

Test Valley Borough Council Consultation for Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 1

COMMENTS FORM

Test Valley Borough Council has published its Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 1 document for public consultation. This consultation document sets out draft strategic planning priorities for Test Valley supported by a number of strategic policies.

The consultation period runs from Friday 11 February to noon on 8 April 2022. Please respond before the close of the consultation period so that your comments may be taken into account.

You can respond to our consultation by filling out the form below. This form has two parts:

Part A: Your Details

Part B: Your Comments (please fill in a separate sheet for each comment you wish to make)

Further information can be found on our website at:

www.testvalley.gov.uk/localplan2040

Once the form has been completed, please send to [REDACTED] by **noon on 8 April 2022**.

Following receipt of your comments from, we will keep you informed of future consultation stages unless you advise us that you want to opt out of such communication.

If you are unable to send via email, please send a postal copy to our address below.

Contacting us

Planning Policy and Economic Development Service
Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
Andover
SP10 3AJ

Tel [REDACTED]

Website: www.testvalley.gov.uk/nextlocalplan

Email: [REDACTED]

Part A: Your Details

Please fill in all boxes marked with an *

Title* Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other (please state)	Mr	First Name*	Jacob
Surname*	Goodenough		
Organisation* (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Nova Planning		

Please provide your email address below:

Email Address*	[REDACTED]
-------------------	------------

Alternatively, if you don't have an email address please provide your postal address.

Address*	[REDACTED]	
	Postcode	[REDACTED]

If you are an agent or responding on behalf of another party, please give the name/company/organisation you are representing:

Mr Simon Diplock

Personal Details and General Data Protection Regulation

Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential. If you are responding as an individual, rather than as an organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email/postal address and telephone number) or signatures online, however the original representations will be available for public viewing at our offices by prior appointment. All representations and related documents will be held by the Council for a period of 6 months after the next Local Plan is adopted.

The Council respects your privacy and is committed to protecting your personal data. Further details on the General Data Protection Regulation and Privacy Notices are available on our website

<http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/aboutyourcouncil/accesstoinformation/gdpr>

Part B: Your Comments

Please use the boxes below to state your comments. Insert any general comments you may have that do not relate to a specific paragraph number or policy in the general comments box. For specific comments, please make it clear which paragraph, policy or matter your comments relate to where possible.

If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording.

If you are commenting on a document supporting the draft Local Plan (such as a topic paper, or the Sustainability Appraisal), please indicate so.

General

We are supportive of the revised approach to the Housing Market Areas and the proposals to define rural and urban sub-areas in northern Test Valley to reflect the high degree of self-containment of Andover and surrounding parishes, whilst recognising the distinction with the wider rural hinterland. It is considered that the parishes surrounding Andover which have the closest physical and functional relationship with the town should be included in the urban sub-area of northern Test Valley reflecting the sphere of influence of the town.

At this point in time we have no concerns over the approach the housing requirement and stated supply. However, this will need to be reviewed as the Local Plan emerges in terms of projected delivery from stated sources and considering the unmet needs of adjoining Local Authorities.

Our primary concerns lie with the approach to the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy, where the assessment work is based on outdated assumptions regarding sustainable location and sustainable patterns of development. With regard to service provision, the assessment work does not reflect the ways in which services are accessed and by extension the importance of superfast broadband provision. Similarly, the impacts of the Coronavirus pandemic that have accelerated change in working patterns are not reflected in the assessment work.

If the Spatial Strategy proceeds on the basis of these flawed assumptions, then sustainable rural villages, which are capable of accommodating reasonable growth without any harm, will see insufficient growth to sustain existing services and facilities. Affordability issues will persist and worsen over the plan period.

The Government's commitment to zero emission cars and vans by 2035 should radically change how we look at sustainability and it opens up opportunities to allocate housing and employment in areas which would traditionally have been seen as less sustainable locations. Where previously specific allocations were made in Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements only, we feel that the emerging Local Plan should look to extend this to Tier 3 settlements and the most sustainable settlements in Tier 4 as defined in the revised Settlement Hierarchy which accompanies this representation. This could be in the form of direct allocations or a Parish level housing allocation to be delivered via Neighbourhood Plans.

