

Cotswold District Settlement Role and Function Study

November 2025



COTSWOLD
District Council

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
	Background.....	1
	Policy Context	2
	Scope	2
2.	Population and Settlement Size	4
	Overview	4
	Population at settlement level	4
	Age at settlement level.....	6
	Summary.....	9
3.	Employment and Economic Activity	10
	Economic Activity Rate	10
	Workplace Population and Employment Density	12
	Travel to work patterns.....	14
	Summary.....	17
4.	Community Facilities and Services.....	19
	Overview	19
	Retail facilities and services	19
	Other facilities and services	21
	Accessibility Matrix.....	25
	Sustainable Transport Provision.....	27
	Summary.....	30
5.	Conclusion and Settlement Scoring	31
	Population and Settlement Size.....	31
	Employment and Economic Activity.....	33
	Community Facilities and Services	35
	Total Scoring	37

1. Introduction

Background

- 1.1 The main purpose of this Settlement Role and Function Study is to build up a picture of the settlements in Cotswold District, and how they relate to each other – their role and function. The study presents information across the themes of population and settlement size; employment and economic activity and community facilities/services. The conclusion outlines the role and function of the district's 49 largest settlements, recommending a hierarchy of Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Rural Settlements for the Council's Local Plan Update.
- 1.2 The identification of these different types of settlement promotes sustainable development by linking housing growth to the availability of jobs and services; therefore reducing the need to travel, supporting accessible housing for people with limited mobility, and supporting the vitality and viability of local facilities. The settlement hierarchy will inform the development strategy in the Local Plan Update. The development strategy will establish the requirements for different types of development and, along with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the supporting infrastructure. Development site allocations will also be made in accordance with the development strategy to meet those requirements.
- 1.3 All data related to the Census (2011 and 2021) or other data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) can be found on their NOMIS website <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk>.
- 1.4 Some statistical data used in this report is only available at 'Lower Super Output Area' (LSOA) level. These geographical areas are defined by the ONS as a means of presenting localised census data in a consistent way. These geographies are also used to present a range of national statistics, including labour statistics and indices of deprivation. LSOAs have a minimum size of 1,000 residents and 400 households. Because almost all LSOAs do not correspond exactly with individual settlement boundaries, it is not possible for this study to attribute figures precisely to specific settlements when using LSOA data. Instead, totals for each settlement have been estimated by aggregating the figures for all the LSOAs that cover/sit within each settlement. They must therefore be viewed on this basis, rather than exact.

Policy Context

- 1.5 Paragraph 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (NPPF) states local plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for meeting housing needs and addressing other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings.
- 1.6 We need to understand how our towns and villages currently work and function before we start to shape the future and set a strategy for determining the pattern, scale and design quality of future development, as required by NPPF paragraph 20. How our settlements currently function can give us clues about what we need to do in the future to deliver positive outcomes for our communities.
- 1.7 Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions; and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making (NPPF para 110).

Scope

- 1.8 The starting point for defining the settlements to be included in the study was the list of settlements in the previous Role & Function of Settlements Study (Cotswold District Council, July 2012). That study focussed on 33 settlements, of which 17 were included as Principal Settlements in the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan (2011-2031).
- 1.9 Settlements with a population of more than 300, but which had been excluded from the previous study for various reasons, have been added to the list of settlements to be assessed in this study. This is because their circumstances might have changed over the years. Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop and Quenington have been assessed as one settlement due to their close proximity to each other. Settlements with a population of less than 300 will be considered Rural Settlements in the settlement hierarchy.

1.10 The following 49 settlements have been (re)assessed:

Ampney Crucis	Eastleach	Poulton
Andoversford	Ebrington	Preston
Avening	Fairford	Quenington ²
Bibury	Great Rissington	Rodmarton
Bledington	Hatherop ²	Sapperton
Blockley	Kemble	Shipton
Bourton-on-the-Hill	Kempsford	Siddington
Bourton-on-the-Water	Kingscote	Somerford Keynes
Broadwell	Lechlade-on-Thames	South Cerney
Chedworth	Longborough	Stow-on-the-Wold
Chipping Campden	Meysey Hampton	Swell ¹
Cirencester	Mickleton	Temple Guiting
Coates	Moreton-in-Marsh	Tetbury
Coberley	Naunton	Upper Rissington
Coln St Aldwyns ²	North Cerney	Weston Subedge
Didmarton	Northleach	Willersey
Down Ampney	Oddington ³	Withington

¹ Covers both Upper and Lower Swell

² Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop and Quenington have been assessed as one settlement due to their close proximity to each other

³ Covers both Upper and Lower Oddington

2. Population and Settlement Size

Overview

- 2.1 Cotswold District's has a population of 91,100 (2021 Census), this is an increase of just under 8,000 compared to the previous Census in 2011. Despite this growth, the district remains mostly rural in nature. It has a low population density of 78 people per square kilometre, comparing with the England average being 438.
- 2.2 Residents have a median age of 48, compared to the UK figure of 41. The proportion of those aged 65 plus in Cotswold District is 26%, substantially higher than the current national average of 18.6%.

Population at settlement level

- 2.3 The population size of a settlement gives a first indication of its role and function in the area; a larger population often means more jobs, community facilities and services. However, this is not always the case, and the proximity of such things within easy travel distance may see settlements rely on each other for jobs and some services, with each playing a different role and function.
- 2.4 Table 1 shows the population for each assessed settlement, according to the 2021 Census data published by ONS at parish level, as well as the total number of dwellings in 2024. The latter figure has been computed from comparing 2011 Census data with the Council's yearly residential land monitoring reports⁴.

Table 1: Population and dwelling figures

Settlement	Population 2021	No of dwellings 2024
Cirencester	20,195	9,829
Tetbury	6,466	3,360
Moreton-in-Marsh	5,013	2,767
Fairford	4,281	1,955
Bourton-on-the-Water	4,213	2,121
South Cerney	3,988	1,879
Lechlade-on-Thames	3,127	1,509
Chipping Campden	2,379	1,470
Mickleton	2,214	1,071
Upper Rissington	2,013	815
Blockley	1,952	1,159
Northleach	1,946	947
Stow-on-the-Wold	1,900	1,414

⁴ <https://cotswold.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/evidence-base-and-monitoring/>

Settlement	Population 2021	No of dwellings 2024
Siddington	1,372	677
Kemble	1,178	531
Kempsford	1,164	481
Avening	1,113	483
Willersey	992	495
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	928	496
Andoversford	805	315
Chedworth	750	377
Ampney Crucis	632	297
Ebrington	612	336
Bibury	578	348
North Cerney	569	265
Down Ampney	566	261
Meysey Hampton	544	280
Withington	494	250
Longborough	489	299
Somerford Keynes	475	475
Coates	468	219
Bledington	464	244
Sapperton	448	203
Swell	432	236
Weston Subedge	414	234
Poulton	404	201
Temple Guiting	397	223
Oddington	396	233
Coberley	379	158
Didmarton	370	183
Shipton	361	167
Great Rissington	356	188
Naunton	354	194
Rodmarton	348	164
Preston	336	250
Broadwell	333	205
Eastleach	311	167
Bourton-on-the-Hill	305	219
Kingscote	305	126

Table 1 Colour Key:

Population 2022
Over 20,000
3,000 to 19,999
1,000 to 2,999
500 to 999
Less than 500

2.5 Cirencester is by far the largest settlement in the district with a population of over 20,000, more than triple the size of second-placed Tetbury with a

population of 6,466 and quadruple the size of third-placed Moreton-in-Marsh with a population of 5,013. Fairford, Bourton-on-the-Water, South Cerney and Lechlade-on-Thames also have a population of over 3,000. This is to be expected as these settlements have more defined centres and more employment opportunities and services.

- 2.6 The remaining top 15 largest settlements comprise Chipping Campden, Mickleton, Upper Rissington, Blockley, Northleach, Stow-on-the-Wold and Siddington. Siddington is adjacent to Cirencester and its population figure also includes residential developments in Cirencester that have spilled over the parish border into Siddington.
- 2.7 There are 17 settlements with a population over 1,000. These have the potential to be a Principal Settlement. However, this depends on their employment and economic offer as well as their accessibility to services and facilities, which is assessed further down in this study.
- 2.8 Ten of the settlements being assessed have a population under 1,000 but over 500. This includes the cluster of Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop and Quenington. These are all less likely to be considered Principal Settlements, however, they could still qualify depending on their employment and economic offer, and accessibility to services and facilities.
- 2.9 There are 22 settlements with a population under 500. These would not be considered for Principal Settlement status but could potentially be Non-Principal Settlements. This would again depend on their employment and economic offer, and accessibility to services and facilities.

Age profile of settlements

- 2.10 The age profile of a settlement can also be an indication of its role and function. For example, a high proportion of working age people could mean high levels of economic activity, lots of jobs, or that the settlement is within an easy commute to jobs elsewhere. A settlement that is attractive to families may show a high proportion of children and young people living there. Alternatively, a high proportion of older people could mean relatively low levels of economic activity.
- 2.11 Table 2 shows the age of the population for each settlement in three age groups, as set out in the 2021 Census data published by ONS. The figures are shown as percentages, which more clearly identify high and low concentrations of age ranges in a settlement.

