

## **Hambleton District Council**

# **Audit of Village Services & the Rural Settlement Hierarchy Report March 2017**

## **Contents**

1.0 Context

2.0 Methodology

3.0 Analysis of results

4.0 Scoring system

Annex A: 2014 Settlement Hierarchy

Annex B: Summary of settlement scores for 2014 and 2016 audit

## **1.0 Context**

- 1.1 The Settlement Hierarchy was developed to provide a spatial guide to the location of development and activities within the Local Development Framework (LDF). The position of a settlement within the hierarchy is determined by the number of services and facilities and access to public transport. The LDF spatial approach focuses new development within the most sustainable and accessible places, those with the most number of services and facilities and with the best access to public transport.
- 1.2 The district council is preparing a new Local Plan for the district which will set out how much land should be provided to accommodate the new homes and jobs that are needed within Hambleton up to 2035 and where this should be located. The preferred strategy within the emerging Local Plan is to support new development opportunities to meet the needs of local communities in the most accessible and sustainable villages according to the Settlement Hierarchy.
- 1.3 This report provides an update to the 2014 audit of village services report. It highlights changes in level of service provision within settlements identified through the 2016 audit of facilities. The audit only covered those settlements listed within the 2014 Settlement Hierarchy shown at Appendix A. Any changes to the Settlement Hierarchy may affect the spatial distribution of new development in the new Local Plan and this is the reason for updating the audit.

## **2.0 Methodology**

- 2.1 In spring 2016, the Council undertook an audit of facilities and services within each of the settlements within the Settlement Hierarchy. Surveys were sent to Parish Councils where their parish area included one or more of the settlements. The 2016 audit did not survey those settlements within the North York Moors National Park Boundary. North Yorkshire County Council provided Hambleton District Council information on changes to bus services within the settlements, highlighting those instances where there had been a gain or loss of bus services. This formed part of the audit. Information relating to availability of sports pitches, other outdoor sports areas, children play areas and casual recreation areas was provided by colleagues within the District Council and also formed part of the audit.
- 2.2 The results of the audit were input into a database which generates a sustainability score for each settlement. This determines the position of the settlement within the hierarchy. The scoring system used is the same as that used in 2014, subject to a couple of additional categories which are proposed. The proposed changes and reasons for these are set out in section 4.0 of this report.
- 2.3 The cut-off points (threshold) for each category within the Settlement Hierarchy remains the same as that used in 2014.

<p>Service Villages must have a score of 28 points and above Secondary Villages must have a score between 14 and 27 Other Villages are 13 points and below.</p>
---

### 3.0 Analysis of Results

#### Service Villages

- 3.1 Most of the existing Service Villages retained the highest scores within the audit. These scores range between 25 and 44.
- 3.2 The 2016 score shows that there have been some changes in scores within some of the Service Villages since the 2014 audit. **However, the changes are not sufficient to require a change in status within the Settlement hierarchy, with exception to Husthwaite (see below).** The majority of these marginal changes are due to reported changes in bus services. This information shows that Crakehall, Kirkby Fleetham, Hutton Rudby and Husthwaite villages have gained a bus service (outside of work hours) but no longer have a bus service in work hours (reduces overall score by 1). Linton on Ouse has retained the bus service in work hours and gained a bus service (out of hours) resulting in increase in score (by 1).
- Great Broughton has seen an overall reduction of 1 since 2014 due to a loss of the Methodist chapel (sold for residential use) but addition of hairdressers.
  - Morton on Swale has seen a reduction of 5 from 33 to 28. This is due to loss of post office and non-food shop (antiques shop).
  - Snape and Huby reported a playgroup/nursery in the 2016 audit which was not reported in 2014. This has increased each score by 6 (from 31 to 37 and from 28 to 34 respectively). Brafferton & Helperby reported loss of a playgroup / nursery which has reduced score from 39 to 33. However, see proposed changes in scoring for this facility in section 3.6 of this report which may affect scores going forward.
  - In addition to some changes in bus services in Husthwaite, the 2016 audit also shows loss of general convenience shop and pub (with possible re-opening at some point) and addition of youth club. This resulted in overall reduction in score from 31 to 24 which would trigger a change from Service Village to Secondary Village.
  - Great Ayton reported loss of youth club in 2016 which reduces score marginally by 2 (from 46 to 44).
- 3.3 It is considered appropriate to retain the existing defined Service Villages of Great Ayton, Great Broughton, Hutton Rudby, Brafferton/Helperby, Huby, Linton on Ouse, Stillington, Crakehall, Kirkby Fleetham, Snape, West Tanfield, Carlton Miniott, Topcliffe, Brompton, East Cowton and Morton on Swale. Based on change in score alone, the results would see Husthwaite change from Service to Secondary Village. Consideration of this is needed.
- 3.4 The results of the audit on scoring services alone suggest that Appleton Wiske (score of 38), Alne (score of 28) and Tollerton (score of 34) which are currently Secondary Villages, could become Service Villages. However, the primary basis for the designation of Service Villages is that they currently have the best range of services and public transport to their Service Centre, based on the results of the audit. These villages have a school, a food shop, a community hall, sports and recreation facilities and a bus to a Service Centre arriving before 9am and returning after 5pm, thus