The Settlement Hierarchy recognises that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. This acknowledges that small villages may not perform particularly well when considered in isolation but that groups of villages that have a geographic and functional relationship can perform better when considered together. This is endorsed by the NPPF and we are supportive of this in principle.

However, the approach to settlement grouping has no clear methodology and appears to lack objectivity by being based upon a planning judgement. This sits at odds with the settlement hierarchy generally which otherwise adopts a rigid approach to the tiering of settlements. As a consequence, the approach to defining settlement groups is inconsistent. It also fails to appropriately acknowledge certain settlement groups within the Borough, thereby prejudicing these in the hierarchy. The methodology to define settlement groups needs to be reviewed and applied consistently across the Borough.

This is important to ensure that the spatial strategy can properly acknowledge the development needs of the settlement groups and their capacity to accommodate growth. This point was made through previous representations by Nova Planning on behalf of our client.

Our client, controls land on Dauntsey Lane, Fyfield, which has a close physical and functional relationship with the neighbouring villages of Kimpton and Thruxton which has not be recognised in the settlement hierarchy. Together these villages provide most of the 'Key Facilities' and are all benefitting from Superfast Broadband. This settlement group is also well related to the higher order settlement of Andover with good public transport connections here and to Salisbury. This is comparable to recent housing allocations around Andover such as Picket Twenty, Picket Piece and East Anton, which have experienced considerable growth and are considered part of the Tier 1 settlement of Andover. It is considered that the settlement group of Fyfield, Kimpton and Thuxton can accommodate a level of development in each settlement that would constitute organic growth, allowing the villages to retain their own distinct identity whilst helping to maintain the existing services and facilities within the group which are key to their overall sustainability. Our client's land at Fyfield is unconstrained. It is deliverable and developable in the short term, and it represents a suitable site for allocation in Fyfield.

Paragraph Ref	Specific Comments
2.26 - 2.28	<p>We agree with the emphasis placed on sustainable modes of transport but feel that this should also reflect the Government's commitment to zero emission cars and vans by 2035. To support this commitment and to enable rural areas to become more sustainable, we suggest that the Local Plan should adopt a Development Management policy seeking electric charging points for all new dwellings. This would have environmental benefits whilst making the travel by car or van at least as sustainable as public transport.</p> <p>Paragraph 105 of the NPPF notes that a flexible approach should be taken to this taking account of local circumstances.</p>
3.1 – 3.16	<p>Spatial Strategy</p> <p>The 'Spatial Strategy Topic Paper (Feb 2022)' identifies the options (Option A – F) considered by TVBC and sets out the rationale behind the suggested strategy for growth over the Plan period. It identifies the following key criteria against which all options are assessed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. whether they are consistent with national policy; 2. how they perform in terms of their sustainability as evidenced through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process; 3. their deliverability over the plan period; and, 4. the extent to which they address and meet identified local needs and priorities for Test Valley Borough (in relation to corporate objectives, our communities, and our economic and housing requirements). <p>Options B – F are considered worthy of consideration, but Option B (concentrating development at Transport Hubs) and Option F (dispersed growth) are not taken forward.</p> <p>We agree that Option B in isolation would not be appropriate on the basis that it aligns with only aspects of two of the key criteria above. However, the Topic Paper acknowledges that some of the transport hubs are provided in key settlements so there is an overlap with Options C and D, which are taken forward.</p> <p>The rationale for discounting Option F is set out at paragraph 4.7 of the Spatial Strategy Topic Paper, which states:</p> <p><i><u>"Dispersing future growth to all parishes (Option F) has emerged as an approach that is not preferred. While this option presents the greatest opportunities to contribute to supporting housing need across all communities and parishes, with opportunities for neighbourhood plans across all areas, it could also lead to development in locations that are not well served by a range of existing facilities, services and infrastructure, or sustainable travel networks. This approach is likely to result in a greater dependence on travel by private vehicles and presents</u></i></p>

fewer opportunities to utilise previously developed land. It therefore also has poorer implications for the mitigation of climate change and air quality, and could also impact the character and identity of settlements, as well as our rural environment and landscapes. This Option may present deliverability issues, particularly in the more sensitive rural areas of the Borough, including the AONB. It may also do less to support the viability and vitality of the town centres. It is therefore considered Option F is not an appropriate and sustainable option to take forward."

