

WOODCOTE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2013-2035

Basic Conditions Statement

Attachment A: Sustainability Assessment



NOVEMBER 2021

CONTENTS

Section 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Sustainability Appraisal
- 1.2 The Woodcote Challenge
- 1.3 Scoping Report
- 1.4 Sustainability Appraisal Approach

Section 2 Strategic Option Appraisal

- 2.1 Requirement
- 2.2 Strategic Options
- 2.3 Option Appraisal
- 2.4 Appraisal Outcome

Section 3 Site Option Assessment

- 3.1 Potential Site identification
- 3.2 Approach
- 3.3 Site Appraisal Tests
- 3.4 Site Option Appraisal
- 3.5 Appraisal of Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives

Section 4 Additional Policy Appraisal

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Sustainability Objectives
- 4.3 Policies
- 4.4 Approach
- 4.5 New Policy Appraisal

Section 5 Conclusion

- 5.1 Context
- 5.2 Conclusions

Tables

- 2.1 Sustainability Framework Strategic Option Appraisal Tests
- 2.2(i) Magnitude of the Impact
- 2.2 (ii) Contribution to Sustainability
- 2.2(iii) Residual Impact
- 2.3 Strategic Option Assessment
- 2.4 Strategic Option Appraisal Summary

- 3.1 Sites Offered for Development
- 3.2 Site Appraisal Tests
- 3.3 Residual Impact Definition
- 3.4 New Housing Site Appraisal
- 3.5 Employment Site Appraisal
- 3.6 Housing Site Option Appraisal Summary
- 3.7 Employment Site Option Appraisal Summary
- 3.8 Sustainability Objectives
- 3.9 Appraisal of Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives
- 3.10 Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives Appraisal Summary

- 4.1 Retained Policies
- 4.2 Renumbered Retained Policies
- 4.3 New Policies to be Appraised
- 4.4 New Policy Appraisal
- 4.5 New Policy Appraisal Summary

Appendix

- A. Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2035 Policies

Woodcote Parish Council
The Parish Office
Woodcote Village Hall
Reading Road
Woodcote
RG8 0QY

www.woodcote-online.co.uk

©Woodcote Parish Council 2021

Section 1: Introduction

In 2014 the Woodcote Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013 – 2027 (**WNP1**) was formally ‘made’. This plan established the development objectives for the Parish of Woodcote (**the Parish**) and set out planning policies to realise these.

In December 2020 South Oxfordshire District Council (**SODC**), the Local Planning Authority (**LPA**), adopted a new local plan; the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011-2035 (the **SOLP35**).

In 2016, Woodcote Parish Council (the **Parish Council**), the designated body, approved the production of an updated Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Parish - the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2035 (**WNP2**). This Sustainability Appraisal relates to **WNP2**.

1.1 Sustainability Appraisal

The environmental assessment of plans with a significant environmental impact came from the EC Directive 2001/42/EC. This Directive is enshrined in UK law through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004). Woodcote is entirely within, and washed over by, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (**AONB**) which, because the emerging Neighbourhood Plan specifies additional development, means that undertaking an environmental assessment (SEA) in accordance with the SEA Directive is considered necessary.

Sustainability Appraisal is a process to assess the social, environmental and economic impacts of a Plan and is a requirement for local development documents under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This requirement does not extend to Neighbourhood Development Plans. However, because sustainability is important to the Parish Council and local community and because the Parish is located entirely within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) then sustainability has been a paramount consideration in the development of the Plan and a Sustainability Appraisal of the WNP2 has therefore been undertaken.

1.2 The Woodcote Challenge

The current Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan (WNP1) identifies a need, and allocates sites, for 76 new homes in the Parish in the period to 2027. In 2020 the SOLP35 allocated the parish 225 new homes, an increase of 22% in the size of the village. In addition, the WNP2 allocates an additional 0.5 ha of employment land to support local enterprise.

The challenge facing the Parish Council is to identify sites for new houses in a village that is entirely within and washed over by the AONB, that lacks local services, and whose residents want to protect the AONB and limit the impact of development upon the natural environment and quality of life and services.

The neighbourhood plan is largely, but not exclusively, about housing and employment so it is the allocation of land for those purposes that is the primary focus of this appraisal. Other aspects of living and working in Woodcote are important and are considered but, as the baseline data and consultations demonstrate, housing is by far the issue that most concerns residents. The appraisal begins, therefore, by considering the strategic options for the location of new housing and employment. Once the preferred strategic option is determined the appraisal then appraises the impact on sustainability of policies allocating sites for development and concludes with an appraisal of the impact of the remaining policies on sustainability.

1.3 Scoping Report

A sustainability appraisal scoping report (the **Scoping Report**) was produced in February 2020. This identified the relevant planning policies and documents that apply to a Woodcote neighbourhood plan and presented baseline data under eleven different headings:

- Nature Conservation
- Human Population
- Landscape
- Human Health
- Air Quality and Climate Factors
- Material Assets
- Heritage and Character
- Employment and Jobs
- Soil and Geology
- Education and Skills
- Water

Consultation

As required by Regulation 4 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 a copy of the Scoping Report was provided to the statutory consultation bodies: Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency. Their responses are provided as Appendix II to the Scoping Report.

1.4 Sustainability Appraisal Approach

Stage C in the recommended approach to Sustainability Appraisal (*Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects*) requires that a sustainability framework will be used to test the strategic plan options as they emerge and then to test all potential developments and sites.

The Scoping Report established two sustainability frameworks: one to appraise the neighbourhood plan's strategic options¹ and a second to appraise potential sites and developments². In each set there are tests that the option or site must satisfy if the sustainability of the option or site is to be assessed as acceptable.

Scope

WNP2 allocates additional sites for development and introduces new policies, with particular emphasis on reducing the contribution to climate change. This Sustainability Appraisal appraises the new housing and employment sites allocated, previously allocated sites that have not yet submitted a planning application, and the new policies introduced in WNP2. Policies retained from WNP1 were appraised for WNP1 and the appraisal of these is not repeated in this Appraisal.

¹ Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2035: Scoping Report Section 6.2

² Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2035: Scoping Report Section 6.3

Section 2: Strategic Option Sustainability Appraisal

The Scoping Report established that the sustainability of strategic options be appraised using the tests in the framework below (Table 2.1) noting that these tests recognise the importance attached in the NPPF to:

- i. conserving and enhancing the landscape of the AONB. Paragraph 176 requires that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. Woodcote is entirely within the Chilterns AONB and options that use brownfield land or sites within the built-up area of the parish will be preferred;
- ii. avoiding major development in AONBs. Paragraph 176 requires that the scale and extent of developments within a designated area, such as an AONB, should be limited and paragraph 177 requires that planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Although there is no formal definition of major in this context, research³ suggests that a development that increases the settlement housing stock by 4-5% will usually be considered as major. This may be altered by other circumstances such as the location, but 4.5% provides a useful indication for assessing whether a development is likely to be considered as major. In the context of Woodcote 4.5% represents about 45 houses, which, at, say, 30 dph, would occupy 1.5 Ha. Therefore, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, options requiring the loss of less than 1.5 Ha of greenfield land in the AONB will be preferred;
- iii. habitat conservation and enhancement. Paragraph 174 requires that local ecologically rich habitats be safeguarded and conserved thus options that do not result in the loss of greenfield or ecologically rich land will be preferred; and
- iv. responding to local character. Options that support development that would integrate both architecturally and socially will be preferred.