allowing journeys to work. Appleton Wiske does not have a bus service in work hours which is a requirement for Service Villages. Alne does not have a food shop and Tollerton does not have a school, both of which are requirements of Service Villages. As a result, these three settlements remain as Secondary Villages.

### **Secondary Villages**

- 3.5 With exception to Appleton Wiske, Alne and Tollerton mentioned above, existing Secondary Villages generally scored between 27 and 14.
- 3.6 The 2016 score shows that there have been some changes in scores within some of the Secondary Villages since the 2014 audit. The majority of these are small changes. **The changes are not sufficient to require a change in status within the Settlement hierarchy according to the thresholds shown in paragraph 2.3.** This is with exception to Scruton and Borrowby and these circumstances are discussed below.
- The 2014 audit for Scruton identified a children's pre-school playgroup. This closed in 2015 and was therefore not included in the 2016 audit. Under the current scoring system, this reduces the score from 17 in 2014 to 11 (loss of 6 points). However, on reflection, it is suggested that a playgroup / nursery should not score the same as a primary school. It is proposed that the score for playgroup / nursery is reduced to 3 and the scoring system amended to reflect this. This would see Scruton retained as a Secondary Village. See further proposals for amendments to the scoring system in section 4.
  - Borrowby does not have a primary school within the settlement but children attend school in Knayton which is very close. The school was included as a facility in 2014. It is proposed that the sustainability of Borrowby is influenced by the proximity of a school in Knayton and it is suggested that the school should still be counted (this would see the score for Borrowby remain as 28).

See other changes below:

- The score for Shipton seemed to reduce from 28 to 25, however on further review of this, it is clear that there has not actually been any changes in services within the settlement. In the 2014 audit, a non-food shop and petrol filling station were included (with a combined score of 3). However, it was realised in the 2016 audit that the petrol filling station and shop are not within the settlement and these services are not accessible via footpath. Therefore, they should not be included in the score. The correct score for Shipton remains at 25 (Secondary village).
- The score for Burneston has increased from 20 to 25 and this is due to the reporting of the availability of a playgroup / nursery in 2016 audit which increases the score by 6. This does not trigger a change in position within hierarchy. However, as mentioned in paragraph 3.6 above, it is proposed that a playgroup/nursery should no longer be allocated a score of 6. It is proposed that the score for playgroup / nursery is reduced to 3. If this approach is adopted then the score will not see such an increase. The 2014 audit also identified an outdoor sports area for Burneston, however, the 2016 review shows there is no such facility in the village (only a school playing field). This reduces the score by 1.