Table 2: Age of population figures in percentages per category

Settlement	Aged 0 to 15	Aged 16 to 64	Aged 65+
Ampney Crucis	14.4%	59.7%	25.9%
Andoversford	19.5%	60.2%	20.2%
Avening	19.0%	58.0%	23.0%
Bibury	15.9%	58.5%	25.6%
Bledington	15.3%	53.7%	31.0%
Blockley	14.2%	57.4%	28.4%
Bourton-on-the-Hill	12.5%	57.4%	30.2%
Bourton-on-the-Water	17.4%	55.0%	27.6%
Broadwell	14.1%	58.0%	27.9%
Chedworth	15.5%	55.3%	29.2%
Chipping Campden	13.0%	50.1%	36.9%
Cirencester	15.7%	61.0%	23.4%
Coates	16.0%	61.5%	22.4%
Coberley	14.2%	69.4%	16.4%
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	17.0%	53.6%	29.4%
Didmarton	14.9%	53.8%	31.4%
Down Ampney	15.7%	54.6%	29.7%
Eastleach	14.5%	60.8%	24.8%
Ebrington	12.9%	56.4%	30.7%
Fairford	19.3%	56.3%	24.3%
Great Rissington	11.5%	63.8%	24.7%
Kemble	20.0%	58.1%	21.9%
Kempsford	16.6%	59.5%	23.9%
Kingscote	22.6%	53.4%	23.9%
Lechlade-on-Thames	14.4%	53.9%	31.7%
Longborough	13.9%	55.2%	30.9%
Meysey Hampton	11.8%	54.2%	34.0%
Mickleton	17.0%	52.6%	30.4%
Moreton-in-Marsh	16.8%	58.0%	25.2%
Naunton	12.1%	54.0%	33.9%
North Cerney	17.8%	60.6%	21.6%
Northleach	18.0%	55.8%	26.2%
Oddington	17.7%	55.6%	26.8%
Poulton	12.4%	58.2%	29.5%
Preston	13.1%	43.8%	43.2%
Rodmarton	16.1%	59.5%	24.4%
Sapperton	15.2%	60.0%	24.8%
Shipton	15.0%	63.2%	21.9%
Siddington	16.5%	56.0%	27.5%
Somerford Keynes	13.1%	58.3%	28.6%
South Cerney	17.7%	60.3%	22.1%
Stow-on-the-Wold	9.4%	51.6%	39.1%
Swell	14.4%	60.6%	25.0%
Temple Guiting	14.4%	58.2%	27.5%

Settlement	Aged 0 to 15	Aged 16 to 64	Aged 65+
Tetbury	16.8%	57.4%	25.8%
Upper Rissington	25.2%	65.7%	9.0%
Weston Subedge	12.1%	58.9%	29.0%
Willersey	15.0%	52.4%	32.6%
Withington	18.0%	60.5%	21.5%

Table 2 Colour Key:

Aged 0 to 15	Aged 16 to 64	Aged 65+
Over 20%	Over 60%	Over 40%
15 to 19.9%	55 to 59.5%	30 to 39.9%
10 to 14.9%	50 to 54.9%	20 to 29.9%
Under 10%	Under 50%	Under 20%

- 2.12 Upper Rissington is a notable result from Table 2, having both the highest proportion of inhabitants aged 0 to 15 and aged 16 to 64. Consequently, it has by far the lowest proportion of inhabitants aged 65+. This makes it only one of two settlements in the study where the aged 65+ group is below the national average of 18.6% and the only settlement in the study where this group represents less than 10% of the population. Upper Rissington had a large development approved in 2010 and has seen large growth since then. The construction of many family homes is likely to have attracted families with children, which in turn has had a strong influence on the age profile of the village.
- 2.13 Preston has the largest percentage of inhabitants aged 65+ (43.2%) and is also the only settlement with a working age population (16 to 64) of less than half of its total population. Of the larger settlements, both Stow-on-the-Wold and Chipping Campden have more than a third of the population falling in the 65+ category, with the former being the only settlement where the youngest age group (0 to 15) forms less than 10% of the population.
- 2.14 ONS also publishes population forecasts per age category. These estimates show the increase up to 2041 compared to the Census 2021 data. For the district, this data shows:
- The number of children and teenagers (aged 0-19) is projected to grow by around 16.5% (around 2,400 more people). But as a proportion of the overall population, this group will decrease by 1.3 percentage points (from 16.4% in 2021 to 15.1% in 2041).
 - The number of working-age adults (aged 20-64) is projected to increase by just 9.5% (4,935 more people), which proportionally represents a decline from 58% of the population in 2021 to just over half the population (51.5%) in 2041.

- The number of people aged 65 and over is expected to grow by nearly 57% (13,500 people) – substantially rising from 26.2% in 2021 to a third of the population (33.2%) in 2041.

2.15 If the ONS projections are broadly correct, by 2041, Cotswold District's number of residents aged 65+ will be more than double the number of children/teenagers, with working age adults accounting for about half of the population.

Summary

2.16 Cirencester is rightfully called the 'capital of the Cotswolds' as it is by far the largest settlement in the district, with a population three times the size of the second largest settlement.

2.17 In total there are 17 settlements with a population above 1,000 all of which are potential candidates for Principal Settlement status. However, their suitability will depend on their employment and economic offer as well as their accessibility to services and facilities, which is assessed further in the following chapters.

2.18 Of the remaining settlements assessed, ten have a population of between 500 and 1,000 and 22 settlements have a population under 500. These are more likely to be Non-Principal Settlements but could be Principal Settlements depending on their employment and economic offer as well as their accessibility to services and facilities. The study does not assess settlements with a population under 300. These settlements are all considered to be Rural Settlements.

2.19 An aging population which is already well above the national average when it comes to residents over 65 is one of the major challenges the district faces. However, the figures for Upper Rissington indicate that additional housing can attract a younger, economically active population.

3. Employment and Economic Activity

Economic Activity Rate

- 3.1 In terms of labour supply, Cotswold District has over 76,000 residents aged 16+, of which over 44,500 are economically active (Census 2021). This can be expressed as an Economic Activity Rate, which is the percentage of the population that is normally available to work (regardless of their actual employment status); or in other words, the total potential workforce.
- 3.2 For Cotswold District, this Economic Activity Rate is 59.8%, which is higher than the South West regional average of 59.5%, but lower than the national average of 60.9%. This is attributed to the average age of the population in the district, which is also higher than the national average. There will therefore be a higher proportion of retirees, which are not counted as being economically active.
- 3.3 The figure of 44,500 economically active people includes those who are unemployed but looking for work. The unemployment figure itself is low in Cotswold District at 2.1%, compared to 2.2% across the South West region, and the national figure of 3.7%.
- 3.4 Table 3 shows the Economic Activity Rate at settlement level based on the 2021 Census data.

Table 3: Economic Activity Rates by Settlement

Settlement	Residents aged 16+	Economically active	Economic Activity Rate
Upper Rissington	1,493	1,090	73.0%
Avening	865	560	64.7%
Rodmarton	136	88	64.7%
Kempsford	631	402	63.7%
Sapperton	192	121	63.1%
Coates	284	179	63.1%
Kemble	832	525	63.1%
Preston	220	139	63.0%
Great Rissington	268	169	63.0%
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	455	286	62.9%
Eastleach	203	127	62.6%
Kingscote	142	89	62.6%
Didmarton	455	285	62.6%
Andoversford	578	361	62.4%
Shipton	296	185	62.4%
Siddington	1,344	835	62.1%

Settlement	Residents aged 16+	Economically active	Economic Activity Rate
Moreton-in-Marsh	4174	2,561	61.4%
Fairford	3,715	2,274	61.2%
Ampney Crucis	478	291	60.9%
Bibury	488	297	60.9%
South Cerney	2,791	1,697	60.8%
Chedworth	649	393	60.6%
Withington	365	221	60.6%
Tetbury	5,566	3,361	60.4%
Cirencester	17,338	10,435	60.2%
Northleach	1535	921	60.0%
Coberley	147	88	59.6%
North Cerney	272	162	59.6%
Somerford Keynes	333	197	59.2%
Bledington	411	244	59.2%
Oddington	354	209	59.2%
Swell	352	208	59.0%
Naunton	298	176	59.0%
Temple Guiting	280	165	59.0%
Bourton-on-the-Water	3,576	2,098	58.7%
Bourton-on-the-Hill	270	156	58.0%
Broadwell	322	187	58.0%
Longborough	489	284	58.0%
Poultton	359	205	57.2%
Down Ampney	489	277	56.7%
Meysey Hampton	507	288	56.7%
Blockley	1,132	629	55.6%
Mickleton	1,830	1,011	55.3%
Willersey	887	481	54.2%
Weston Subedge	374	203	54.2%
Lechlade-on-Thames	2,690	1,448	53.8%
Ebrington	392	209	53.4%
Stow-on-the-Wold	1,724	861	49.9%
Chipping Campden	2,025	1,006	49.7%

Table 3 Colour Key:

Above National Average (60.9%)

Above Cotswold District Average but below National Average

Below Cotswold District Average (59.8%)

- 3.5 The figures show that the Economic Activity Rate is quite varied across the district. Settlements, such as Upper Rissington and Andoversford, which have a younger population, also have a higher Economic Activity Rate (76.3% and 68.7% respectively). While settlements with an older population (and therefore more people in retirement), such as Chipping Campden and Stow-on-the-Wold, have a much lower economic activity rate (50.8% and 50.1% respectively).

