop's Cleeve	44	2	2
Boddington	4	49	58
Brockhampton	7	31	39
Buckland	2	55	64
Chaceley	5	41	50
Chargrove	9	36	19
Charlton Abbotts	1	59	68
Coombe Hill	17	15	22
Deerhurst	6	38	47
Deerhurst Walton	7	31	39
Didbrook	4	49	58
Down Hatherley	13	20	27
Dumbleton	8	29	37

Settlement	TOTAL SCORE / 48	URBAN FRINGE MODIFIED RANK	OVERALL RANK
Tewkesbury	45	1	1
Bishop's Cleeve	44	2	2
Winchcombe	41	3	3
Highnam	34	4	7
Stoke Orchard	24	5	10
Woodmancote	25	5	10
Shurdington	23	7	12
Twyning	23	7	12
Gotherington	22	9	16
Maisemore	22	9	16
Twigworth	19	11	19
Alderton	18	12	20
Greet	18	12	20
Minsterworth	17	14	22
Ashleworth	17	14	22
Coombe Hill	17	14	22
Tredington	15	17	25
Toddington (incl, New Town)	15	17	25
Down Hatherley	13	19	27
Elmstone Hardwicke	12	20	29
Gretton	12	20	29
Norton	12	20	29

Settlement	TOTAL SCORE / 48	URBAN FRINGE MODIFIED RANK	OVERALL RANK
Elmstone Hardwicke	12	21	29
Fiddington	11	24	32
Forthampton	7	31	39
Gotherington	22	10	16
Great Washbourne	0	65	74
Great Witcombe	6	38	47
Greet	18	13	20
Gretton	12	21	29
Hardwicke	7	31	39
Hasfield	1	59	68
Hawling	1	59	68
Highnam	34	5	7
Laverton	3	54	63
Little Witcombe	7	31	39
Maisemore	22	10	16
Minsterworth	17	15	22
Norton	12	21	29
Oxenton	5	41	50
Pamington	5	41	50
Prescott	2	55	64
Priors Norton	2	55	64
Sandhurst	7	31	39
Shurdington	23	8	12
Shuthonger	4	49	58
Snowhill	5	41	50
Southam	10	26	34
Stanton	5	41	50
Stanway	2	55	64
Staverton	10	26	64
Stoke Orchard	24	6	39
Teddington	6	38	12
Tewkesbury	45	1	1
64The Leigh	7	31	50
Tirley	5	41	34
Toddington (inc New Town)	15	18	50
Tredington	15	18	64
Twigworth	19	12	34
Twyning	23	8	10
Winchcombe	41	3	47
Wood Stanway	0	65	1
Woodmancote	24	6	39
Woolstone	1	59	3
Wormington	1	59	68

Settlement	TOTAL SCORE / 48	URBAN FRINGE MODIFIED RANK	OVERALL RANK
Apperley	11	23	32
Fiddington	11	23	32
Southam	10	25	34
Staverton	10	25	34
Chargrove	9	27	36
Dumbleton	8	28	37
Aston Cross	8	28	37
Brockhampton	7	30	39
Deerhurst Walton	7	30	39
Forthampton	7	30	39
Hardwicke	7	30	39
Little Witcombe	7	30	39
Sandhurst	7	30	39
The Leigh	7	30	39
Teddington	6	37	47
Great Witcombe	6	37	47
Deerhurst	6	37	47
Pamington	5	40	50
Oxenton	5	40	50
Snowhill	5	40	50
Stanton	5	40	50
Tirley	5	40	50
Badgeworth	5	40	50
Bentham	5	40	50
Chaceley	5	40	50
Didbrook	4	48	58
Alstone	4	48	58
Aston-on-Carrant	4	48	58
Boddington	4	48	58
Shuthonger	4	48	58
Laverton	3	53	63
Prescott	2	54	64
Buckland	2	54	64
Stanway	2	54	64
Priors Norton	2	54	64
Wormington	1	58	68
Charlton Abbots	1	58	68
Hasfield	1	58	68
Hawling	1	58	68
Woolstone	1	58	68
Barrow	1	58	68
Great Washbourne	0	64	74
Wood Stanway	0	64	74