- The score for Great Smeaton has increased marginally from 18 to 20 due to the reporting of a casual recreation area in 2016 audit that was not reported in 2014 which increases score by 1 and the review of bus services indicates there is now a bus service operating outside work hours which increases score by 1.
- The score for Knayton increased marginally from 22 to 24. In the 2016 audit for Knayton, the district council identified outdoor gym equipment and an equipped child play area as additional facilities which are available to residents of the village at the nearby Hillside Rural Activities Park. These were not identified in 2014 and account for the increase in score.
- The score for Sandhutton has decreased from 17 to 10. In the 2014 audit, a petrol filling station was included, however, the 2016 audit confirmed that this is only a garage (without the petrol filling station) and so this has reduced the score by 2. In 2014, the Council included a sports ground pitch as being available in the village, however, the 2016 review of facilities has confirmed that there is no open space meeting this criteria within the village. This partially accounts for the reduced score even though there is no actual change in availability of a sports ground pitch. The 2014 audit also identified a convenience shop within the outbuildings of the local pub, however the 2016 update confirms that the shop is no longer open and this also contributes to the reduction in the score. The review of bus services shows Sandhutton has a service to York before 9am and returning after 5pm, this was not accounted for in 2014 and increases the settlement score by 2. However, overall the score has reduced and this is largely due to the loss of the shop.
- South Otterington has seen a reduction in score by 1 and this is due to loss of an outdoor sports area. The facility was available on North Yorkshire police grounds but the site is now being sold for other uses.
- East Harlsey has reported loss of youth club resulting in change in score from 17 to 15.
- Alne has seen reporting of a restaurant in 2016. If the new scoring category is adopted, then this would see score increase of 2 (from 26 to 28).

### **Other Settlements**

- 3.7 The 'Other' settlements scored between 0 and 13. There have been a few marginal changes in scores.
- The score for Balk has reduced by 2. However, the football pitch, child play area and skate-park are actually located within Bagby and therefore should not contribute to the score for Balk. There are no actual changes to facilities in Balk.
  - The score for Kirkby-in-Cleveland has reduced by 1. However, the sports ground pitch is located within Great Broughton and therefore should not contribute to the score for Kirkby. There are no actual changes to facilities in Kirkby-in-Cleveland.
  - The score for Kirklington has reduced by 4. This is due to a mobile post office reported in the 2014 audit. However, this was not counted in 2016 as it is not a permanent facility. There are no actual changes to facilities in Kirklington.

- The score for Nether Silton has reduced by 2 and this is due to loss of village hall which is now in private use.
- The score for Newby Wiske has reduced by 1. This is due to loss of availability of sports ground at police head-quarters.
- The score for Over Dinsdale has reduced by 2. However, there has been no change in facility. The church included in the 2014 audit is actually located in Low Dinsdale and so is not included in score for Over Dinsdale.
- Thornton-le-Beans score has increased by 3. The district council has identified a child playing area in the village which was not accounted for in the 2014 audit and the village has gained a bus service in work hours.
- Hutton Sessay is an 'other' settlement. There is a shop at the local caravan site which was categorised as a General Convenience Shop in the 2014 audit. However, it is now understood that this shop is only open during the caravan season and therefore it should not attract a score. This reduces the score for Hutton Sessay from 9 to 3. This does not change the position in the hierarchy.
- Review of bus services shows Aldwark, Flawith and Great Busby have gained a bus service (out of hours) but lost a bus service in work hours reducing their scores by 1. Updated bus information also shows Myton on Swale and Newton on Ouse have retained the bus service in work hours and gained a bus service (out of hours) which increase their scores by 1. Thornton le Beans has gained a bus service in work hours (increasing score by 2). Tholthorpe has gained a bus service (out of hours).
- Felixkirk and Nether Silton have reported loss of public hall leading to small reduction in scores. Kirkby Wiske has reported addition of public hall resulting in increase in score from 6 to 8.
- Potto has reported loss of playgroup/nursery and addition of public hall. This has resulted in reduction in score from 12 to 8. However, if the proposed amendment to the score for playgroup/nursery is adopted (see section 3.6 of this report), this will result in a marginal reduction in score.
- Brandsby has reported addition of playgroup/nursery, however if the proposed amendment to the score for playgroup/nursery is adopted (see section 3.6 of this report), this will result in a smaller increase.
- Seamer has reported loss of non-food shop resulting in minor change to score.
- Upsall has reported loss of public hall resulting in reduction in score from 2 to 0.
- Low Worsall has seen loss of petrol filling station resulting in reduction of score from 9 to 7.
- Rudby has reported a loss of place of worship in 2016 audit, resulting in reduction of score from 4 to 2.

