

Dear Planning Policy,

Please can you consider the below, in response to the consultation to the Settlement Hierarchy Assessment (dated February 2022). I apologise that this did not reach you by midday yesterday, but the e-mail was stuck in my outbox. I hope you can still consider my response.

1. At 1.3 higher tier settlements are more sustainable because residents have greater access to facilities without having to travel as far by car. Stockbridge has approximately 560 residents and because it is isolated, all outlying villages rely on car transport, and in many cases travelling as far as a 10 mile radius of Stockbridge. This does **not** fit the category of sustainably in my view.

2. At 3.1 (Methodology) it is noted that the criteria for assessing sustainable locations is not a precise science. It is also noted at 3.1 that the NPPF places weight on development being located at places that are sustainable which offer public transport choices. Stockbridge is not considerable sustainable in my view due to the minimal, and lack of, public transport services.

3. Greater consideration should be given to how development can help mitigate the climate emergency crisis, by promoting larger development in areas where there is less reliance on car transport i.e. those with frequent and adequate public transport, and those within walking distances of services and employment.

4. Stockbridge not been grouped with nearby settlements just as those in 3.9 have. Why?

5. In 4.5 It is noted that Tier 2 Settlements have 'All key facilities' but this is incorrect in the case of Stockbridge. Bus services are minimal, they do not run to take people to work and bring them home, and there are no buses on a Sunday which means that Stockbridge does **not** meet the definition of a 'good level of public transport'.

6. At 4.9 it states that Stockbridge has a secondary school, but it does not because this is located in Longstock.

7. It is my conclusion following research, and discussions with TVBC Policy that proper consideration has not been given to allocating Stockbridge a Tier 2 settlement, weighted against the lack of sustainability due to the poor public transport provision, and the reliance on private vehicle to access Stockbridge.

8. Draft settlement hierarchy. I do not agree at 5.1 that Stockbridge meets the criteria of Tier 2 of having all the key facilities, because it does **not** have a 'good' level of public transport, as per the report's definition.

9. it has been confirmed by TVBC Policy treats both NHS and private dentist's are considered a 'key service'. I feel that this is very wrong because a medical facility that is private only will not be available to those on low incomes by virtue of being private. Services should **not** be considered if they are only available to those on higher incomes, and should only be considered 'key' when they are available to all, regardless of incomes. To put it another way, a settlement containing a private school, a private dentist and a private GP could not be considered as 'key' services for the purposes of settlement and planning policies written by the borough council because they would only be accessible by a portion of the settlement, and not by all.

10. I do not agree with TVBC's confirmation that a 'takeaway' should be considered both (a) a takeaway restaurant in the traditional sense that it does not sell food for consumption on the

premises, or (b) a pub/restaurant that might sell food to be consumed off the premises as well as on the premises. For accuracy, there should be a distinction between (a) being a 'takeaway' and (b) being 'has takeaway facilities'.

11. The facilities contributed to Longstock are incorrect. I haven't looked at the other settlements, but because the secondary school located in Longstock was incorrectly allocated to Stockbridge (please see item 6 above), I looked at this assessment for comparison.

Longstock has a substantial Waitrose shop and so it should score '1' and not '0' as a key facility. Longstock also has a cafe/restaurant and would also score '1' and not '0' for this. The Leckford Estate is located in Longstock and it has a Waitrose food shop and a cafe/restaurant at the same site, alongside a garden centre. The estate sells takeaway food and drinks though it's two on-site cafes, which would score Longstock a '1' and not '0'. Longstock is currently assessed as (Key facilities, Other facilities and Public transport) 4/3*/M. The result **should therefore be 5/5*/M** when including the above.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Lawrence

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]