Sustainability Type		Consideration
Environmental		
SOT-01	Landscape	Could the option be delivered entirely within the existing built-up area?
SOT-02		Would the option result in a development greater than 1.5ha in then AONB?
SOT-03		Could the option be delivered on brownfield land?
SOT-04	Ecological Impact	To what extent will the option result in loss of biodiversity and habitat?
Social		
SOT-05	Local Character impact	Would the option create a new development greater than 4.5% of current village size?
SOT-06	Heritage	Can the option be delivered without degrading or damaging any heritage assets or their significance?
SOT-07	Flood risk	Could the option be delivered without increasing an existing, or creating a new, flood risk?
Economic		
SOT-8	Employment	Would the option improve the employment opportunities in the village?

Table 2.1: Sustainability Framework Strategic Option Appraisal Tests

³ Research paper – “What is Major Development in an AONB”

2.1 Requirement

The SOLP35 proposes a 15% increase on the housing stock as it was at 2011 plus the Core Strategy allocations, where these exist, for each of the larger villages. In so doing it recognises (paragraph 4.28) that *'some villages are constrained by factors such as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and Flood Zones. Where Neighbourhood Development Plans are considering sites within an AONB or sites that form part of the setting of an AONB, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be undertaken. In these villages a 15% growth may not be fully achievable'*. The allocation for Woodcote is 225 which, deducting WNP1 allocations and windfalls, becomes 115 very few of which will not require the development of greenfield land on the edge of the village and thus intrude into the landscape of the AONB. A housing density of 25-30 new homes per hectare has been assumed to allow for screening and other environmental features to help provide a sympathetic transition. The additional 0.5 hectares of employment land will, similarly, require greenfield land on the edge of the current built-up area.

2.2 Strategic Options

The new SOLP35 allocation would require the allocation of some 4-4.5 ha of land for new homes in addition to the land allocated in WNP1 and the 0.4 ha for new employment purposes during the period to 2035. Three delivery options are considered:

- Option A: place all new housing and all new employment development in a single site within the parish;
- Option B: place all new housing in a single site and all employment in separate single site; or
- Option C: spread all development (housing and employment) across a small number (5-7) of sites within the parish.

2.3 Option Appraisal

Table 2.3 uses the Strategic Options Sustainability Framework presented in the Scoping Report to appraise the three options. The impact of each option on a sustainability objective is assessed by considering:

- i. the likelihood that it will take place;
- ii. the magnitude of the effect on the parish; and
- iii. the duration of the effect.

However, because:

- i. all the options are for housing and employment building then the duration of the effect, whatever the option, is permanent; and
- ii. the new housing will be built to meet the agreed requirements of the Local Planning Authority then the likelihood is high for all options;

thus

- iii. to a great extent the impact is determined by the magnitude or scale of the change effected by the option and whether the change is beneficial or damaging to sustainability.

Magnitude	Description
High (H)	The option has an impact on a nationally sensitive sustainability consideration.
Medium (M)	The option has an impact on a locally important sustainability consideration.
Low (L)	The option has an impact on other local sustainable considerations.
Neutral (Ne)	The option has no impact on the sustainability consideration.

Table 2.2 (i): Magnitude of the Impact

Contribution	Description
Positive (P)	The option has a beneficial impact on, or contributes to, sustainability.
Negative (N)	The option would reduce or degrade sustainability.

Table 2.2 (ii): Contribution to Sustainability

Mitigation

The appraisal proceeds by considering the unmitigated sustainability impact of the option and then the residual impact following steps taken to offset any adverse effects on sustainability (environmental, social and economic) arising from the option. Table 2.2 (iii) provides definitions for appraisal of the residual impact on sustainability.

Residual Impact	Description
Beneficial	The option exceeds the plan's sustainability objectives and satisfies the sustainability criteria as defined in the Scoping Report without the need for mitigation.
Acceptable	The option meets the plan's sustainability objectives and satisfies the sustainability criteria as defined in the Scoping Report with little or no mitigation.
Acceptable with mitigation	The option fails to meet sustainability criteria as defined in the Scoping Report, but the adverse effect can be reduced or largely eliminated by specific mitigation measures
Unacceptable	The adverse impact on sustainability of the option cannot, practically, be effectively mitigated.

Table 2.2 (iii): Residual Impact

2.4 Appraisal Outcome

Table 2.3 summarises the outcome of the appraisal. All options show a cumulative negative effect. There is not enough pre-developed or vacant land in the Parish to accommodate the new homes and employment requirement thus most of the development will lead to the permanent loss of greenfield sites and landscape quality in the AONB.

Option C does allow some limited development within the built-up area. Smaller sites distributed around the edges of the built-up area offer better opportunities for screening, albeit potentially intruding into or losing long views, more opportunity to provide for wildlife, and fit better with the character of the village as it has developed since the creation of the AONB. Thus, as more housing is required Option C, as the least damaging to sustainable development, is selected.

	Option A One large development site	Option B Two sites: one for housing and one for employment	Option C Five to seven sites for housing and employment distributed around the parish
SOT-01 Landscape Impact Could the option be delivered entirely within the built-up area? Woodcote is entirely within the Chilterns AONB and any development outside the current village boundary will intrude into and, potentially, degrade a nationally important landscape.	No - there are no sites large enough to accommodate a single development of the required size within the built-up area. As such, this option requires a major incursion into, and loss of landscape quality of, the AONB. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation - although some screening may be possible and better density obtained, a large development cannot be sufficiently sympathetically implanted in the landscape without changing and obstructing views in this part of the AONB. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	No – there are no sites within the built-up area for a single housing site of the size required. A separate employment site might be possible so, overall, there could be some minor, but insignificant, reduction in the degree of intrusion into the AONB. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation - although some screening may be possible and there may be a somewhat smaller single incursion into the AONB, the insertion of a large housing site into the landscape, however screened, will diminish and obstruct the landscape and local views. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	No – there is not enough undeveloped land in the built-up area to accommodate the requirement and there will still be a significant incursion, albeit somewhat reduced and distributed, into the AONB. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) M ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – smaller developments will be easier to screen and could reduce the scale of the visual intrusion but views in a nationally significant landscape will be diminished in several locations rather than one. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation
SOT-02 Would the option result in a single development greater than 1.5 HA? Sites greater than 1-1.5 ha would constitute major development in this part of the AONB.	Yes – the total area required, using a density of 25–30 homes/ha would be more than 4-4.5 ha and constitute a major development in the AONB. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – major development is permissible if exceptional circumstances can be shown. None exist in this case thus mitigation of this option remains screening as for SOT-01, above. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Yes – locating the employment development away from the new housing site still constitutes major development as the housing site will be some 4 Ha. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – major development is permissible if exceptional circumstances can be shown. None exist in this case thus mitigation of this option remains screening as for SOT-01, above. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	No – while the total requirement remains greater than 4 Ha, if spread relatively evenly across 5-7 sites all developments would be less than 1.5 Ha. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – implementing the requirement across a set of smaller sites will avoid a development of more than 1HA. Mitigation remains screening as for SOT-01, above. Residual Impact: Acceptable