3.8 **None of the above changes within 'other' settlements have been sufficient to trigger a change in the position of the settlement within the hierarchy according to the thresholds shown in paragraph 2.3.**

3.9 However, proposed amendments to the scoring system and the rationale for these changes are set out in section 4 of this report. If the amended scoring system is adopted, this would result in a few other changes in score, none are sufficient to trigger a change in position within the hierarchy, with exception to Tholthorpe (see below).

3.10 Tholthorpe is an 'other' settlement. Since, 2014, there has been the addition of a small shop in the local pub, providing daily essentials and fresh bakery products. Such a facility does not fit within the existing categories within the scoring system. A possible approach for accounting for new facilities such as this is set out below.

#### **4.0 Scoring System**

4.1 It is suggested there are a couple of amendments to the scoring system to reflect changing patterns of the way in which facilities are provided within smaller settlements. Currently, there are some facilities that are not accounted for in the current scoring system and no score is attributed to them. However, it is recognised that such facilities do add to the vitality and viability of settlements and so it is proposed they should be reflected within the scoring system.

4.2 For example, the inclusion of a small shop within the local village pub or inclusion of a post office within the village shop or pub, is one way in which the viability of such facilities may be maintained in smaller villages. The offer and opening hours may be limited but they do provide some basic grocery essentials. This has been seen in Tholthorpe where there is now a small shop within the pub providing daily essentials and fresh bakery products, available during pub opening hours. It is recognised that this should not score the same as a 'General Convenience Store' but that a score should be allocated to this facility as it does improve the availability of some essential provisions locally within the village, albeit within restricted opening hours. It is proposed that such a facility should be categorised as 'Other Convenience Shop' and should score 3 (half that of a 'General Convenience Shop'). Similarly, if a stand-alone General Convenience Store in a village has restricted opening hours, it is proposed this would also score 3 instead of 6. There are cases where a post office is available in the village pub to maintain the viability of the post office. and this can mean access to the post office is limited. This means access to the post office is restricted to pub opening hours. Ingleby Arncliffe is an example of this. However, it can be argued that reduced opening hours for a post office has comparatively less of an impact on local residents than limited access to essential groceries. It is therefore proposed that a post office will continue to score 4 irrespective of opening hours.

4.3 Survey results from villages also show that there are settlements which have 'Other Food Shops' such as a bakery, butcher or fish and chip shop which do not fit within an existing category in the scoring system. Tholthorpe is also an example of a settlement that has a butchers and Stillington has a fish and chip shop. It is proposed that these 'Other Food Shops' should be recognised and be allocated a score of 2. It is proposed that 'Other Non-food shops' will continue to score 1. It is also recognised that a café or restaurant (eatery) adds to vitality of a village and could be allocated a score of 2.

4.4 The above changes to the scoring system are recommended for reasons set out above. If the changes are adopted the following settlements scores would be affected as follows:

- The score for Tholthorpe would increase from 9 to 14 taking it marginally over the threshold for 'other' settlements into the Secondary Village category. Consideration of this change is needed.
- The score for Stillington which is a Service Village would increase from 42 to 44. This would not affect the position in the hierarchy.
- Exelby which is an 'other' settlement has a shop within the pub which has been categorised as a General Convenience Store, scoring 6. In the revised scoring system, this shop would be allocated a score of 3 reducing the score for Exelby from 10 to 7. This would not affect the position in the hierarchy.

4.5 If the proposed change in scoring for playgroup / nursery is adopted as suggested in section 3.6 of this report, this would see Scruton retained as a Secondary Village.