TVBC acknowledge that Option F presents the "greatest opportunities to supporting housing need across all communities and parishes". As such, this option performs better than all other options against one of the key criteria. However, it is discounted for two reasons: 1) a longstanding principle that sustainable development depends on avoiding reliance on car usage and in doing so reducing the associated environmental impacts, and; 2) the potential landscape impact of development in terms of settlement identity.

- 1) Sustainable Development - as noted above under 'Settlement Hierarchy', the Government has committed to ceasing the sale of petrol and diesel cars and vans will in 2030 and committing to a strategy to ensure that all new cars and vans will be fully zero emission by 2035. The process of change is well underway and by the midpoint of the emerging Plan period it is reasonable to assume that most vehicles will be fully zero emission. The implication of this change is that the environmental impacts associated with car usage will significantly reduce early in the plan period and cease to be relevant by the end of the plan period. On this basis the concerns regarding "climate change air quality" cited at Paragraph 4.7 appear to be largely misplaced or at least significantly overstated. Where traditionally there has been a legitimate reluctance to allocate development to smaller settlements (Option F) on environmental grounds, this should no longer be the case.
- 2) Landscape Sensitivity and Settlement Identity – Only a small portion of Test Valley falls within a protected landscape in accordance with paragraph 176 of the NPPF. This is to the north of Andover which is designated as AONB. As such, there is no grounds for concern in landscape policy terms for the vast majority of the land within borough. Settlement identity and landscape setting are clearly important factors for consideration but generally the villages within the rural areas of Test Valley are well separated and coalescence is not a relevant issue for most of the villages. Proportionate and organic growth can take place on the edge of villages without causing significant landscape harm. When considering settlement identity, the commentary in the Topic Paper fails to

consider the importance of existing facilities which form the built and social fabric of villages. Without sufficient growth these facilities will lack a balanced age profile and critical mass to be sustainable and consequently the identity of these villages will be compromised.

As an extension to the comments above, the provision of proportionate and organic growth in sustainable rural villages will address longstanding affordability issues that are the result of a lack of meaningful growth over the previous two plan periods. Paragraph 78 of the latest NPPF confirms that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. 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. The modest level of organic growth in these villages will also assist TVBC's in meeting the requirement to provide 10% of the housing requirement on smaller sites in accordance with paragraph 69 of the NPPF and to maintain a consistent housing land supply.

With these considerations in mind, a revised approach should be considered to incorporate a combination of Options C, D, E and F. It is appreciated that there is great diversity in the level of service provision amongst the Tier 4 villages, and whilst some of the smallest villages have very limited services, others perform well either alone or as part of a group and as such it is reasonable that proportionate growth should be allocated to the villages in Tier 4 of the revised Settlement Hierarchy presented in this representation relative to their level of service provision. This could be in the form of direct allocations or a Parish level housing allocation to be delivered via Neighbourhood Plans.

**3.19 –
3.35 &
Spatial
Strategy
Policy 1**

Settlement Hierarchy

The Settlement Hierarchy in the draft Local Plan has been established by the *Settlement Hierarchy Assessment (Feb 2022)*. The introduction of the assessment (Paragraph 1.3) states that

“Settlements that are in a higher tier of the hierarchy are more sustainable, as residents are able to access a greater range of services and facilities more easily without the need to travel as far by car”.

This is based on a longstanding principle that sustainable patterns of development depend on locating housing near facilities and employment provision – thus avoiding reliance on car usage and in doing so reducing the associated environmental impacts.

This approach may have been appropriate for the previous plan cycle, but behaviours have changed significantly since the adoption of the current Local Plan Review in terms of how people access services and facilities, and the way people work. Further significant changes will occur during the plan period in terms of how people travel and the environmental impact of travel. These factors are not reflected in the assessment and consequently the hierarchy is not considered to be sound.