Table 2.3 Strategic Option Assessment (page 1 of 4)

SOT-03 Could the option be delivered on brownfield land? The use of brownfield land will reduce the loss of greenfield sites in the AONB and, potentially, allow remediation of previously developed land.	No. This option requires a site of some 4- 4.5 ha and there is insufficient brownfield land in the settlement to meet this. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – none. For this option all development will be on greenfield land in the AONB. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	No. This option requires a site of some 4 ha for housing and 0.4 ha for employment. There is insufficient brownfield land in the settlement to meet this. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – none. For this option all housing development will be greenfield land in the AONB. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	No. There is insufficient land in the developed area to meet the overall requirement although brownfield sites might deliver a small, less than 25%, of the overall requirement. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) M ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – none. Although some development may be possible on a small amount of previously developed land and some may be in repurposed existing buildings there will still be a need for greenfield sites. Residual Impact: Unacceptable
SOT-04 Ecological Impact To what extent will the option result in loss of biodiversity and habitat? Woodcote is recognised as one of the most important locations for wildlife in the county with the habitat significance of 60% classed as <i>Very High</i> and 25-30% as <i>High</i>.	The built-up area of the parish is surrounded by land 85-90% of which is rated as having Very High or High value ecologically. This option results in the loss of a single area of 4 – 4.5 ha of ecologically important habitat. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – the scale of the habitat loss makes it difficult to replace but careful site design can maintain green corridors, the addition of roosting and nesting features, and other local habitat improvement projects could compensate to some extent for the permanent loss of habitat. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	The built-up area of the parish is surrounded by land 85-90% of which is rated as having Very High or High value ecologically. This option reduces the single largest loss of important habitat to some 4 Ha. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – the scale of the habitat loss makes it difficult to replace but careful site design can maintain green corridors, the addition of roosting and nesting features, and other local habitat improvement projects could compensate to some extent for the permanent loss of habitat. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	The built-up area of the parish is surrounded by land 85-90% of which is rated as having Very High or High value ecologically. This option produces smaller areas of loss which, although together amount to 4 -4.5 Ha, could be located to minimise the habitat loss. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) M ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – this option makes it easier to maintain green corridors which, with provision of wildlife friendly features, such as nesting boxes, in the development together with nearby, of-site, habitat improvements would reduce the overall loss to some 70% of that for options A and B. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation

Table 2.3 Strategic Option Assessment (page 2 of 4)

SOT-05 Local Character Impact Would the option create a new development greater than 4.5% of current village size?	Yes. A single development of 4-4.5 ha will increase the size of the developed area by more than 4.5% in a village in a form inconsistent with the smaller developments allowed since the creation of the AONB. A single large development can only be placed on the edge of the built-up area which will require paths and street lighting and other urbanisation features uncharacteristic of many parts of the village. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – sympathetic design providing a soft edge and the incorporation of substantial planting and green features could mimic some of the characteristics of village areas. Lighting will need to be carefully introduced and designs must lead to a soft edge to the meeting of the developed are and AONB. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Yes. Locating the employment development away from the new housing site will reduce the area required for housing but this will still require an increase in the developed area of more than 4.5% in a form inconsistent with the smaller developments allowed since the creation of the AONB. This option can only be placed on the edge of the built-up area which will require paths and street lighting and other urbanisation features uncharacteristic of many parts of the village. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) H ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – sympathetic design providing a soft edge and the incorporation of substantial planting and green features could mimic some of the characteristics of village areas. Lighting will need to be carefully introduced and designs must lead to a soft edge to the meeting of the developed are and AONB. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	No. Overall this option will increase the size of the developed area by more than 4.5% but the option allows this to be done in a manner that mirrors the smaller developments allowed since the creation of the AONB and that characterise the built-up area of the village. The majority of these smaller developments will be on the edge of the village and thus introduce and extend urban features into the AONB. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) M ▪ Impact (P/N) N Mitigation – sympathetic design, with planting and green features could lend these smaller developments the characteristics of recent development and careful lighting can help reduce light pollution. Low level building could also soften the impact on the AONB. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation
SOT-06 Heritage Can the option be delivered without degrading or damaging any heritage assets or their significance?	Yes – this option can only be met by developing greenfield land outside the current built-up area and hence beyond the location of heritage assets in the parish. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this option can only be met by developing greenfield land outside the current built-up area and hence beyond the location of heritage assets in the parish. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this option will largely be met by developing greenfield land outside the current built-up area and hence beyond the location of heritage assets in the parish. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required. Residual Impact: Acceptable

Table 2.3 Strategic Option Assessment (page 3 of 4)

SOT-07 Flood Risk Could the option be delivered without increasing an existing, or creating a new, flood risk?	Yes – Woodcote’s location on the Chilterns escarpment some 60-180 metres above sea level makes flooding unlikely given that the development is constructed with adequate drainage provision. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Yes – Woodcote’s location on the Chilterns escarpment some 60-180 metres above sea level makes flooding unlikely given that the development is constructed with adequate drainage provision. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Yes – Woodcote’s location on the Chilterns escarpment some 60-180 metres above sea level makes flooding unlikely given that the development is constructed with adequate drainage provision. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required. Residual Impact: Acceptable
SOT-08 Employment Would the option improve the employment opportunities in the village?	Yes. New housing means new clients for local businesses and new employment sites create the opportunity for new small businesses. New employment sites create the opportunity for new businesses. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required albeit consideration must be given to design and location to reduce the impact on the AONB. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Yes. New housing means new clients for local businesses and new employment sites create the opportunity for new small businesses. New employment sites create the opportunity for new businesses. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required albeit consideration must be given to design and location to reduce the impact on the AONB. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Yes. New housing means new clients for local businesses and new employment sites create the opportunity for new small businesses. New employment sites create the opportunity for new businesses. ▪ Magnitude (L/M/H) L ▪ Impact (P/N) P Mitigation – none required albeit consideration must be given to design and location to reduce the impact on the AONB. Residual Impact: Acceptable

Table 2.3 Strategic Option Assessment (page 4 of 4)

			A	B	C
SOT-01	Landscape	Could the option be delivered entirely within the existing built-up area?	U	U	U
SOT-02		Would the option result in a development greater than 1.5Ha?	U	U	A
SOT-03		Could the option be delivered on brownfield land?	U	U	U
SOT-04	Ecological Impact	To what extent will the option result in loss of biodiversity and habitat?	U	U	AW
SOT-05	Local Character impact	Would the option create a new development greater than 4.5% of current village size?	U	U	AW
SOT-06	Heritage	Can the option be delivered without degrading or damaging any heritage assets or their significance?	A	A	A
SOT-07	Flood risk	Could the option be delivered without increasing an existing, or creating a new, flood risk?	A	A	A
SOT-08	Employment	Would the option improve the employment opportunities in the village?	A	A	A

Table 2.4: Strategic Option Appraisal Summary

Key: U - Unacceptable
 AW - Acceptable with Mitigation
 A - Acceptable
 B - Beneficial

Section 3: Site Option Appraisal

3.1 Potential Site Identification

A list of potentially suitable sites was assembled by adding all sites in the South Oxfordshire District Council's current Strategic Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) to:

- i. all unallocated sites identified for the current Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan (WNP1);
- ii. other sites notified to South Oxfordshire District Council; and
- iii. all responses to an advertisement placed by Woodcote Parish Council in the Henley Standard.