4.6 The scoring system is shown below. This highlights the additional categories and associated scores which this report suggests are needed. It also highlights the proposed amendment to the score for play group / nursery.

**Table 1: Scoring System**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>Score</b>
Post Office	4
General Convenience Store	6
Other Convenience Shop (providing limited range of convenience goods / restricted opening hours, eg shop within pub or post office)	3
Other Food Shop (eg, butcher, bakery, fish & chip shop)	2
Café or restaurant	2
Other Non-Food Shop	1
Public House	2
Petrol Filling Station	2
Playgroup/Nursery	3
Primary School	8
Public Hall	2
Place of Worship	2
Youth Club	2
Doctors Surgery	6
Sports Ground	1
Children's Play Area	1
Casual Recreation Area	1
Bus to Service Centre before 9 and returning after 5	2

- 4.7 If the new scoring system is adopted this does take the score for Tholthorpe over the threshold into Secondary village. As part of the new Local Plan preparation process, the preferred policy approach is not to allocate sites for development in 'other' settlements. If Tholthorpe is moved in to Secondary Village status, then allocation of sites is a consideration. It may be necessary to consider whether any sites submitted in this settlement as part of the Call for Sites process are deemed suitable.
- 4.8 There are no other changes to the position of settlements within the hierarchy as a result of the 2016 audit of facilities. With exception to Tholthorpe, the 2014 Settlement Hierarchy shown at Appendix A remains unchanged.
- 4.9 It is worth noting however, that if the changes to the scoring system are adopted and included within the next audit of village facilities which is circulated to parish councils, more information may come forward in response to this, which may result in some small changes to scores. Timing of any future audit is not yet known.
- 4.10 A summary of settlements showing the score for 2014 audit and 2016 audit is shown at Annex B.

## **5.0 Adjoining Settlements**

- 5.1 As part of the recent review of facilities within settlements, it is also proposed that Hutton Rudby and Rudby should be considered as one settlement. Hutton Rudy is currently identified as a Service Village and Rudby as an 'other' settlement. However, given the proximity between the two villages, and the accessibility of a range of facilities within Hutton Rudby, it is proposed that they could be identified as Hutton Rudby (with Rudby) within the Service Village category of the hierarchy. This requires some consideration.

## Annex A: Settlement Hierarchy 2014

Service Centres				
Northallerton (with Romanby)	Thirsk (with Sowerby)	Bedale (with Aiskew)	Easingwold	Stokesley
Service Villages				
Brompton East Cowton Morton on Swale	Carlton Miniott Topcliffe	Crakehall Kirkby Fleetham Snape West Tanfield	Brafferton/Helpbury Huby Husthwaite Linton on Ouse Stillington	Great Ayton Great Broughton Hutton Rudby
Secondary Villages				
Appleton Wiske East Harlsey Great Smeaton West Rounton	Bagby Borrowby Dalton Knayton Pickhill Sandhutton Sessay South Kilvington South Otterington	Burneston Leeming Leeming Bar Scruton Thornton Watlass Well	Alne Crayke Raskelf Shipton Sutton on the Forest Tollerton	Crathorne Ingleby Arncliffe
Other Settlements				
Ainderby Steeple Danby Wiske Deighton East Rounton Ellerbeck Great Langton Hornby Kepwick (part NYMNP) Low Worsall Nether Silton (part NYMNP) Over Dinsdale Over Silton (part NYMNP) Streetlam Thimbleby (part NYMNP) Thrintoft Welbury Yafforth	Ainderby Quernhow Balk Carlton Husthwaite Catton Cowesby (part NYMNP) Felixkirk Great Thirkleby Holme Howe Hutton Sessay Kilburn (part NYMNP) Kirby Wiske Little Thirkleby Maunby Newby Wiske Sinderby Skipton-on-Swale Sutton under Whitestonecliffe Thirlby (part NYMNP) Thornton-le-Beans Thornton-le-Moor Thornton-le-Street Upsall	Burrill Carthorpe Clifton on Yore Exelby Firby Gatenby Great Fencote Hackforth Kirklington Langthorne Little Fencote Londonderry Nosterfield Sutton Howgrave Theakston Thirn Thornborough	Aldwark Alne Station Brandsby Farlington Flawith Myton-on-Swale Newton-on-Ouse Oulston Skewsby Stearsby Tholthorpe Thormanby Whenby Yearsley	Easby Great Busby Kirkby in Cleveland Middleton-on-Leven Newby Picton Potto Rudby Seamer Tame Bridge