- 3.6 When compared to the national average of 60.9%, 16 of the assessed settlements have a higher Economic Activity Rate. 20 settlements have an Economic Activity Rate higher than the regional average of 59.5%. The three largest settlements in the district are all above the district average and more towards the national average with Cirencester at 60.4%, Tetbury at 60.5% and Moreton-in-Marsh even above the national average at 61.2%.

Workplace Population and Employment Density

- 3.7 ONS has also published Census 2021 data on the 'workplace population'. This identifies the number of people who work at specific settlements but who do not necessarily live there. The number of jobs in a settlement gives a good indication of its importance for employment.
- 3.8 The workplace population can then be compared to the number of economically active residents to show the balance of jobs and workers at settlements, known as the Employment Density. Those places with a good balance of jobs to workers are more sustainable as there is more opportunity for residents to work near to where they live. Of course, in reality, there will be many people travelling to and from settlements even where there is a reasonable match in the number of jobs to workers, for example to travel to jobs that match their skills. Despite this, Employment Density is still a good indicator to show how sustainable a settlement is for its employment offer.
- 3.9 Table 4 lists the Employment Density for each settlement. This figure shows whether the settlement is a net importer (figure below 100%) or net exporter (figure above 100%) of working people. A figure of 100% would mean there is the same amount of people working in the settlements as there are economically active people living in the settlement.

Table 4 Workplace Population and Employment Density per Settlement

Settlement	Workplace Population	Economically Active Population	Employment Density (jobs to workers)
Cirencester	11,789	10,435	88.5%
Tetbury	3,022	3,361	111.2%
Moreton-in-Marsh	2,401	2,561	106.7%
Bourton-on-the-Water	2,321	2,098	90.4%
South Cerney	1,972	1,697	86.1%
Fairford	1,969	2,274	115.5%
Chipping Campden	1,306	1,006	77.0%
Lechlade-on-Thames	1,158	1,448	125.0%
Stow-on-the-Wold	1,149	861	74.9%
Siddington	1,059	835	78.8%
Willersey	743	481	64.8%
Mickleton	725	1,011	139.5%

Settlement	Workplace Population	Economically Active Population	Employment Density (jobs to workers)
Upper Rissington	700	1,090	155.7%
Blockley	681	629	92.3%
Northleach	679	921	135.7%
Avening	503	560	111.3%
Kemble	407	525	129.2%
Kempsford	373	402	107.7%
Didmarton	357	285	79.9%
Chedworth	340	393	115.8%
Andoversford	319	361	113.2%
Weston Subedge	313	203	64.8%
Bibury	313	297	95.0%
Ampney Crucis	307	291	95.0%
North Cerney	301	162	53.8%
Coln St Aldwyns	297	286	96.3%
Hatherop			
Quenington			
Bledington	287	244	84.7%
Oddington	247	209	84.7%
Meysey Hampton	240	288	120.1%
Longborough	237	284	119.5%
Down Ampney	231	277	120.1%
Ebrington	230	209	91.0%
Swell	219	208	95.0%
Withington	191	221	115.8%
Somerford Keynes	188	197	104.9%
Naunton	185	176	95.0%
Poultton	176	205	116.8%
Temple Guiting	174	165	95.0%
Shipton	163	185	113.2%
Coberley	163	88	53.8%
Broadwell	156	187	119.5%
Preston	154	139	90.4%
Coates	139	179	129.2%
Bourton-on-the-Hill	131	156	119.5%
Eastleach	124	127	103.1%
Great Rissington	119	169	142.2%
Kingscote	111	89	79.9%
Sapperton	94	121	129.2%
Rodmarton	79	88	111.3%

Table 4 Notes and Key:

Net importer of workers
(below 100%)

Net exporter of workers
(above 100%)

An Employment Density of 100% would mean the same amount of people are working in the settlements as there are economically active people living in the settlement.

- 3.10 With a working population of over 11,500, Cirencester is by far the largest employment hub in the district, and with an employment density of around 88%, it is also providing jobs for the surrounding area. Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh, Bourton-on-the-Water and South Cerney also provide significant employment between 2,000 and 3,000 jobs. Fairford, Lechlade-on-Thames, Chipping Campden and Siddington provide between 1,000 and 2,000 jobs.
- 3.11 When it comes to employment density, 26 of the settlements assessed in this study have a larger economically active population compared to the workforce in the settlements. This is especially noticeable in Upper Rissington where the economically active population is more than a third larger than the amount of people working in the settlement, which is likely leading to increased levels of out-commuting.
- 3.12 On the other side of the scale, there are Willersey, Weston Subedge, Coberley and North Cerney with an employment density of less than 65% and therefore having a much smaller economically active population compared to the amount of people that work in those settlements. Higher levels of in-commuting are likely here.
- 3.13 Looking at the settlements with the six largest workplace populations, there does not seem to be a correlation between having a large workforce and having a high or low Employment Density. Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water and South Cerney are all net importers of workers, while Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh and Fairford are all net exporters of workers. However, this discrepancy is likely due significant housing growth but very limited additional employment growth, or even a loss of employment land to housing in the latter 3 settlements.

Travel to work patterns

- 3.14 The 2021 Census did not capture the levels and location of in-commuting. The 2011 Census data is still available on the Nomis website⁵, although this data is now 14 years old and therefore it is not guaranteed to still be applicable to the situation today.
- 3.15 However, the 2021 Census does hold information on the distance and mode of transport used by commuters. Table 5 shows the distance people commute per settlement. The Census data notes that although it was undertaken during the Covid pandemic, respondents were asked to choose the option that fitted their normal commuting pattern, the figures should therefore not be overly

⁵ <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/wu03uk/chart>

influenced by the Covid pandemic. The 'Other' column consists of people working abroad, offshore or do not have a fixed place of work.

Table 5: Commuting distance per settlement in percentage of the working population

Settlement	Home Working	Less than 2km	2km to less than 10km	10km to less than 30km	30km and over	Other
Ampney Crucis	48.1%	4.3%	13.2%	14.8%	6.2%	13.3%
Andoversford	46.8%	2.2%	11.1%	18.6%	6.2%	15.0%
Avening	46.4%	1.9%	15.1%	14.7%	7.7%	14.1%
Bibury	48.1%	4.3%	13.2%	14.8%	6.2%	13.3%
Bledington	44.6%	5.6%	12.6%	11.0%	10.6%	15.6%
Blockley	44.1%	5.1%	12.6%	14.0%	9.6%	14.5%
Bourton-on-the-Hill	44.1%	2.9%	15.1%	12.9%	9.8%	15.2%
Bourton-on-the-Water	30.5%	18.2%	8.6%	18.6%	6.6%	17.5%
Broadwell	44.1%	2.9%	15.1%	12.9%	9.8%	15.2%
Chedworth	47.8%	3.2%	7.3%	22.9%	5.6%	13.2%
Chipping Campden	41.1%	11.1%	9.9%	14.6%	9.4%	13.9%
Cirencester	32.1%	23.7%	8.9%	16.6%	5.2%	13.5%
Coates	32.7%	7.9%	8.2%	26.6%	8.9%	15.6%
Coberley	47.1%	2.5%	15.0%	16.0%	5.4%	13.9%
Coln St Aldwyns	39.1%	11.9%	10.1%	18.9%	5.8%	14.2%
Didmarton	48.0%	3.7%	10.2%	16.7%	7.2%	14.2%
Down Ampney	48.1%	0.6%	16.7%	15.2%	6.5%	12.8%
Eastleach	48.4%	2.6%	9.0%	17.2%	6.0%	16.8%
Ebrington	47.8%	5.2%	10.9%	13.8%	9.6%	12.6%
Fairford	34.4%	12.6%	8.9%	21.8%	7.0%	15.4%
Great Rissington	42.8%	1.6%	14.2%	18.0%	8.2%	15.2%
Kemble	32.7%	7.9%	8.2%	26.6%	8.9%	15.6%
Kempsford	39.0%	2.0%	9.6%	25.6%	9.6%	14.2%
Kingscote	48.0%	3.7%	10.2%	16.7%	7.2%	14.2%
Lechlade-on-Thames	40.2%	5.5%	7.5%	23.9%	8.6%	14.3%
Longborough	44.1%	2.9%	15.1%	12.9%	9.8%	15.2%
Meysey Hampton	48.1%	0.6%	16.7%	15.2%	6.5%	12.8%
Mickleton	42.0%	3.4%	12.4%	16.6%	11.7%	13.9%
Moreton-in-Marsh	32.1%	12.6%	11.4%	16.7%	11.5%	15.6%
Naunton	46.8%	5.0%	9.2%	14.6%	9.2%	15.2%
North Cerney	47.1%	2.5%	15.0%	16.0%	5.4%	13.9%
Northleach	38.3%	6.2%	9.0%	23.4%	6.4%	16.9%
Oddingtons	44.6%	5.6%	12.6%	11.0%	10.6%	15.6%
Poulton	48.1%	1.0%	16.3%	15.2%	6.5%	12.9%
Preston	27.3%	29.9%	9.0%	14.3%	5.9%	13.5%
Rodmarton	46.4%	1.9%	15.1%	14.7%	7.7%	14.1%
Sapperton	48.3%	1.4%	18.1%	16.0%	5.5%	10.7%
Shipton	46.8%	2.2%	11.1%	18.6%	6.2%	15.0%
Siddington	39.0%	12.0%	13.1%	18.1%	5.5%	12.3%
Somerford Keynes	48.3%	1.4%	18.1%	16.0%	5.5%	10.7%
South Cerney	40.2%	5.4%	17.4%	17.7%	5.5%	13.7%
Stow-on-the-Wold	29.3%	15.7%	12.2%	14.0%	8.6%	20.2%