The result was a list of approximately 70 entries which required substantial 'cleaning' to remove entries for sites that were:

- duplicated;
- already developed;
- already allocated for development in WNP1;
- too small to be anything other than infill opportunities;
- unavailable because of a covenant against development;
- unavailable because the owner did not wish to develop them; or
- withdrawn following a change of ownership.

Although they were initially assessed, two sites were withdrawn during the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. The land adjacent to Bouchier Fencing (a WNP1 reserve site) was withdrawn by the owner and the land at Goats Gambol has been sold and the new owners do not wish to develop the site.

The result is 16 sites listed in table 3.1.

Site Id	Source	Ref.	Other Site Ref.	Description
Land offered only for housing				
1	WNP2 Approach		SHLAA - W005	Hilltop Field
2	WNP2 Approach		SHLAA - W006	Land adjoining Yew Tree Farmhouse at rear
3	WNP2 Approach		SHLAA - W006	Land at rear of Yew Tree Farmhouse and behind Scrooby
4	WNP2 Approach		SHLAA - W012	Rear of 16 Bridle Path
6	WNP2 Approach			Wood Lane
9	HELAA	339		Beechwood Court Offices at present
16	HELAA	823	042	Land north of Beech Lane
20	HELAA	869	125	Foxcovert Farm
27	HELAA	1028	345	Land at Greenmore Hill Farm (Black Lion)
29	HELAA	1105	015	Land at Greenmore
30	HELAA	1111	264	Land west of Woodcote Garden Centre (Church Farm)
34	HELAA	1182	391b	Land south of Red Lane (Hildred Fields)
45	SHLAA	W001 (a)		Chiltern Rise WNP1 Reserve Site
Land offered only for employment				
25	HELAA	972	263	Land west of Church Farm
98	WNP2 Approach			Paddock by Wards Farm
Land offered for part housing and part employment.				
43	HELAA	1359	W00 15	Land east of Greenmore - Bishops Yard + additional land

Table 3.1: Sites Offered for Development

3.2 Approach

Sustainability is, and has been, a major consideration throughout the production of the WNP2 and potential sites are assessed using the site evaluation criteria presented in the Scoping Report (reproduced as Table 3.2) to identify those sites where development, with or without mitigation, would be sustainable. As a further element in the appraisal the sites emerging as acceptable are appraised against the sustainability objectives of WNP2. Section 4 then reviews the sustainability impact of the policies in WNP2.

3.3 Site Appraisal Tests

The initial landscape element of the site assessment was subsequently supplemented by a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The appraisal below includes the results from the LVIA. A preliminary ecological assessment of the sites emerging as potentially suitable for development was then carried out by ecology consultants Ecology by Design Ltd. This assessment did not identify any significant ecological issues on any of the potentially suitable sites.

Test	
Major Development	
PST-01	Is the site greater than 1.5HA? (4.5% of the current built-up area)?
PST-02	Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?
Landscape and Visual Impact	
PST-03	What would be the landscape impact?
PST-04	What would be the visual impact?
Contiguity	
PST-05	Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?
PST-06	Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?
Heritage	
PST-07	Would development on the site be likely to affect the significance of any heritage asset, including its setting?
Pedestrian Road Safety and Congestion	
PST-08	Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?
PST-09	Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?
PST-10	Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?
PST-11	Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?
PST-12	Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?
PST-13	Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?
Traffic Issues	
PST-14	Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?
PST-15	Is the main route from the site a narrow road?
PST-16	Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?
Flood Risk	
PST-17	Is the site vulnerable to flooding?
Ecology	
PST-18	Is the site ecologically valuable?
Economy	
PST-19	Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?

Table 3.2: Site Appraisal Tests

3.4 Site Option Appraisal

Table 3.4 presents the appraisal of each offered site. The impact of each option on a sustainability objective is assessed by considering the likelihood that it will take place, the magnitude of the effect on the objective, and the duration of the effect.

All options are for housing and employment buildings and, as such, produce a permanent change. Furthermore, the construction of new housing can be regarded as certain because it is required by the Local Plan. The impact, therefore, is determined by the magnitude of the effect on the Parish and the AONB and whether development improves or degrades sustainability.

Mitigation

The appraisal proceeds by considering the unmitigated impact and then the residual impact following steps taken to offset any adverse effects on sustainability (environmental, social and economic) arising from the plan's proposals. The ideal strategy will avoid adverse impacts. However, where avoidance is not possible then opportunities for reduction, remediation and compensation are considered. Table 3.3 provides definitions for appraisal of the residual impact on sustainability.

Residual Impact	Description
Beneficial	The development will complement or improve the sustainability of the sustainable component under appraisal.
Acceptable	The development complies with plan objectives and meets sustainability criteria as defined in the Scoping Report.
Acceptable with mitigation	There will be some adverse effects of development, or the development fails to meet sustainability criteria as defined in the Scoping Report, but these can be reduced or largely eliminated by specific measures.
Unacceptable	The adverse impact is too excessive and cannot, practically, be mitigated

Table 3.3 Residual Impact Definitions

In this appraisal mitigation measures may be:

- i. constraints or other requirements on the design of the new developments; or
- ii. measures to disguise or compensate for any residual adverse impacts.

Outcome

Tables 3.4 and 3.5 appraise the sustainability qualities of each proposed site which are then summarised in Tables 3.6 and 3.7. From this:

- i. the four sites below emerge as **Acceptable with Mitigation** for new homes:
 - Site 2. Land at Yew Tree Farmhouse;
 - Site 3. Land behind Scrooby;
 - Site 9. Beechwood Court;
 - Site 30. Land west of Garden Centre; and
- ii. the three sites below emerge as **Acceptable with Mitigation** for new employment development:
 - Site 25. Land west of Church Farm;
 - Site 43a. Bishop's Yard (the Old Coal Yard); and
 - Site 98. Wards Farm Paddock.