Status of Facilities:

For the most part we agree that the '*Key Facilities*' as stated in the assessment remain important indicators of sustainability, as these facilities perform important social functions which underpin the vitality of communities, and these functions cannot be replicated by ecommerce. The exception to this is the emphasis placed on '*Public Transport*' which should sit outside of the '*Key Facilities*' section and be weighted on the basis of the presence or absence of the individual key services/facilities, i.e. if the key facilities are present in a given settlement, then the provision of public transport is less important as there is no reliance on public transport to access these key services/facilities.

Under '*Other Facilities*', a number of the facilities/services quoted represent duplicate provision as opposed to additional provision, i.e. '*other shop*', '*shop with post office*', '*other educational facility*' and '*other medical facility*'. The fact that a given settlement may have two convenience stores does not automatically mean it is more sustainable than a settlement with one convenience store and the same is true of the other facilities/services. The key indicator is whether the day-to-day needs are met, and this is suitably covered within the '*Key Facilities*' section.

Another issue is the assumption that all of the '*Other Facilities*' are accessed in person. This may have been the case for the previous Local Plan cycle, but technology has changed how people access services. A large proportion of the population already access many of these services/facilities virtually and this is an increasing trend. This includes a significant shift towards online retail (inc. grocery shopping), online food delivery and online medical consultations. These behaviour patterns were already well established, and the Coronavirus pandemic has accelerated this pattern. The consequence of this change in behaviour is that less emphasis should be placed on the proximity of the physical infrastructure that provide these facilities and services and more emphasis should be placed upon the ability to access these facilities online, i.e. '*Superfast Broadband*' provision being the key indicator of online access. In this respect, we feel that the presence of superfast broadband should be included as one of the '*Key Facilities*', with the comparative value attributable to the '*Other Facilities*' reduced, many of which are increasingly accessed online.

Reliance on car usage and associated environmental impacts

The assessment explicitly links sustainability and car usage, with an assumption that increased car usage results in a less sustainable location. The benefit of public transport also appears to be predicated on this assumption.

With regard to the general rationale on car usage within the assessment, it is important to note that the Government has committed to cease the sale of petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2030, with an additional commitment that all new cars and vans will be fully zero emission by 2035. It is reasonable to assume on this basis that the majority of new and an increasing proportion of existing car journeys will be undertaken by low or zero emission vehicles by 2030. Indeed, the process of change is well underway and the implication of the change is that the environmental impacts associated with car usage will significantly reduce. Where traditionally there has been a legitimate reluctance to allocate development to smaller settlements on environmental grounds, this should no longer be the case. The draft plan does mention the implications of these issues at paragraphs 2.31 and 3.2 but this is presented as *'keeping this under review'* as opposed to positively planning for it. It is expected that development management policies will require proposals to make suitable provision for electric vehicles to support this transition. Acknowledgement in this shift should be reflected in the evidence base underpinning the spatial strategy for the Borough.

In terms of number of car journeys, the implication of the Coronavirus pandemic on working patterns is also an important consideration. The restrictions during the pandemic introduced the majority of the working population to home-working and technology evolved quickly to facilitate these arrangements. Whilst the restrictions eased, the behaviours and expectations of the working population have changed, with employees appreciating the work-life benefits of home-working and seeking to retain this arrangement going forward. Home-working has now become the norm for businesses who see the benefits of being able to access a wider employment market and benefitting from associated cost savings. An extensive survey was undertaken by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in August 2021 to understand post pandemic working patterns - *'Coronavirus (COVID-19) and future working from home plans'*. In response to the question regarding post pandemic working patterns, *'Where do you think you will work when you are able to return to your usual place of work?'*, 49% of respondents, all of whom worked outside of the home pre pandemic, confirmed that they would mostly work from home with only 6% of respondents confirming that they will return to their previous working arrangements outside of the home. This emphasises the change that has occurred and how it will be reflected in working patterns over the plan period. One of the key implications of this change is an inevitable reduction in journeys associated with commuting, which will further reduce car usage.