Settlement	Home Working	Less than 2km	2km to less than 10km	10km to less than 30km	30km and over	Other
Swell	46.8%	5.0%	9.2%	14.6%	9.2%	15.2%
Temple Guiting	46.8%	5.0%	9.2%	14.6%	9.2%	15.2%
Tetbury	38.2%	12.1%	11.2%	18.0%	6.9%	13.7%
Upper Rissington	39.6%	2.1%	14.3%	19.8%	8.8%	15.3%
Weston Subedge	41.3%	4.6%	15.1%	17.2%	6.9%	14.9%
Willersey	41.3%	4.6%	15.1%	17.2%	6.9%	14.9%
Withington	47.8%	3.2%	7.3%	22.9%	5.6%	13.2%

Table 5 Colour Key: Over 20% 15 to 19.9% 10 to 14.9% 5 to 9.9% Under 5%

- 3.16 At a district level, 39.1% of people in employment in Cotswold District work from home and 10.7% live within easy walking distance (less than 2km) of their working place. This latter figure is slightly skewed as at settlement level, the percentage is the highest in Cirencester which also has the highest number of people in employment. In the smaller and more rural settlements of the district this percentage rarely goes above 5%. 11.1% live within 2km to 10km of their working place. There is quite some variation in this category at settlement level, although there is no clear pattern. People who commute between 10 to 30km, more than 20km or who fall into the other category, amount to 17.6%, 7.1% and 14.4% of the population respectively, which is broadly representative of all the settlements assessed.
- 3.17 The 2021 Census also looks at the mode of transport used for commuting. For Cotswold District 49% of the working population uses a car as part of their commute. The second most common way of commuting, but far behind car use, is cycling and walking at almost 10%. Public transport sees very little use for commuting with both train and bus used by less than 1% of the working population for their commute. The 39.1% who work from home of course do not use any mode of transport for commuting.
- 3.18 ONS also provides data on the occupation of the working population and categorises them by using the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) 2020⁶. The largest occupational category in Cotswold District is 'Managers, directors and senior officials' at 19.4%, closely followed by 'Professional occupations' at 19%. Both high-earning categories combined therefore make up almost 40% of the working population.

6

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/standardoccupationalclassificationsoc/soc2020>

Summary

- 3.19 **Cirencester** is by far the most important settlement for employment with both the largest working population and economically active population. Moreover, as a net-importer of working people it also provides jobs for the wider area. Despite being a net-importer, it does provide jobs to a large amount of people who live within walking distance of these jobs. It has a slightly lower percentage of homeworkers compared to the district's average, but this is to be expected from a settlement which such an important retail function (as set out in the chapter 4) which is a sector less suitable to home working.
- 3.20 **Tetbury** is the second largest employment hub in the district, although it only provides about a quarter of the jobs that Cirencester provides. It has a similar Economic Activity Rate to Cirencester, but a very different Employment Density being a net-exporter. Given that the 10 to 30km category is the second most common distance commuted (after home working), it is likely it is exporting workers to Cirencester.
- 3.21 As the third largest employment hub in the district, **Moreton-in-Marsh** has a slightly higher Economic Activity Rate than Tetbury and Cirencester. Moreover, with an Employment Density close to 100% it offers sufficient jobs for its economically active population. However, with almost 40% of economically active people commuting 2km or more, it seems there is a discrepancy between the skills of its economically active population and what is needed for the jobs available. **Fairford** has a similar economically active population but has a higher employment density and is therefore an importer of jobs.
- 3.22 **Bourton-on-the-Water** and **South Cerney** have an economically active population of respectively 2,098 and 1,697. Both are net-importers of workers, making them significant providers of jobs in the district. Bourton-on-the-Water has an above average amount of people living within walking distance of their job, but a lower amount of home workers. This is likely due to Bourton-on-the-Water being a popular tourist destination, therefore it has more tourism related jobs which are less suited for homeworking.
- 3.23 **Chipping Campden**, **Lechlade-on-Thames**, **Siddington** and **Stow-on-the-Wold** are all employment hubs in the district that provide more than 1,000 jobs. However, Lechlade-on-Thames is a net-exporter of workers while the others are all net-importers. Except for Siddington, all these settlements have an Economic Activity Rate below the district average, which to an extent can be explained by the older population in some of these settlements.

- 3.24 The following settlements all have a small employment role with between 600 to 1,000 jobs: **Mickleton, Blockley, Upper Rissington, Northleach** and **Willersey**. However, Mickleton, Northleach and Upper Rissington are two of the largest exporters of workers, while Blockley and North Cerney are two large importers.
- 3.25 All other settlements provide less than 500 jobs and therefore do not perform a significant employment role in the district.

4. Community Facilities and Services

Overview

- 4.1 Access to community facilities and services is vitally important when considering the role and function of settlements. Although online shopping and use of the internet for other services (e.g. banking, health care appointments) has grown significantly over recent years (even more so since the Covid-19 pandemic), national policy still expects most new development to have good access to services and facilities by focusing significant development on locations which limit the need to travel and offer genuine sustainable transport options.
- 4.2 When thinking about the role and function of settlements, it is useful to distinguish between facilities and services that serve a more local area within a settlement or neighbourhood ('local'), with those that have a wider catchment serving both local residents and those across a wider area ('strategic'). In other words, some facilities/services require a larger population than others, and tend to serve a larger geographic area e.g. secondary schools and supermarkets require a larger population than primary schools or convenience stores.
- 4.3 Consequently, there are fewer strategic facilities in total than local facilities and settlements that have more strategic facilities play a key function in providing the wider area with these facilities and services.

Retail facilities and services

- 4.4 The adopted Local Plan includes the following retail hierarchy for settlements that have an important retail function:
- Town Centre: Cirencester;
 - Key Centres: Bourton-on-the-Water, Chipping Campden, Moreton-in-Marsh, Stow-on-the-Wold and Tetbury;
 - District Centres: Fairford and Lechlade;
 - Local Centres: Northleach and South Cerney.
- Please note that retail hierarchy of the adopted Local Plan is being reviewed as part of the Local Plan Update.
- 4.5 These centres provide a variety of shops and retail options. They are important service centres for the majority of needs of their respective local catchment areas, which is particularly important for those, such as the elderly and disabled, who rely on services and facilities being close-by. Cirencester is the district's

dominant centre for retailing with each consecutive tier being more limited in both number and range on offer.

- 4.6 The role of the settlements is also determined by whether they provide strategic retail facilities such as supermarkets and banks as well as local retail facilities such as a village shop/convenience store and/or a post office.

Table 6: Retail option availability per settlement (as per Spring 2025)

Settlement	Service Centre	Supermarket	Convenience store	Bank	Post Office
Ampney Crucis	No	0	0	0	0
Andoversford	No	0	1	0	1
Avening	No	0	0	0	1*
Bibury	No	0	0	0	1*
Bledington	No	0	1	0	1*
Blockley	No	0	1	0	1*
Bourton-on-the-Hill	No	0	1	0	0
Bourton-on-the-Water	Key Centre	1	1	0	1
Broadwell	No	0	0	0	0
Chedworth	No	0	0	0	0
Chipping Campden	Key Centre	0	2	0	1
Cirencester	Town Centre	4	11	6	2
Coates	No	0	0	0	0
Coberley	No	0	0	0	0
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	No	0	1	0	1
Didmarton	No	0	0	0	0
Down Ampney	No	0	1	0	1
Eastleach	No	0	0	0	0
Ebrington	No	0	0	0	0
Fairford	District Centre	2	1	0	1
Great Rissington	No	0	0	0	0
Kemble	No	0	1	0	1
Kempsford	No	0	0	0	1*
Kingscote	No	0	0	0	0
Lechlade-on-Thames	District Centre	0	2	0	1
Longborough	No	0	1	0	1*
Meysey Hampton	No	0	0	0	0
Mickleton	No	0	1	0	0
Moreton-in-Marsh	Key Centre	2	2	1	1
Naunton	No	0	0	0	0
North Cerney	No	0	0	0	0
Northleach	Local Centre	0	1	0	1
Oddington	No	0	0	0	1*
Poulton	No	0	0	0	0
Preston	No	0	0	0	0
Rodmarton	No	0	0	0	0

Settlement	Service Centre	Supermarket	Convenience store	Bank	Post Office
Sapperton	No	0	0	0	0
Shipton	No	0	0	0	0
Siddington	No	0	1	0	1
Somerford Keynes	No	0	0	0	0
South Cerney	No	0	2	0	0
Stow-on-the-Wold	Key Centre	2	1	0	1
Swell	No	0	0	0	0
Temple Guiting	No	0	0	0	0
Tetbury	Key Centre	1	2	0	1
Upper Rissington	No	0	1	0	1*
Weston Subedge	No	0	0	0	0
Willersey	No	0	0	0	0
Withington	No	0	0	0	0

* Limited opening times

- 4.7 Provision of the assessed retail and services is limited across the board. None of the smaller and even some of the larger settlements, such as Fairford and Lechlade, have a supermarket. Only Cirencester and Moreton-in-Marsh have permanent access to a bank. Less than half of the settlements assessed have direct access to a convenience store and/or a post office, with the latter having limited opening times in many settlements.