Site Number & Name Framework Test	1 Hilltop Field	2 Land adjoining Yew Tree Farmhouse at rear	3 Land at rear of Yew Tree Farmhouse and behind Scrooby
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT	Mitigation – the adverse impact cannot be practically mitigated and, in the absence of any exceptional circumstances. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	Mitigation –the adverse impact can be reduced with policies covering the development of the site to: (i) ensure that development does not abut; (ii) provide green corridors between each site; and (iii) limit the developable area to reduce the scale of the development. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation – The adverse impact can be reduced with policies covering the development of the site to: (i) ensure that development does not abut; (ii) provide green corridors between each site; and (iii) limit the developable area to reduce the scale of the development. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation
PST-01 Is the size greater than 1.5HA?	Development of this 4.88 HA this site, with a potential capacity of over 120 homes, would constitute major development in the AONB. Impact: Very High Adverse	Development of this 0.38 HA site, while not being a major development, would represent an incursion into the AONB. Impact: Low Adverse	Development of this 0.44 HA site, while not being a major development, would represent an incursion into the AONB. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-02 Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?	There are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	This site abuts site 3 potentially creating a site of some 0.8 HA which if both were developed to their full extent would represent a significant incursion into the AONB. Impact: Medium Adverse	This site abuts site 2 potentially creating a site of some 0.8 HA which if both were developed to their full extent would represent a significant incursion into the AONB. Impact: Low Adverse
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	Mitigation - mitigation in the form of landscape buffer planting along the site boundaries, could help to provide some filtering effect on views into the development but would also restrict the longer views and compromise the important visual connections with the wider landscape. Planting to mitigate visual	Mitigation – The site makes a limited contribution to the landscape of the AONB. Adverse effects could be mitigated by sympathetic building design and limited buffer planting along the north west site boundary to provide some filtering effect on views of the development on this site and would not detract from any longer	Mitigation – The site makes a limited contribution to the landscape of the AONB. Negative effects could be mitigated by sympathetic building design and limited buffer planting along the north west site boundary to provide some filtering effect on views of the development on this site and would not detract from any longer

	impact would therefore exacerbate the landscape impacts by causing additional adverse changes to the prevailing landscape character. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	views into the site. Planting in front of the houses would limit the impact on residents nearby. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	views into the site. Planting in front of the houses would limit the impact on residents nearby. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation
PST-04 What would be the visual impact?	The site is in a prominent position on the edge of the escarpment in the Chilterns AONB providing long views across the Thames valley into the North Wessex Downs AONB. The LVIA assesses the impact on the visual amenity as 'Major adverse'. Impact: Very High Adverse	The site is not visible from Behoes Lane. There is only limited visibility from a small number of adjacent residential properties, although there are distant views from open ground to the north west. The LVIA assesses the visual impact of developing this site as 'Medium adverse'. Impact: Medium Adverse	The site is not visible from Behoes Lane, there is only limited visibility from a small number of adjacent residential properties, although there are distant views from open ground to the north west. The LVIA assesses the visual impact of developing this site as 'Medium adverse'. Impact: Medium Adverse
CONTIGUITY	Mitigation – An extension of the developed area into the AONB cannot be practically mitigated. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST- 05 Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?	Yes Impact: Acceptable	Yes Impact: Acceptable	Yes Impact: Acceptable
PST-06 Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?	Yes – A 4.88 HA development will significantly extend the built-up area of the village into the undeveloped AONB. Impact: High Adverse	No – this lies within the existing build line of the village. Impact: Acceptable	No – this lies within the existing build line of the village. Impact: Acceptable

HERITAGE	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-07 Heritage Would development on the site be likely to affect the Impact of any heritage asset, including its setting?	No – this site neither contains nor abuts sites of heritage value. Impact: Acceptable	No – this site neither contains nor abuts sites of heritage value. Impact: Acceptable	No – this site neither contains nor abuts sites of heritage value. Impact: Acceptable
PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY	Mitigation – None required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for, in most cases, an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for, in most cases, an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-08 Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?	Yes Impact: Acceptable	Yes Impact: Acceptable	Yes Impact: Acceptable
Walking distances PST-09 Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?	Yes – although some 450m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – although some 500m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – although some 500m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable
PST-10 Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?	Yes – although some 450m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	No – at some 325m this is acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	No – at some 325m this is acceptable. Impact: Acceptable

PST-11 Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?	Yes – although some 450m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	No – at some 325m this is acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	No – at some 325m this is acceptable. Impact: Acceptable
PST-12 Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?	Yes – although some 450m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – at some 900m this site is some twice the preferred distance to encourage walking. Impact: Low adverse	Yes – at some 900m this site is some twice the preferred distance to encourage walking. Impact: Low adverse
PST-13 Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?	Yes – although at some 550m this is considered acceptable. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – at some 900m this site is some twice the preferred distance to encourage walking. Impact: Low adverse	Yes – at some 900m this site is some twice the preferred distance to encourage walking. Impact: Low adverse
ROAD SAFETY AND CONGESTION	Mitigation – of the considerable congestion likely to arise from the development of this site would require (i) the widening of adjacent and access roads, (ii) a ban on street parking in Wayside Green which, given the lack of alternatives is not a viable solution, or (iii) make the right turn from Wayside Green into Behoes Lane No Entry which would seriously inconvenience the residents of that part of Behoes Lane, and/or (iv) the installation of a one-way system. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-14 Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?	No – traffic would leave any development at least 300m from the War memorial crossroads. Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic would leave any development at least 300m from the 'Coop-Junction' of Beech Lane, Goring Road and Bridlepath Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic would leave any development at least 300m from the 'Coop-Junction' of Beech Lane, Goring Road and Bridlepath Impact: Acceptable

PST-15 Is the main route from the site a narrow road?	Yes – access to the site will be from the 1.5 vehicle width Behoes Lane or South Stoke Roads or through Wayside Green which is always reduced to a single lane with blind bends. Impact: High Adverse	No – access to this site would be via Beech Lane and the first part of Behoes Lane which have the capacity to handle the additional traffic from any small development on this site. Impact: Acceptable	No – access to this site would be via Beech Lane which has the capacity to handle the additional traffic from any small development on this site. Impact: Acceptable
PST-16 Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?	Yes – vehicles can be expected to access the site through Wayside Green which always has residents' cars parked on the road reducing it to a single lane with blind bend and poor visibility. Impact: High Adverse	No – access to this site would be via Beech Lane which has the capacity to handle the additional traffic from any small development on this site. Impact: Acceptable	No – access to this site would be via Beech Lane which has the capacity to handle the additional traffic from any small development on this site. Impact: Acceptable
FLOOD RISK	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-17	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable
ECOLOGY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-18 Is the site ecologically valuable?	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable

ECONOMY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-19 Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?	Development will neither reduce nor increase employment opportunities. Impact: Acceptable	Development will neither reduce nor increase employment opportunities. Impact: Acceptable	No change. Development will neither reduce nor increase employment opportunities. Impact: Acceptable

Table 3.4: New Housing Site Appraisal (part 1 of 5)

Site Number & Name Framework Test	4 Rear of 16 Bridle Path	6 Wood Lane	9 Beechwood Court (Offices at present)
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT	Mitigation – the adverse impact cannot be practically mitigated and, in the absence of any exceptional circumstances. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	Mitigation – although not major development it would result in the loss of a significant parcel of greenfield land in the AONB which can only be disguised. Limited, but of uncertain practicality, mitigation measures would be the implementation of might be achieved with policies covering the development of the sites to: (i) ensure that development does not abut; (ii) provide green corridors between each site; and (iii) limit the developable area to reduce the scale of the development would limit the adverse impact. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	Mitigation – this site is already developed and requires no mitigation. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-01 Is the size greater than 1.5HA?	Development of this 3.4HA site, with a potential capacity of over 80 homes, would constitute major development of, and a major incursion into 'the AONB' Impact: Very High Adverse	Development of this 1 HA site, while not being a major development, would represent a significant incursion into the AONB. Impact: Low Adverse	No – this is a small site of some 0.25HA. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-02 Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?	No - although planning permission has been granted for a new home on a 0.63HA site abutting the north-western edge of this site. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site abuts the site at the end of Wood Lane allocated in the first Woodcote neighbourhood plan potentially creating a site of over 1.6 HA if both were developed to their full extent - a major development in the AONB. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – this site is opposite the first neighbourhood plan development at the old Bus Station potentially creating a site of some 0.75 HA if this site is developed to its full extent Impact: Low Adverse
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	Mitigation – the loss of over 3HA of the AONB cannot be mitigated. Buffer planting along the south eastern boundary would provide limited screening of the	Mitigation - the topography of the site means that mitigation is only possible by a substantial reduction in the developed area. However, any development will result	Mitigation – conversion of the existing buildings into homes will have no impact on the visual quality provided that there is no