## Annexe B: Summary of settlement scores for 2014 and 2016 audit

Settlement ID	<i>SubArea</i>	<i>Hierarchy</i>	Settlement	2014 Sustainability	2017 Sustainability	Difference 2014 - 2017 Scores
3	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Brompton</b>	31	31	0
4	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Carlton Miniott</b>	38	38	0
5	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Crakehall</b>	40	39	-1
6	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Dalton</b>	20	20	0
8	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>East Cowton</b>	31	31	0
9	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Great Ayton</b>	46	44	-2
10	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Great Broughton</b>	34	33	-1
11	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Hustwaite</b>	31	24	-7
12	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Hutton Rudby</b>	44	43	-1
13	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Leeming Bar</b>	23	23	0
14	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Morton-on-Swale</b>	33	28	-5
16	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Shipton (does not meet SPATIAL PRINCIPLE 3)</b>	28	25	-3
17	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Snape</b>	31	37	6
18	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Stillington</b>	42	44	2
21	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>West Tanfield</b>	35	35	0
23	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Ainderby Steeple</b>	11	11	0
25	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Aldwark</b>	7	6	-1
26	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Alne</b>	26	28	2

27	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Appleton Wiske (does not meet SPATIAL PRINCIPLE 3)</b>	38	38	0
28	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Bagby</b>	14	14	0
29	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Balk</b>	4	2	-2
33	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Borrowby (does not meet SPATIAL PRINCIPLE 3)</b>	28	20	-8
34	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Brandsby</b>	5	11	6
36	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Burneston</b>	20	25	5
38	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Carlton Husthwaite</b>	7	7	0
40	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Carthorpe</b>	13	13	0
42	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Crathorne</b>	19	19	0
43	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Crayke</b>	24	24	0
47	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Danby Wiske</b>	7	7	0
48	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Deighton</b>	4	4	0
49	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Easby</b>	4	4	0
52	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>East Harlsey</b>	17	15	-2
54	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Exelby</b>	10	7	-3
55	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Felixkirk</b>	6	4	-2
56	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Flawith</b>	2	1	-1
57	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Gatenby</b>	0	0	0
61	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Great Smeaton</b>	18	20	2
62	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Hackforth</b>	13	13	0
63	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Brafferton &amp; Helperby</b>	39	33	-6
64	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Hornby</b>	3	3	0
65	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Huby</b>	28	34	6

68	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Hutton Sessay</b>	3	3	0
69	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Ingleby Arncliffe</b>	25	25	0
70	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Ingleby Greenhow</b>	21	0	-21
73	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Kirby Wiske</b>	6	8	2
74	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Kirkby-in-Cleveland</b>	8	7	-1
75	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Kirkby Fleetham</b>	28	27	-1
76	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Kirklington</b>	13	9	-4
77	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Knayton</b>	22	24	2
79	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Linton-on-Ouse</b>	35	36	1
82	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Myton-on-Swale</b>	4	5	1
83	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Nether Silton (part NYMNP)</b>	13	11	-2
85	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Newton-on-Ouse</b>	11	12	1
87	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Nosterfield</b>	4	4	0
89	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Pickhill</b>	15	15	0
90	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Picton</b>	3	3	0
91	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Potto</b>	12	8	-4
92	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Raskelf</b>	27	27	0
94	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Sandhutton</b>	17	10	-7
95	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Scruton</b>	17	11	-6
96	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Seamer</b>	7	6	-1
97	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Sessay</b>	19	19	0
99	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Skipton-on-Swale</b>	2	2	0