Other facilities and services

- 4.8 The 49 settlements being considered in this study have also been assessed to see which other community facilities and services are present. The findings are presented in the tables 7 and 8 below, broken down by strategic and local facilities. Note that they refer to the presence of facilities within or adjacent to the settlements identified, rather than a wider area such as the parish boundary.
- 4.9 To gather this data, the Council contacted the town and parish councils of the settlements assessed in the Study in Spring 2025 and asked them to complete a short form to indicate the availability of services and facilities in their settlements. Town and parish councils have the best and most up to date local knowledge of this and were also able to nuance their responses for example by indicating that the local post office has only limited opening times. Please note that no response was received from Coberley and Down Ampney within the deadline; the data for these settlements has therefore been based on a desktop assessment and local knowledge.
- 4.10 Table 7 below looks at strategic facilities and services which have a wider catchment serving both local residents and those across a wider area, this encompasses Leisure Centre, Swimming Pools, Secondary Schools, Colleges/6th

Forms and NHS Hospitals. Only settlements that have at least one strategic facility have been listed.

Table 7: Strategic facilities and services per settlement (as per Spring 2025)

Settlement	Leisure Centre	Swimming Pool	Secondary School	College / 6th Form	NHS Hospital
Ampney Crucis	0	0	0	0	0
Andoversford	0	0	0	0	0
Avening	0	0	0	0	0
Bibury	0	0	0	0	0
Bledington	0	0	0	0	0
Blockley	0	0	0	0	0
Bourton-on-the-Hill	0	0	0	0	0
Bourton-on-the-Water	1	1	1	1	0
Broadwell	0	0	0	0	0
Chedworth	0	0	0	0	0
Chipping Campden	1	0	1	1	0
Cirencester	1	2	2	2	1
Coates	0	0	0	0	0
Coberley	0	0	0	0	0
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	0	0	0	0	0
Didmarton	0	0	0	0	0
Down Ampney	0	0	0	0	0
Eastleach	0	0	0	0	0
Ebrington	0	0	0	0	0
Fairford	0	0	1	1	0
Great Rissington	0	0	0	0	0
Kemble	0	0	0	0	0
Kempsford	0	0	0	0	0
Kingscote	0	0	0	0	0
Lechlade-on-Thames	0	0	0	0	0
Longborough	0	0	0	0	0
Meysey Hampton	0	0	0	0	0
Mickleton	0	0	0	0	0
Moreton-in-Marsh	1	1	0	0	1
Naunton	0	0	0	0	0
North Cerney	0	0	0	0	0
Northleach	0	1	0	0	0
Oddington	0	0	0	0	0
Poulton	0	0	0	0	0
Preston	0	0	0	0	0
Rodmarton	0	0	0	0	0
Sapperton	0	0	0	0	0
Shipton	0	0	0	0	0
Siddington	0	0	0	0	0
Somerford Keynes	0	0	0	0	0
South Cerney	1	0	0	0	0

Settlement	Leisure Centre	Swimming Pool	Secondary School	College / 6th Form	NHS Hospital
Stow-on-the-Wold	0	0	0	0	0
Swell	0	0	0	0	0
Temple Guiting	0	0	0	0	0
Tetbury	1	0	1	0	0
Upper Rissington	0	0	0	0	0
Weston Subedge	0	0	0	0	0
Willersey	0	0	0	0	0
Withington	0	0	0	0	0

4.11 All strategic services and facilities are clustered around the larger settlements in the district, which is to be expected. These settlements therefore play an important role in providing services for the wider area.

4.12 Table 8 looks at facilities and services that serve a more local area within a settlement or neighbourhood.

Table 8: Local facilities and services per settlement (as per Spring 2025)

Settlement	Library	Primary School	Pre-school / Nursery	GP Surgery	Dentist	Pharmacy	Pub	Community Hall	Sports Field	Allotments	Play Area
Ampney Crucis	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Andoversford	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1
Avening	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Bibury	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Bledington	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Blockley	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	5
Bourton-on-the-Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Bourton-on-the-Water	1	1	1	1	2	1	6	4	1	3	3
Broadwell	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Chedworth	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Chipping Campden	1	2	2	1	2	1	5	2	1	1	4
Cirencester	1	5	9	4	8	5	17	4	10	10	11
Coates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Coberley	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3
Didmarton	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Down Ampney	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Eastleach	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Ebrington	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Fairford	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	1

Settlement	Library	Primary School	Pre-school / Nursery	GP Surgery	Dentist	Pharmacy	Pub	Community Hall	Sports Field	Allotments	Play Area
Great Rissington	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Kemble	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	2
Kempsford	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Kingscote	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Lechlade-on-Thames	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	1	2	2	3
Longborough	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Meysey Hampton	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Mickleton	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	2
Moreton-in-Marsh	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	3	5	3	3
Naunton	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
North Cerney	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Northleach	1	1	1	1	0	2	3	2	1	3	2
Oddington	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1
Poultton	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Preston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Rodmarton	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Sapperton	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Shipton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Siddington	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Somerford Keynes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
South Cerney	0	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	3	3
Stow-on-the-Wold	1	1	1	1	2	1	6	1	2	1	2
Swell	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Temple Guiting	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Tetbury	1	1	3	1	3	2	5	2	2	3	5
Upper Rissington	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	2
Weston Subedge	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Willersey	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Withington	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1

- 4.13 None of the local facilities and services assessed are available across the board, although more than half of the settlements has a primary school, pub, village hall and/or play area. Only the larger settlements have access to a library, GP, dentist and/or pharmacy. The lack of local facilities does not only occur in small settlement such as Coates and Shipton, but also medium sized settlements such as Willersey.

Accessibility Matrix

- 4.14 Gloucestershire County Council has produced an Accessibility Matrix which is based on average drive-time and walking/public transport journey times to key services and facilities across the county⁷. The Matrix records average theoretical journey times from each postcode in Gloucestershire to the nearest (or most quickly accessible) to a range of key facilities presuming they occur on a Tuesday between 10am and Midday.
- 4.15 The matrix data is provided at Ward and postcode level. For this study, the postcode of a central point in each settlement was used to get the most accurate results. Actual travel times will of course differ depending on the exact starting point of a journey. Travel times do not take account of variable traffic conditions but do rely upon genuine bus timetables and safe/realistic walking routes.
- 4.16 Table 9 shows the driving data in relation to Cotswold District derived from the latest available matrix (2022). Drivetimes have been divided into three categories: Good access (less than five minutes – marked in green in the table), Fair access (between five and fifteen minutes – marked in blue in the table) and Poor access (over fifteen minutes – marked in orange in the table).

Table 9: Average drivetimes to key services

Settlement	Supermarket	Fitness Facility	GP Surgery	Hospital	Library	Pharmacy	Post Office	Primary School	Secondary School	FE College
Ampney Crucis	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue
Andoversford	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Avening	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Bibury	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Bledington	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Blockley	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Bourton-on-the-Hill	Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Bourton-on-the-Water	Green	Green	Green	Blue	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Broadwell	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Chedworth	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Orange
Chipping Campden	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Cirencester	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
Coates	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue

⁷ <https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/inform/accessibility-transport-and-internet/accessibility-transport/>

Settlement	Supermarket	Fitness Facility	GP Surgery	Hospital	Library	Pharmacy	Post Office	Primary School	Secondary School	FE College
Coberley										
Coln St Aldwyns										
Hatherop										
Quenington										
Didmarton										
Down Ampney										
Eastleach										
Ebrington										
Fairford										
Great Rissington										
Kemble										
Kempsford										
Kingscote										
Lechlade-on-Thames										
Longborough										
Meysey Hampton										
Mickleton										
Moreton-in-Marsh										
Naunton										
North Cerney										
Northleach										
Oddington										
Poultton										
Preston										
Rodmarton										
Sapperton										
Shipton										
Siddington										
Somerford Keynes										
South Cerney										
Stow-on-the-Wold										
Swell										
Temple Guiting										
Tetbury										
Upper Rissington										
Weston Subedge										
Willersey										
Withington										

Table 9 Colour Key:

Access Level	Time in minutes
Good access	<5
Fair access	5-15
Poor access	>15

- 4.17 Cirencester is the only settlement which has good access by private vehicle to all key facilities. Although Bourton-on-the-Water, Chipping Campden, Mickleton, Moreton-in-Marsh, Stow-on-the-Wold, Tetbury and Willersey all have good driving access to the majority of facilities and fair access to the rest.
- 4.18 Most settlements assessed have good access by private vehicle to a primary school and a post office, while most other facilities have fair driving access. Kempsford and the Coln St Aldwyns - Hatherop - Quenington cluster have poor driving access to both a supermarket and a hospital. Poor driving access to a hospital is also an issue for Eastleach, Great Rissington, Northleach, Temple Guiting and Withington.
- 4.19 Given the rural and dispersed nature of the district, it is not surprising that there are no key facilities that have good driving access across the board. However, as only a few settlements have poor access to only a couple of key facilities, the overall picture of car accessibility to key facilities is positive.