Grouping of Settlements

The *Settlement Hierarchy Assessment* considers settlement groups (Paragraph 3.9) where it states that:

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

This responds to paragraphs 79 and NPPF and we are supportive of the grouping of settlements in principle. However, the approach to settlement grouping has no clear methodology and appears to lack objectivity by being based upon a planning judgement. This sits at odds with the settlement hierarchy generally which otherwise adopts a rigid approach to the tiering of settlements. As a consequence, the approach to defining settlement groups is inconsistent. It also fails to appropriately acknowledge certain settlement groups, such as Fyfield, Kimpton and Thruxton for example. Failure to appropriately acknowledge these groups prejudices these settlements as individuals in the hierarchy and in doing so masks their collective potential to accommodate proportionate growth.

The methodology to define settlement groups needs to be reviewed and applied consistently across the Borough.

We have undertaken a review of the Settlement Hierarchy to reflect the comments above. This includes the following changes:

- Moving ‘Public Transport’ outside of ‘Key Facilities’
- Removal of duplicate services in ‘Other Facilities’
- Include ‘Superfast Broadband’ within ‘Key Facilities’
- A review of settlement grouping

This results in a revised Settlement Hierarchy as follows (an Excel file is provided separately to explain how settlements have been ranked).

Tier 1: Andover, Romsey

Tier 2: Charlton, Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorne, Nursling and Rownhams, Shipton Bellinger, Valley Park, Wellow, North Baddesley, Abbots Ann, Stockbridge

Tier 3: Braishfield, Broughton, Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford, The Wallops, West Tytherley

Tier 4: Ampfield, Appleshaw, Ashley, Awbridge, Barton Stacey, Bossington, Bullington, Chilbolton, Chilworth, East Dean, East Tytherley Enham Alamein, Facombe, Fyfield Kimpton and Thruxton, Grateley Station Palestine and Grateley, Houghton, King Somborne, Leckford, Linkenholt, Little Somborne, Lockerley, Longparish, Longstock, Michelmersh and Timsbury, Monxton and Ampport, Mottisfont and Dunbridge, The Pentons, Plaitford, Quarley, Smannell, Tangley Hatherton Wildern and Charlton Down, Up Somborne, Upton, Vernham Dean, West Dean, Weyhill, Wherwell

In summary, tier 1, 2 and 3 have access to all 'Key Facilities' including Superfast Broadband, with tier 1 settlements distinguished by their range of 'Other Facilities' and excellent public transport connectivity. Tier 2 and 3 settlements are distinguished from one another by the level of public transport connectivity. Tier 4 captures a great diversity of smaller settlements which are grouped in a single tier due to either a lack of 'Key Facilities' or superfast broadband.

**4.123 –
4.134**

The draft plan recognises the importance of strategic growth in sustainable villages, where local services and facilities can be sustained through a more balanced age profile and organic population growth. A good example of this is where schools have falling numbers, they are at risk of closure due to reduced economies of scale and ongoing reductions in Council funding. Indeed, this is evidenced by an ongoing consultation by Hampshire County Council regarding the potential closure of Hatherden School in Northern Test Valley due to declining pupil numbers making it unviable. The importance of properly acknowledging settlement groups that rely on one another to sustain key facilities is essential in this context.

Sympathetic developments within such areas would help to ensure that there are sufficient, affordable family homes that can help sustain communities and ensure that their vital services remain viable in the longer term.

As with other sections of the draft Local Plan, the approach to sustainable travel fails to reflect the Government's commitment to zero emission cars and vans by 2035. As set out above under 'Settlement Hierarchy' and 'Spatial Strategy'. Public transport remains an important part of the strategy to address the impacts of travel on Climate Change but the movement to zero emission car and van travel is likely to have a more substantial impact as it does not rely on a change in behaviour. The process of change is already underway and as such it would be more appropriate if TVBC's policies on sustainable travel positively plan for this ongoing change by acknowledging the benefits and putting forward policies to ensure that the infrastructure is available early in the plan period to facilitate the move to zero emission vehicles.