102	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>South Otterington</b>	22	21	-1
107	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Sutton Howgrave</b>	2	2	0
108	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Sutton-on-the-Forest</b>	25	25	0
109	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Sutton-under-Whitstonecliffe</b>	4	4	0
112	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Tholthorpe</b>	9	14	5
113	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thormanby</b>	6	6	0
114	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thornborough</b>	1	1	0
115	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Thornton Watlass</b>	16	16	0
116	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thornton-le-Moor</b>	5	5	0
118	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thrintoft</b>	2	2	0
119	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Tollerton (does not meet SPATIAL PRINCIPLE 3)</b>	34	34	0
120	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Service Villages</i>	<b>Topcliffe</b>	41	41	0
122	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Upsall</b>	2	0	-2
123	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Welbury</b>	6	6	0
124	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Well</b>	14	14	0
125	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>West Rounton</b>	15	15	0
129	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Yafforth</b>	4	4	0
436	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Ainderby Quernhow</b>	1	1	0
439	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Boltby</b>	4	0	-4
441	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Burrill</b>	3	3	0
442	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Carlton-in-Cleveland</b>	21	0	-21
443	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Catton</b>	0	0	0
445	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Clifton on Yore</b>	0	0	0

446	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Cowesby (part NYMNP)</b>	2	2	0
448	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Coxwold</b>	14	0	-14
450	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>East Rounton</b>	5	5	0
451	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Ellerbeck</b>	2	2	0
452	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Faceby</b>	14	0	-14
453	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Farlington</b>	7	7	0
454	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Firby</b>	1	1	0
455	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Great Fencote</b>	3	3	0
456	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Great Busby</b>	3	2	-1
457	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Great Langton</b>	4	4	0
458	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Holme</b>	0	0	0
459	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Howe</b>	1	1	0
460	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Kepwick (part NYMNP)</b>	2	2	0
461	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Kilburn (part NYMNP)</b>	9	9	0
462	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Kildale</b>	6	0	-6
463	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Kirby Knowle</b>	2	0	-2
465	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Langthorne</b>	1	1	0
466	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>Leeming</b>	23	23	0
467	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Londonderry</b>	3	3	0
468	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Low Worsall</b>	9	7	-2
469	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Maunby</b>	5	5	0
470	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Middleton-on-Leven</b>	3	3	0
472	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Newby</b>	3	3	0
473	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Newby Wiske</b>	2	1	-1

474	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Osmotherley</b>	36	0	<b>-36</b>
475	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Oulston</b>	4	4	<b>0</b>
476	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Over Dinsdale</b>	4	2	<b>-2</b>
477	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Over Silton (part NYMNP)</b>	2	2	<b>0</b>
479	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Sinderby</b>	3	3	<b>0</b>
480	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Skewsby</b>	2	2	<b>0</b>
481	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Secondary Villages</i>	<b>South Kilvington</b>	16	16	<b>0</b>
483	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Stearsby</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
484	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Streetlam</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
485	<i>NYM National Park</i>	<i>North York Moors National Park (NYMNP)</i>	<b>Swainby</b>	28	0	<b>-28</b>
486	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Tame Bridge</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
487	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Theakston</b>	1	1	<b>0</b>
488	<i>Northallerton</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thimbleby (part NYMNP)</b>	1	1	<b>0</b>
489	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thirlby</b>	2	2	<b>0</b>
490	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thirn</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
491	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thornton-le-Beans</b>	8	11	<b>3</b>
492	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Thornton-le-Street</b>	6	6	<b>0</b>
494	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Yearsley</b>	2	2	<b>0</b>
497	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Great Thirkleby</b>	6	6	<b>0</b>
498	<i>Bedale</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Little Fencote</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
500	<i>Thirsk</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Little Thirkleby</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>
506	<i>Stokesley</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Rudby</b>	4	2	<b>-2</b>
512	<i>Easingwold</i>	<i>Other Settlements</i>	<b>Alne Station</b>	0	0	<b>0</b>