Sustainable Transport Provision

- 4.20 Table 10 below shows the public transport/walking data in relation to Cotswold District derived from the latest available matrix (2022). Travel times have been divided into three categories: Good access (less than 15 minutes – marked in green in the table), Fair access (between 15 and 45 minutes – marked in blue in the table), Poor access (over 45 minutes – marked in orange in the table) or Not possible (marked in pink in the table).

Table 10: Average travel times by walking/public transport to key services

Settlement	Supermarket	Fitness Facility	GP Surgery	Hospital	Library	Pharmacy	Post Office	Primary School	Secondary School	FE College
Ampney Crucis	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue
Andoversford	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Avening	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Bibury	Blue	Orange	Orange	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue
Bledington	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue
Blockley	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Pink	Pink

Settlement	Supermarket	Fitness Facility	GP Surgery	Hospital	Library	Pharmacy	Post Office	Primary School	Secondary School	FE College
Bourton-on-the-Hill										
Bourton-on-the-Water										
Broadwell										
Chedworth										
Chipping Campden										
Cirencester										
Coates										
Coberley										
Coln St Aldwyns										
Hatherop										
Quenington										
Didmarton										
Down Ampney										
Eastleach										
Ebrington										
Fairford										
Great Rissington										
Kemble										
Kempsford										
Kingscote										
Lechlade-on-Thames										
Longborough										
Meysey Hampton										
Mickleton										
Moreton-in-Marsh										
Naunton										
North Cerney										
Northleach										
Oddington										
Poulton										
Preston										
Rodmarton										
Sapperton										
Shipton										
Siddington										
Somerford Keynes										
South Cerney										
Stow-on-the-Wold										
Swell										
Temple Guiting										

Settlement	Supermarket	Fitness Facility	GP Surgery	Hospital	Library	Pharmacy	Post Office	Primary School	Secondary School	FE College
Tetbury										
Upper Rissington										
Weston Subedge										
Willersey										
Withington										

Table 10 Colour Key:

Access Level	Time in minutes
Good access	<15
Fair access	15-45
Poor access	>45
Not possible	N/A

- 4.21 The dispersed and rural nature of the district is significantly more limiting on public transport and walking accessibility compared to private vehicle accessibility. Some settlements have poor access across the board. Cirencester, Bourton-on-the-Water, Moreton-in-Marsh, Siddington and Stow-the-Wold are the only settlements that have good access to most key facilities and at least fair access to the rest. Tetbury has good access overall, however it is considered to have poor access to a Further Education College due to limited public transport availability.
- 4.22 As the majority of facilities listed in the Accessibility Matrix are of a strategic nature, these should be located in larger settlements and serve a wider area. It is therefore not reasonable to expect good access (as defined in the Accessibility Matrix) to all these services. However, for these facilities to properly serve a wider geographical area, residents in that area should be able to have fair access to these facilities by public transport and / or walking. This is not the case for many of the settlements assessed. Improving public transport and walking accessibility is therefore a major challenge to delivery sustainable development within Cotswold District.
- 4.23 Gloucestershire County Council has also listed all Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in the county from most accessible to least accessible (please see paragraph 1.4 for more information on LSOAs). It is notable that there is only one LSOA within Cotswold District in the top ten most accessible LSOAs in Gloucestershire (this LSOA is in the centre of Cirencester). Conversely, of the ten least accessible LSOAs, six are in Cotswold District, even when being compared to other rural districts such as the Forest of Dean.

Summary

- 4.24 Strategic services and facilities such as hospitals and secondary schools tend to be located in larger settlements which provide for the wider area. This is also the case in Cotswold District where Cirencester by far has the most strategic services, followed by settlement such as Moreton-in-Marsh, Tetbury and Fairford as other main service hubs. The population of surrounding settlements is often reliant on transport by car to access these services/facilities due to limited options to use public transport or access to these services on foot.
- 4.25 Due to the rural and dispersed nature of the district, there are many small and medium-sized settlements that are lacking some or even most of the local services and facilities assessed in this study. They rely on nearby settlements for access to such services/facilities which, as with the strategic services and facilities, often requires transport by car.

5. Conclusion and Settlement Scoring

- 5.1 Three broad themes have been assessed to help determine the role and function of individual settlements or groups of settlements in the district: population and settlement size; employment and economic activity; and community facilities/services. This chapter brings together the various strands of information to make conclusions about which settlements are the most sustainable locations for development.
- 5.2 This Study does not set the future development strategy for the district – this will need to factor in other important issues and constraints, such as land availability and 80% of the district being within the Cotswolds National Landscape, before the location of future growth can be confirmed. However, the Study is part of the evidence that will inform future decision making. In order to provide this evidence, all of the settlements assessed have been scored against three themes. The resulting total scores determine whether the settlement should be a Principal Settlement, a Non-Principal Settlement or a Rural Settlement. Any settlement in the district with a population of less than 300 people is deemed to be a Rural Settlement.

Population and Settlement Size

- 5.3 The population size of a settlement gives a first indication of its role and function in the area; a larger population often means more jobs, community facilities and services. However, this is not always the case, so this category has been given less weight in the overall scoring with a maximum score of five.
- 5.4 The age profile of a settlement can also be an indication of its role and function. The Study has shown that, in the case of Upper Rissington, building sufficient family homes attracted enough economically active families with children to have a significant impact on the age profile of a settlement. This could therefore potentially form part of the solution for one of the major challenges the district faces, with an aging population which is already well above the national average. However, for the purpose of this Study, the current age profile does not indicate where new development could be located, so no scoring has been assigned based on age profile.
- 5.5 Table 11 shows the scoring that has been assigned based on settlement size. Cirencester is by far the largest settlement and is therefore the only settlement with a maximum score of 5. Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh, Fairford, Bourton-on-the-Water, South Cerney and Lechlade-on-Thames are all larger settlements with a population of over 3,000 and receive a score of 4. Chipping Campden,

Mickleton, Upper Rissington, Blockley, Northleach, Stow-on-the-Wold, Siddington, Kemble, Kempsford and Avening all have a population over 1,000 and receive a score of 3. The remaining settlements are divided between having a population above or below 500 and receive a score of two or one respectively.

Table 11: Settlement Size scores

Settlement	Score	Reason
Cirencester	5	Population over 20,000
Tetbury	4	Population over 3,000
Moreton-in-Marsh	4	Population over 3,000
Fairford	4	Population over 3,000
Bourton-on-the-Water	4	Population over 3,000
South Cerney	4	Population over 3,000
Lechlade-on-Thames	4	Population over 3,000
Chipping Campden	3	Population over 1,000
Mickleton	3	Population over 1,000
Upper Rissington	3	Population over 1,000
Blockley	3	Population over 1,000
Northleach	3	Population over 1,000
Stow-on-the-Wold	3	Population over 1,000
Siddington	3	Population over 1,000
Kemble	3	Population over 1,000
Kempsford	3	Population over 1,000
Avening	3	Population over 1,000
Willersey	2	Population over 500
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	2	Population over 500
Andoversford	2	Population over 500
Chedworth	2	Population over 500
Ampney Crucis	2	Population over 500
Ebrington	2	Population over 500
Bibury	2	Population over 500
North Cerney	2	Population over 500
Down Ampney	2	Population over 500
Meysey Hampton	2	Population over 500
Withington	1	Population over 300
Longborough	1	Population over 300
Somerford Keynes	1	Population over 300
Coates	1	Population over 300
Bledington	1	Population over 300
Sapperton	1	Population over 300
Swell	1	Population over 300
Weston Subedge	1	Population over 300
Poulton	1	Population over 300
Temple Guiting	1	Population over 300
Oddington	1	Population over 300
Coberley	1	Population over 300
Didmarton	1	Population over 300

Settlement	Score	Reason
Shipton	1	Population over 300
Great Rissington	1	Population over 300
Naunton	1	Population over 300
Rodmarton	1	Population over 300
Preston	1	Population over 300
Broadwell	1	Population over 300
Eastleach	1	Population over 300
Bourton-on-the-Hill	1	Population over 300
Kingscote	1	Population over 300

Employment and Economic Activity

- 5.6 Table 12 shows the scoring based on the employment role of each settlement. This is determined by an initial score based on the size of the workplace population. Settlements with a high workplace population play a more important employment role in the district. An adjustment is then made to this score based on the employment density. Settlements with a high employment density are currently exporting workers which increases the amount of commuting. They have been given an adjustment of -1 per 20 percentage points over the ideal score of 100% (with a minimum of 0). Settlements with a low employment density could potentially see a decrease in the amount of commuting if more suitable and affordable homes were available in the settlement. They have been given an adjustment of +1 per 20 percentage points under the ideal score of 100%.
- 5.7 Settlements with railway stations are more sustainable locations for new development because they are already well-connected and accessible. Therefore they did not receive an adjustment as in and out commuting.
- 5.8 Cirencester has by far the largest workplace population and therefore receives a score of 5. Tetbury, Moreton-in-Marsh and Bourton-on-the-Water provide over 2,000 work places and receive a score of 4. None of these settlements have been given an adjustment as their employment density is within 20 percentage points of 100%. Chipping Campden, Siddington and Stow-on-the-Wold also score 4 after the employment density adjustment.
- 5.9 South Cerney, Fairford, Willersey, North Cerney and Coberley all score 3 after the adjustment. The remainder of the district scores 2, 1 or in some cases even 0 after the adjustment.