<p>Housing Need & Strategic Policy 6</p> <p>5.25</p>	<p>Housing Supply/Requirement</p> <p>A number of assumptions have been made regarding delivery from allocated and unallocated sites in the supply figures quoted at Paragraphs 5.22 – 5.23 of the draft Local Plan. This will need to be carefully reviewed as the emerging Local Plan is refined. Whilst at present the draft Local Plan states at paragraph 5.12 that there is no unmet need from neighbouring Local Authorities, this is in some cases a consequence of the respective Local Plan cycles of the respective authorities, and this will need to be reviewed carefully as the plan moves forward.</p> <p>We support the delivery of additional housing within Test Valley to provide a buffer against slower than anticipated delivery on larger sites such as Whitenap, which Test Valley has consistently relied on to deliver much of its housing need. The delivery of smaller sites would be consistent with government policy and guidance and allow smaller house builders to deliver housing more quickly where large sites can have considerable lead times and infrastructure requirements.</p>
--	--

Please use next page if necessary

What happens next?

All valid responses received within the consultation period will be acknowledged and you will be given a reference number. Please quote this number when contacting the Council about the Local Plan 2040. If you have an agent acting on your behalf, correspondence will be sent to your agent.

All responses received will be taken into account as part of the preparation of the Local Plan 2040.

Settlement	Key Facilities						Other Facilities															
	Shop	Pub	Primary school	Sports facility	Community Hall	Place of worship	Superfast broadband	Post office only	Café/ restaurant	Takeaway	Early years	Secondary school	Doctors	Dentist	Chemist	Allotment	Parks and open space	Indoor sport	Bank	Cashpoint	Public Transport	
Abbots Ann	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	M
Ampfield	0	1	1	1	1	1	N	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	H
Andover	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	H
Appleshaw	0	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	H
Ashley	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Awbridge	0	0	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	M
Barton Stacey	1	1	1	1	1	1	N	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	L
Bossington	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Braishfield	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	L
Broughton	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M
Bullington	0	0	0	1	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	H
Charlton	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	H
Chilbolton	1	1	0	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M
Chilworth	0	1	0	1	1	1	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	M
East Dean	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
East Tytherley	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	H
Enham Alamein	1	0	0	1	1	1	Y	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	H
Facombe	0	1	0	1	0	1	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fyfield, Kimpton & Thruxton	0	1	1	1	1	1	Y	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	H
Goodworth Clatford and Upper Clatford	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M
Grateley Station, Palestine and Grateley	0	1	1	0	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	H
Houghton	0	1	0	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	M
Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorpe	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	H
King's Somborne	1	1	1	1	1	1	N	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M
Leckford	0	0	0	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	M
Linkenholt	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	L
Little Somborne	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
Lockerley	1	0	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	H
Longparish	1	1	1	1	1	1	N	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M
Longstock	0	1	0	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
Michemersh & Timsbury	0	1	0	1	1	1	Y	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	L
Monxton and Ampert	0	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	H
Mottisfont and Dunbridge	0	1	0	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	H
The Wallops	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M
North Baddesley	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	H
Nursling and Rownhams	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	H
The Pentons	0	0	0	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
Plaitford	0	1	0	0	1	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	H
Quarley	0	0	0	0	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
Romsey	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	H
Sherfield English	1	1	0	1	1	1	N	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	H
Shipton Bellinger	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	H
Smannell	0	1	1	0	0	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	L
Stockbridge	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	M
Tangley, Hatherden, Wildhern and Charlton Down	0	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	L
Up Somborne	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
Upton	0	1	0	0	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	M
Valley Park	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	H
Vernham Dean	0	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	L
Wellow	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	H
West Dean	0	1	0	0	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	H
West Tytherley	1	1	1	1	1	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	H
Weyhill	1	1	0	0	1	0	Y	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	H
Wherwell	0	1	1	1	1	1	N	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	M

- Tier 1
- Tier 2 - all 5 Key facilities including SFBB and High PT
- Tier 3 - all 5 key facilities including SFBB and L/M PT
- Tier 4 - either not having 5 key facilities or SFBB