Table 12: Settlement scores based on their employment role

Settlement	Workplace Population	Score	Employment Density	Adjustment	Final Score
Cirencester	11,789	5	88.50%	0	5
Tetbury	3,022	4	111.20%	0	4
Moreton-in-Marsh	2,401	4	106.70%	0	4
Bourton-on-the-Water	2,321	4	90.40%	0	4
Chipping Campden	1,306	3	77.00%	+1	4
Stow-on-the-Wold	1,149	3	74.90%	+1	4
Siddington	1,059	3	78.80%	+1	4
South Cerney	1,972	3	86.10%	0	3
Fairford	1,969	3	115.50%	0	3
Willesley	743	2	64.80%	+1	3
North Cerney	301	1	53.80%	+2	3
Coberley	163	1	53.80%	+2	3
Lechlade-on-Thames	1,158	3	125.00%	-1	2
Blockley	681	2	92.30%	0	2
Avening	503	2	111.30%	0	2
Didmarton	357	1	79.90%	+1	2
Weston Subedge	313	1	64.80%	+1	2
Kingscote	111	1	79.90%	+1	2
Mickleton	725	2	139.50%	-1	1
Northleach	679	2	135.70%	-1	1
Kempsford	373	1	107.70%	0	1
Chedworth	340	1	115.80%	0	1
Andoversford	319	1	113.20%	0	1
Bibury	313	1	95.00%	0	1
Ampney Crucis	307	1	95.00%	0	1
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	297	1	96.30%	0	1
Bledington	287	1	84.70%	0	1
Oddington	247	1	84.70%	0	1
Longborough	237	1	119.50%	0	1
Ebrington	230	1	91.00%	0	1
Swell	219	1	95.00%	0	1
Withington	191	1	115.80%	0	1
Somerford Keynes	188	1	104.90%	0	1
Naunton	185	1	95.00%	0	1
Poulton	176	1	116.80%	0	1
Temple Guiting	174	1	95.00%	0	1
Shipton	163	1	113.20%	0	1
Broadwell	156	1	119.50%	0	1
Preston	154	1	90.40%	0	1
Bourton-on-the-Hill	131	1	119.50%	0	1
Eastleach	124	1	103.10%	0	1
Rodmarton	79	1	111.30%	0	1

Settlement	Workplace Population	Score	Employment Density	Adjustment	Final Score
Upper Rissington	700	2	155.70%	-2	0
Kemble	407	1	129.20%	0	1
Meysey Hampton	240	1	120.10%	-1	0
Down Ampney	231	1	120.10%	-1	0
Coates	139	1	129.20%	-1	0
Great Rissington	119	1	142.20%	-2	0
Sapperton	94	1	129.20%	-1	0

Community Facilities and Services

- 5.10 Access to services and facilities form an essential part of the role and function of settlements within the district. This section has therefore been given greater weight with a maximum score of 10 points (compared to a maximum of 5 points for the other categories). This is supported by the NPPF which requires a genuine choice of transport modes for significant development.
- 5.11 In regards to availability of services within the settlement (retail, strategic and local), a settlement is awarded:
- 0 points if the service/facility is not present in the settlement;
 - 0.5 of a point is awarded if the service/facility is present but it has limited availability (e.g. a post office which opens 2 hours each week);
 - 1 point is awarded for each service/facility of which one instance is available;
 - 1.5 points for each service/facility of which there are multiple present (to reflect the resilience of this service).
- 5.12 In regards to overall accessibility, 0.5 of a point is awarded if there is fair access and 1 point is awarded if there is good access as shown in tables 9 and 10 above.
- 5.13 This results in a maximum potential score of 51.5 points, which is then recalculated to a weighted score with a maximum of 10 points.

Table 13: Settlement scores on community facilities and services

Settlement	Total points (maximum 51.5)	Weighted score (maximum of 10)
Ampney Crucis	15	2.9
Andoversford	21.5	4.2
Avening	20	3.9
Bibury	18.5	3.6
Bledington	17	3.3
Blockley	22	4.3
Bourton-on-the-Hill	18	3.5
Bourton-on-the-Water	40.5	7.9
Broadwell	18	3.5

Settlement	Total points (maximum 51.5)	Weighted score (maximum of 10)
Chedworth	13.5	2.6
Chipping Campden	37.5	7.3
Cirencester	49.5	9.6
Coates	9	1.7
Coberley	13	2.5
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	19	3.9
Didmarton	10	1.9
Down Ampney	16.5	3.2
Eastleach	12	2.3
Ebrington	11	2.1
Fairford	36	7.0
Great Rissington	11	2.1
Kemble	22.5	4.4
Kempsford	13.5	2.6
Kingscote	10	1.9
Lechlade-on-Thames	32.5	6.3
Longborough	18.5	3.6
Meysey Hampton	16.5	3.2
Mickleton	22	4.3
Moreton-in-Marsh	41.5	8.1
Naunton	9	1.7
North Cerney	17	3.3
Northleach	31.5	6.1
Oddington	12	2.3
Poultton	16.5	3.2
Preston	17.5	3.4
Rodmarton	13	2.5
Sapperton	16	3.1
Shipton	13.5	2.6
Siddington	25	4.9
Somerford Keynes	10	2.4
South Cerney	29.5	5.7
Stow-on-the-Wold	35	6.8
Swell	15	2.9
Temple Guiting	10	1.9
Tetbury	40.5	7.9
Upper Rissington	22.5	4.4
Weston Subedge	13.5	2.6
Willersey	17.5	3.4
Withington	9.5	1.8

Total Scoring

5.14 Table 14 summarises the sustainability of each assessed settlement. The weighted scores of each theme have been combined with a maximum score of 5 for Settlement Size; 5 for Employment Role; and 10 for Services and Facilities. The total maximum potential score is therefore 20.

Table 14: Total scores per settlement

Settlement	Settlement Size (max score 5)	Employment Role (max score 5)	Services and Facilities (max score 10)	Total (max score 20)
Cirencester	5	5	9.6	19.6
Moreton-in-Marsh	4	4	8.1	16.1
Bourton-on-the-Water	4	4	7.9	15.9
Tetbury	4	4	7.9	15.9
Chipping Campden	3	4	7.3	14.3
Fairford	4	3	7.0	14.0
Stow-on-the-Wold	3	4	6.8	13.8
South Cerney	4	3	5.7	12.7
Lechlade-on-Thames	4	2	6.3	12.3
Siddington	3	4	4.9	11.9
Northleach	3	1	6.1	10.1
Blockley	3	2	4.3	9.3
Avening	3	2	3.9	8.9
Willersey	2	3	3.4	8.4
Kemble	3	1	4.4	8.4
North Cerney	2	3	3.3	8.3
Mickleton	3	1	4.3	8.3
Upper Rissington	3	0	4.4	7.4
Andoversford	2	1	4.2	7.2
Kempsford	3	1	2.6	6.6
Bibury	2	1	3.6	6.6
Coberley	1	3	2.5	6.5
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	2	1	3.9	6.9
Ampney Crucis	2	1	2.9	5.9
Chedworth	2	1	2.6	5.6
Weston Subedge	1	2	2.6	5.6
Longborough	1	1	3.6	5.6
Bourton-on-the-Hill	1	1	3.5	5.5
Broadwell	1	1	3.5	5.5
Preston	1	1	3.4	5.4

Settlement	Settlement Size (max score 5)	Employment Role (max score 5)	Services and Facilities (max score 10)	Total (max score 20)
Bledington	1	1	3.3	5.3
Down Ampney	2	0	3.2	5.2
Meysey Hampton	2	0	3.2	5.2
Poulton	1	1	3.2	5.2
Didmarton	1	2	1.9	4.9
Ebrington	2	1	2.1	5.1
Kingscote	1	2	1.9	4.9
Swell	1	1	2.9	4.9
Shipton	1	1	2.6	4.6
Rodmarton	1	1	2.5	4.5
Somerford Keynes	1	1	2.4	4.4
Eastleach	1	1	2.3	4.3
Oddington	1	1	2.3	4.3
Sapperton	1	0	3.1	4.1
Temple Guiting	1	1	1.9	3.9
Withington	1	1	1.8	3.8
Naunton	1	1	1.7	3.7
Great Rissington	1	0	2.1	3.1
Coates	1	0	1.7	2.7

5.15 These total scores have then been translated in a settlement hierarchy. The aim of this settlement hierarchy is to promote a sustainable pattern of development as required by the NPPF. The identification of these different types of settlement promotes sustainable development by linking housing growth to the availability of jobs, facilities and services; therefore reducing the need to travel and supporting the vitality and viability of local facilities. This also helps meet the needs of groups with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, particularly older people and disabled people. It also fits in with the NPPF requirement to mitigate climate change and Cotswold District Council's aim to make its local plan 'Green to the Core' through the local plan update it is currently undertaking.

5.16 Table 15 sets out the settlement level for each assessed settlement. Any settlement with a total score above 10 is considered to be a Principal Settlement while settlements with a total score below 5 have been recommended as Rural Settlements.

5.17 For settlements with a total score between 5 and 10, the recommended settlement level is based on the services and facilities score:

- Settlements with a score above 4: Principal Settlement
- Settlements with a score between 3 and 4: Non-Principal Settlement
- Settlements with a score below 3: Rural Settlement

Table 15: Recommended Settlement Levels

Settlement	Settlement Level	Settlement	Settlement Level
Ampney Crucis	Rural	Longborough	Non-Principal
Andoversford	Principal	Meysey Hampton	Non-Principal
Avening	Non-Principal	Mickleton	Principal
Bibury	Non-Principal	Moreton-in-Marsh	Principal
Bledington	Non-Principal	Naunton	Rural
Blockley	Principal	North Cerney	Non-Principal
Bourton-on-the-Hill	Non-Principal	Northleach	Principal
Bourton-on-the-Water	Principal	Oddington	Rural
Broadwell	Non-Principal	Poultton	Non-Principal
Chedworth	Rural	Preston	Non-Principal
Chipping Campden	Principal	Rodmarton	Rural
Cirencester	Principal	Sapperton	Rural
Coates	Rural	Shipton	Rural
Coberley	Rural	Siddington	Principal
Coln St Aldwyns Hatherop Quenington	Non-Principal	Somerford Keynes	Rural
Didmarton	Rural	South Cerney	Principal
Down Ampney	Non-Principal	Stow-on-the-Wold	Principal
Eastleach	Rural	Swell	Rural
Ebrington	Rural	Temple Guiting	Rural
Fairford	Principal	Tetbury	Principal
Great Rissington	Rural	Upper Rissington	Principal
Kemble	Principal	Weston Subedge	Rural
Kempsford	Rural	Willersey	Non-Principal
Kingscote	Rural	Withington	Rural
Lechlade-on-Thames	Principal		

5.18 The following 16 settlements are determined to be Principal Settlements:

1. Andoversford
2. Blockley
3. Bourton-on-the-Water
4. Chipping Campden
5. Cirencester
6. Fairford
7. Kemble
8. Lechlade

9. Mickleton
10. Moreton-in-Marsh
11. Northleach
12. Siddington
13. South Cerney
14. Stow-on-the-Wold
15. Tetbury
16. Upper Rissington

5.19 The following 13 settlements, or cluster of settlements, are determined to be Non-Principal Settlements:

1. Avening
2. Bibury
3. Bledington
4. Bourton-on-the-Hill
5. Broadwell
6. Down Ampney
7. Longborough
8. Meysey Hampton
9. North Cerney
10. Poulton
11. Preston
12. Willersey
13. The cluster of Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop and Quenington.

5.20 All remaining settlements assessed, as well as any other settlement in the district (which will have a population of less than 300), are determined to be Rural Settlements.

Table 16: List of all settlements and their settlement level

Settlement	Settlement Level	Settlement	Settlement Level
Ablington	Rural	Hidcote Boyce	Rural
Adlestrop	Rural	Hilcot	Rural
Aldsworth	Rural	Horcott	Rural
Ampney Crucis	Rural	Icomb	Rural
Ampney St Mary	Rural	Itlay	Rural
Ampney St Peter	Rural	Kemble	Principal
Andoversford	Principal	Kemble Wick	Rural
Ashley	Rural	Kempsford	Rural
Aston Magna	Rural	Kineton	Rural
Aston Subedge	Rural	Kingscote	Rural
Avening	Non-Principal	Lasborough	Rural
Aylworth	Rural	Lechlade-on-Thames	Principal

Settlement	Settlement Level	Settlement	Settlement Level
Bagendon	Rural	Leighterton	Rural
Bagpath	Rural	Little Barrington	Rural
Barnsley	Rural	Little Rissington	Rural
Barton	Rural	Long Newton	Rural
Batsford	Rural	Longborough	Non-Principal
Baunton	Rural	Lower Dowdeswell	Rural
Beverstone	Rural	Lower Hazlecote	Rural
Bibury	Non-Principal	Lower Lemington	Rural
Birdlip	Rural	Lower Oddington	Rural
Bledington	Non-Principal	Lower Slaughter	Rural
Blockley	Principal	Lower Swell	Rural
Bourton-on-the-Hill	Non-Principal	Marsden	Rural
Bourton-on-the-Water	Principal	Maugersbury	Rural
Boxwell	Rural	Meysey Hampton	Non-Principal
Brimpsfield	Rural	Mickleton	Principal
Broad Campden	Rural	Middle Duntisbourne	Rural
Broadwell	Non-Principal	Moreton-in-Marsh	Principal
Brockhampton	Rural	Nags Head	Rural
Calcot	Rural	Naunton	Rural
Calmsden	Rural	Nether Westcote	Rural
Cassey Compton	Rural	Nettleton	Rural
Caudle Green	Rural	Newington Bagpath	Rural
Cerney Wick	Rural	Norcote	Rural
Charingworth	Rural	North Cerney	Non-Principal
Chedworth	Rural	Northleach	Principal
Cherington	Rural	Northwick Park	Rural
Chipping Campden	Principal	Notgrove	Rural
Church Westcote	Rural	Ozleworth	Rural
Cirencester	Principal	Paxford	Rural
Clapton	Rural	Perrott's Brook	Rural
Coates	Rural	Poole Keynes	Rural
Coberley	Rural	Poulton	Non-Principal
Cockleford	Rural	Preston	Non-Principal
Cold Aston	Rural	Quenington	Non-Principal
Colesbourne	Rural	Rendcomb	Rural
Coll	Rural	Rodmarton	Rural
Coln Rogers	Rural	Saintbury	Rural
Coln St Aldwyn	Non-Principal	Salperton	Rural
Coln St Dennis	Rural	Sapperton	Rural
Compton Abdale	Rural	Sevenhampton	Rural
Condicote	Rural	Sezincote	Rural
Cowley	Rural	Sherborne	Rural
Culkerton	Rural	Shipton Moyne	Rural

Settlement	Settlement Level	Settlement	Settlement Level
Cutsdean	Rural	Shipton Oliffe	Rural
Daglingworth	Rural	Shipton Solers	Rural
Daylesford	Rural	Shorcote	Rural
Daylesford Ho	Rural	Siddington	Principal
Didmarton	Rural	Somerford Keynes	Rural
Donnington	Rural	South Cerney	Principal
Dorn	Rural	Southrop	Rural
Doughton	Rural	Stockwell	Rural
Down Ampney	Non-Principal	Stowell	Rural
Draycott	Rural	Stow-on-the-Wold	Principal
Driffild	Rural	Stratton	Rural
Dunfield	Rural	Sunhill	Rural
Duntisbourne Abbots	Rural	Syde	Rural
Duntisbourne Leer	Rural	Syreford	Rural
Duntisbourne Rouse	Rural	Tarlton	Rural
Eastington	Rural	Temple Guiting	Rural
Eastleach	Rural	Tetbury Upton	Rural
Eastleach Martin	Rural	Tetbury	Principal
Eastleach Turville	Rural	Todenham	Rural
Ebrington	Rural	Turkdean	Rural
Edgeworth	Rural	Ullenwood	Rural
Elkstone	Rural	Upper Coberley	Rural
Evenlode	Rural	Upper Dowdeswell	Rural
Ewen	Rural	Upper Harford	Rural
Fairford	Principal	Upper Oddington	Rural
Farmcote	Rural	Upper Rissington	Principal
Farmington	Rural	Upper Slaughter	Rural
Ford	Rural	Upper Swell	Rural
Fossebridge	Rural	Weston Subedge	Rural
Fossebridge	Rural	Westonbirt	Rural
Foxcote	Rural	Whelford	Rural
Frampton Mansell	Rural	Whittington	Rural
Fyfield	Rural	Willersey	Non-Principal
Ganborough	Rural	Windrush	Rural
Great Barrington	Rural	Winson	Rural
Great Rissington	Rural	Winstone	Rural
Guiting Power	Rural	Withington	Rural
Hampen	Rural	Woodbridge	Rural
Hampnett	Rural	Woodmancote	Rural
Harnhill	Rural	Wyck Hill	Rural
Hatherop	Non-Principal	Wyck Rissington	Rural
Hazleton	Rural	Yanworth	Rural
Hidcote Bartrim	Rural		