	development but restrict the longer views, compromise the important visual connections with the wider landscape and significantly alter the openness that makes this part of the Chilterns AONB landscape special. Planting to mitigate visual impact would therefore exacerbate the landscape impacts by causing additional adverse changes to the prevailing landscape character. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	in the loss of a greenfield site typical of the AONB landscape, the loss of valued views, and urbanise the footpath Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	increase in building height or development footprint. No trees will be felled. Residual Impact: Acceptable.
PST-03 What would be the landscape impact?	The development of this site would result in a large extension of built development into the countryside around Woodcote. This site is typical of the character of this part of the AONB and any construction would result in the irreversible loss of a series of small characteristic open fields in the AONB. The LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape as 'Major Adverse'. Impact: Very High Adverse	Development would result in the irreversible loss of the pasture in the dry valley which, with the adjacent deciduous woodland are typical of the special qualities of the AONB. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the AONB. The LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape as 'Major Adverse' Impact: Very High Adverse	This site is an office building, with car parking, located at the limit of the built-up area of the village. Although located in the AONB, the site is surrounded by significant woodland on three sides. Development would be a change of use and, to a large extent, the landscape will remain as is today. The LVIA assesses the overall effect on the landscape is identified as 'Neutral'. Impact: Acceptable
PST-04 What would be the visual impact?	Any development on this site would significantly degrade the local view from Woodcote Footpath 411/9 and intrude upon, and block, the long views towards the north west. A number of residents would also be affected, mainly those occupying the houses in Bridle Path to the north east of the site, who experience direct views from the rear of their properties. The LVIA assesses the impact on the visual amenity as 'Major Adverse'. Impact: Very High Adverse	Any development on this site would be visible from footpath 411/2 and degrade the visual amenity for walkers using the footpath. Open views of pasture and the ancient, semi-natural, deciduous woodland would be largely lost. The impact on local residents is small to negligible. The LVIA assesses the impact on visual amenity to be 'Major Adverse'. Impact: Very High Adverse	The site is set back from Long Toll with trees surrounding the site and only limited visibility to the new homes on the opposite side of Long Toll. There are no significant distant views from the north, west and south of the site. The overall effect on visual amenity is identified as 'Negligible'. Impact: Acceptable

CONTIGUITY	Mitigation – the extension of the developed area of the village into the AONB cannot be practically mitigated Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	Mitigation – the extension of the developed area of the village into the AONB cannot be practically mitigated Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable.
PST-05 Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable
PST-06 Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?	Yes – development of this site would, at over 3HA, significantly extend the built-up area of the village. Impact: High Adverse	Yes – development of this site would significantly extend the built-up area of the village. Impact: High Adverse	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable
HERITAGE	Mitigation – None required	Mitigation – None required	Mitigation – None required
PST-07 Heritage Would development on the site be likely to affect the Impact of any heritage asset, including its setting?	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable
PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY	Mitigation – None required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-08 Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable

Walking distances PST-09 Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 550m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 750m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1000m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-10 Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?	No – there is a bus stop some 100m from the site. Impact: Acceptable	No – there is a bus stop some 350m from the site. Impact: Acceptable	No – there is a bus stop some 375m from the site. Impact: Acceptable
PST-11 Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?	No – at some 150 m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a shop for older, infirm, or those with young children and push chairs. Impact: Acceptable	No – at some 350m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a shop for older, infirm, or those with young children and push chairs. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – although not ideal at some 800m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-12 Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 750m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 900m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1000m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse
PST-13 Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 900m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1000m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1200m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
ROAD SAFETY AND CONGESTION	Mitigation – parking restrictions between the entrance to the site and the Coop would ease congestion. A zebra crossing could be installed to reduce the hazard to pedestrians crossing at this point. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation –measure to reduce the impact of the additional traffic on Wood lane are desirable but given that Wood lane cannot be widened then limiting the number of vehicular movements by limiting the number of new homes would be beneficial Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable

PST-14 Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?	At some 150m from the Coop store and busy junction with the Goring and Beech Lane this site can be expected to add to the congestion currently experienced there. Impact: Low Adverse	No – traffic from this site would emerge over 300m from the Coop/Goring Road/Beech Lane junction. Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic from this development would emerge at least 800m from the nearest location of road hazard or congestion. Impact: Acceptable
PST-15 Is the main route from the site a narrow road?	No – access to this site would be via Bridle Path which on which two vehicles can safely cross. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – vehicular access to this site would be from Wood Lane currently a small, narrow, dead-end. Impact: High Adverse	No – access to this site would be from Long Toll which, although narrow, has the capacity to handle vehicular access to this site. Impact: Acceptable
PST-16 Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?	No – access to this site would be from Bridle Path which although often congested opposite the nearby Co-op store could handle additional traffic without increasing congestion. Impact: Acceptable	No – although vehicle parking does reduce this already narrow lane access to/from this site should be possible depending on the size of any development Impact: Acceptable	No Impact: Acceptable
FLOOD RISK	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-17	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable
ECOLOGY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-18 Is the site ecologically valuable?	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable

ECONOMY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – there is no demand for these offices, and several have been vacant for some while. However, the loss can be compensated by allocating additional employment space elsewhere in the village. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-19 Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?	No change. Impact: Acceptable	No change. Impact: Acceptable	Ye – this site comprises offices which will be converted to one and two bed flats. Impact: Acceptable

Table 3.4: New Site Housing Appraisal (part 2 of 5)

Site Number & Name Framework Test	16 Land north of Beech Lane	20 Foxcovert Farm	27 Land at Greenmore Hill Farm (Black Lion)
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT	Mitigation – development would result in the loss of greenfield land in the AONB but at less than 0.5HA it cannot be considered to be major development. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – development would result in the loss of greenfield land in the AONB but at 0.7HA although substantial it cannot be considered to be major development. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – This site is separated from the old reservoir site by a bridle path which should be protected. Policies covering the development of the sites to: (i) ensure that development does not abut; (ii) provide green corridors between each site; and (iii) limit the developable area to reduce the scale of the development. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation
PST-01 Is the size greater than 1.5HA?	No – at 0.4HA the incursion into the AONB will not be major. Impact: Low Adverse	No – at 0.66HA the incursion into the AONB will be substantial but not major. Impact: Low Adverse	No – at 0.15HA the incursion into the AONB will be negligible. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-02 Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site abuts site 43 and the old reservoir site allocated in the first Woodcote neighbourhood plan potentially creating a site of nearly 0.9 HA if all were developed to their full extent. Impact: Low Adverse
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	Mitigation – the loss of an open paddock typical of the AONB cannot be compensated for. Retention of a major part of the hedgerow and landscape buffer planting could also provide some filtering effect on views of the development, particularly along the southern and northern edge, but the widening of the lane to provide access will open views into the site and make development immediately apparent.	Mitigation - the location (remote from the built area of the village) means that development will have a significant impact on the landscape unless it is restricted to sympathetic replacement of the existing buildings. Landscape buffer planting along the site boundaries, could help to provide some filtering effect on views of the development on this site, particularly along the eastern edge.	Mitigation – development would result in the permanent loss of a field typical of the AONB. Development could be partially concealed by substantial, tall, buffer planting along the western edge but to be effective this would have an overbearing impact on the bridle path. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.

	Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Residual Impact: Unacceptable	
PST-03 What would be the landscape impact?	Any construction would result in the irreversible loss of an open arable greenfield site. It would have an adverse effect on the landscape of the AONB as it would result in the loss of openness in this area. The LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape of development on this site as Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse	Foxcovert farm is located in an isolated position near to the southernmost point of the parish on the Goring Road. There are houses to the south, and opposite in the woods is one further house. The northern boundary of the site extends onto cultivated arable fields. To the west, are major woods forming part of the Chilterns AONB, which include the public footpath 411/17 through Fox Covert Woods. With mitigation the LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape as Neutral. Impact: Low Adverse	This small greenfield site is located behind the Black Lion public house. Typical of the character of this part of the AONB, the site is bounded by trees with bridleway 19 running alongside its western boundary. The LVIA assesses the impact of development on the landscape to be High Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse
PST-04 What would be the visual impact?	Any development on this site would be clearly visible from both Beech Lane and the housing lying to north-west and from Behoes Lane in the north-east, as the land is relatively flat across this section of the village and arable fields. The LVIA assesses the visual impact of development to be Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse	The site is clearly visible from Goring Road and the footpath opposite in Fox Covert woods which opens onto Goring road. There are also glimpses from Shirvell's Hill and distant views from the Upper Covert woods and from footpath 411/9 (View 3). The LVIA assesses the impact on visual amenity as High Adverse. Impact: High Adverse	The site is visible from the bridleway and users of the bridleway will have an uninterrupted view of the development on this site. To provide access to the site will create a significant opening that will be visible from Greenmore as well as the bridleway. The LVIA assesses the overall effect on visual amenity to be High Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse
CONTIGUITY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – the extension of the developed area of the village into the AONB cannot be practically mitigated Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable.
PST- 05 Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	No – this site is located in an isolated position near to the southernmost point of the parish some distance from the built area of the village.	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable

		Impact: Acceptable	
PST-06 Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?	No – this development would be within the built-up area of the village albeit on the edge of the current developed area. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – development of this site would create a new development outside the built-up area of the village Impact: High Adverse	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable
HERITAGE	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-07 Heritage Would development on the site be likely to affect the Impact of any heritage asset, including its setting?	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable
PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY	Mitigation – mitigation requires the construction of a new footpath which, given the narrowness of the lane would not be possible thus reducing the number of new homes must be considered. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation – mitigation is only possible with the construction of a new footpath. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation – None available although, overall the site is beyond the preferred walking distances and may encourage car use. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-08 Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?	No – pedestrian, wheelchair, invalid carriage or pushchair users would need to walk in the road. Impact: Low Adverse	No – pedestrian, wheelchair, invalid carriage or pushchair users would need to walk in what is a very busy road that links those leaving the M4 at Theale with the M40 at Oxford. Impact: High Adverse	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable
Walking distances PST-09	Yes – although not ideal at some 900m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1000m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1100m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse

Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?			
PST-10 Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 500m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 500m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	No – there is a bus stop some 325m from the site. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-11 Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 500m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 500m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 800m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-12 Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 1000m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1100m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1050m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-13 Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 1200m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 1100m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 900m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
ROAD SAFETY AND CONGESTION	Mitigation – some mitigation in the form of road widening would be desirable but the absence of footpaths makes this impractical. Mitigation must, therefore rely on reducing the additional traffic by limiting the number of new homes. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – parking controls opposite this site will be necessary. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation
PST-14 Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 500m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic would enter and leave this site over 500m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 800m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable

PST-15 Is the main route from the site a narrow road?	Yes - access will be from Beech Lane, a narrow lane in which vehicles have difficulty passing and lacking a footpath. Impact: High Adverse	No – the Goring Road has the capacity to take any extra vehicle movements from this site. Impact: Acceptable	No – Greenmore is wide enough at this point to allow vehicles to pass. Impact: Acceptable
PST-16 Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?	No – although vehicles are occasionally parked in the lane access to this site should be possible depending on the size of any development. Impact: Acceptable	No – vehicles are rarely parked on the Goring Road by this site. Impact: Acceptable	Yes - Greenmore is very heavily parked and reduced to a single lane some 400m towards the Wards Farm site. Impact: High Adverse
FLOOD RISK	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-17	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable
ECOLOGY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-18 Is the site ecologically valuable?	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable
ECONOMY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-19 Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?	No change. Impact: Acceptable	No change. Impact: Acceptable	No change. Impact: Acceptable

Table 3.4: New Housing Site Appraisal (part 3 of 5)

Site Number & Name Framework Test	29 Land at Greenmore	30 Land west of Woodcote Garden Centre (Church Farm)	34 Land south of Red Lane (Hildred Fields)
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT	Mitigation – the adverse impact cannot be practically mitigated and, in the absence of any exceptional circumstances. Residual Impact: Unacceptable.	Mitigation – although only slightly less than 1.5 Ha, the development contains a landscaped car park and lower density development to allow for landscaping to mitigate the effect of the development on the AONB Residual Impact: Acceptable.	Mitigation – major development might be considered sustainable if special circumstances exist. None exist in this case Residual Impact: Unacceptable
PST-01 Is the size greater than 1.5HA?	Yes – 1.7 HA development, with a potential capacity of over 50 homes, would constitute major development in, and a major incursion into the AONB. Impact: High Adverse	No – at 1.46HA the incursion into the AONB will be substantial but not major. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – development of this 23 HA site, with a potential capacity of over 500 homes, would constitute major development of, and a major incursion into the AONB. Impact: Very High Adverse
PST-02 Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	Mitigation – development will result in a significant intrusion into the landscape of the AONB which could be partially disguised by buffer planting, but this would considerably alter the openness that make this part of the Chilterns AONB special and restrict the longer views. Planting would, therefore, exacerbate the impact on the landscape by causing additional adverse changes to the prevailing landscape character. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Mitigation - the visual impact could be substantially reduced by: (i) replanting the lost hedge across the centre of the site with a similar hedge along the northern boundary, (ii) improving the landscape buffer planting along the western edge of the site, (iii) adding landscape buffer planting to the western edge of the site, minimising the loss of hedge on the Reading Road required to access any development, and (iv) limiting the height of development to two stories.	Mitigation - landscape planting within the site would disguise the buildings to a limited extent but not compensate for the loss of the open, tranquil, landscape, open feel and valued views in this part of the AONB. Residual Impact: Unacceptable

		Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	
PST-03 What would be the landscape impact?	This is a large greenfield site of about 1.7 HA with frontage onto Greenmore. The site forms a distinctive gap in the established building pattern contributing to the underlying and distinctive landscape mosaic and creates a semi-rural character to this section of Greenmore. The LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape of development of this site to be Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse	This site runs north from the Reading Road opposite the Village Hall car park, Community Centre and Schools. There are strong boundaries to the south, where views are blocked by a high (2-3m) mixed hedge, and the eastern end by a bungalow. The LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape of developing this site as Medium Adverse. Impact: High Adverse	This is a large (23HA) greenfield site comprising two large, open arable fields both surrounded by tall hedges and typical of the AONB in this area. Construction would have an adverse effect on the landscape of the Chilterns AONB and the LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape to be Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse
PST-04 What would be the visual impact?	The site is bounded by hedges which vary in height, is visible through the gated entrance from Greenmore and is part of the long view from land to the southeast. Thus, any development on this site would be visible from Greenmore and the adjacent residential properties. Any development would also be highly visible from the land to the southeast because of the elevated position of this site. The LVIA assesses the overall effect on visual amenity High Adverse. Impact: High Adverse	A strong hedge blocks all views into field from the Reading Road except for a single, very limited, view across an overgrown gate at the extreme south-eastern corner of the site. Development would be visible from parts of the surrounding hedging removed to provide access and, in small part, from Tidmore Lane, a restricted by-way. The LVIA assess the overall effect on visual amenity as Low Adverse. Impact: Low adverse	The fields are clearly visible from the gated entrances on Tidmore Lane and intermittent views are visible through the hedges from Tidmore Lane and the footpath from Tidmore Lane to the A4074. Any development on this site would be clearly visible to users of the Chiltern Way Extension footpath. Visual amenity would be degraded for walkers using the footpath and Tidmore Lane. The LVIA assesses the impact on visual amenity to be Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse
CONTIGUITY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable.	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable.	Mitigation – None possible Residual Impact: Unacceptable
PST- 05 Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	This site is not contiguous with the built-up area and would create a major (23HA) development in greenfield in the AONB. Impact: High Adverse

PST-06 Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Development of this site would, at over 20HA, significantly extend the built-up area of the village. Impact: High Adverse
HERITAGE	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-07 Heritage Would development on the site be likely to affect the Impact of any heritage asset, including its setting?	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable
PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY	Mitigation – None available although, overall the site is beyond the preferred walking distances and may encourage car use. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – the lack of a footpath along Tidmore Lane presents no significant hazard if pedestrians walk to the village facilities via the development planned for Chiltern Rise which provides a continuous footpath link. Warning signs at either end of Tidmore Lane should be considered. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation
PST-08 Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable	No – pedestrian, wheelchair, invalid carriage or pushchair users would need to walk in the Tidmore Lane (a restricted byway) and then along the busy Reading or Oxford Roads to reach a village footpath. Impact: Adverse

Walking distances PST-09 Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 1000m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – although not ideal at some 550m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	This is a large site and residents would be between a 400m and 900m from the surgery. Although not ideal this is considered manageable. Impact: Acceptable
PST-10 Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 575m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	No – there is a bus stop some 100m from the site Impact: Acceptable	No – there is a bus stop some 150m from the site Impact: Acceptable
PST-11 Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 575m this is considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	No – at some 100m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a shop. Impact: Acceptable	This is a large site and residents would be between a 350m and 850m from a shop. Although not ideal this is considered manageable. Impact: Acceptable
PST-12 Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 900m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse	No – at some 150m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a bus stop. Impact: Acceptable	This is a large site and residents would be between a 200m and 700m from the Village Hall. Although not ideal this is considered manageable. Impact: Acceptable
PST-13 Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 650m this is considered manageable Impact: Low Adverse	No – at less than 100m from the schools this site is within the recommended walking distance to school. Impact: Acceptable	At between 350m and 850m from the schools this site is within the recommended walking distance. Impact: Acceptable

ROAD SAFETY AND CONGESTION	Mitigation – Parking restrictions on the stretch of Greenmore from this site to Wards Farm will be necessary Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation – A car park will be needed on this site to accommodate all the vehicles currently regularly parked on the road. Consideration should also be given to parking restrictions on Reading Rd Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation –mitigation would require the conversion of an undetermined part of a restricted byway into a two-lane road. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation
PST-14 Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 600m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 225m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – traffic would enter and leave this site some 100m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-15 Is the main route from the site a narrow road?	No – Greenmore is wide enough at this point to allow vehicles to pass. Impact: Acceptable	No – The Reading Road is wide enough at this point to allow vehicles to pass. Impact: Acceptable	Yes - access will require the use of Tidmore Lane – a restricted byway. Impact: High Adverse
PST-16 Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?	Yes – vehicles of those using the Wards Farm site park on this road between the Wards Farm site and this site during the working days (including Saturdays) creating a considerable hazard to road users. Impact: High Adverse	Yes - Reading Road is severely restricted by on-street parking near the schools. Impact: High Adverse	Unknown – in the absence of an existing access this cannot be determined. Impact: Undetermined
FLOOD RISK	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-17	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable

ECOLOGY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-18 Is the site ecologically valuable?	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable
ECONOMY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-19 Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?	No change. Impact: Acceptable	No change. Impact: Acceptable	No change. Impact: Acceptable

Table 3.4: New Housing Site Appraisal (part 4 of 5)

Site Number & Name Framework Test	45 Chiltern Rise WNP1 Reserve Site	WNP1-19 The Smallholding
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT	Mitigation – Policies covering the development of the adjacent sites to: (i) ensure that development does not abut; (ii) provide green corridors between each site; and (iii) limit the developable area to reduce the scale of the development. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation	Mitigation –the adverse impact can be reduced with policies covering the development of the site to ensure that green corridors to the adjacent woodland are maintained and suitable landscaping is provided to reduce the impact on the landscape locally. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-01 Is the size greater than 1.5HA?	No – at 0.7 HA the incursion into the AONB will be substantial but not major. Impact: Low Adverse	No – the site area is 0.65 ha. Impact: Acceptable
PST-02 Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?	Yes – this site abuts the site at Chiltern Rise site allocated in the first Woodcote neighbourhood plan potentially creating a site of some 1.7 HA if all were developed to their full extent and constitute a major development in the AONB. Impact: High Adverse	No The site abuts a reserve site allocated in WNP1 (WNP11) but that site has been withdrawn by the owner and is no longer available for development. Impact: Acceptable
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	Mitigation - adding to the tree and hedge line along the northern boundary will obscure, to a limited degree new building but not conceal the new, atypical, intrusion into the landscape and degrade the current visual amenity for walkers. Residual Impact: Unacceptable	Mitigation – The site makes a limited contribution to the landscape of the AONB. The impact of development could be mitigated by restricting construction to the northern half of the site with screening separating it from an open southern half. This would, however, still result in the loss of valued views and urbanise the northern half of the footpath.

		Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation
PST-03 What would be the landscape impact?	This site adjacent to Tidmore Lane a tranquil restricted byway, is an area of grassland, with hazel and other shrub growth, and edged by mature trees typical of the character of this part of the AONB. The LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape of developing this site to be Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse	The site occupies the eastern side of a small dry valley rising steeply alongside a Public Right of Way which leads south-southwest into the ancient and semi-natural woodland of Elmore Park Wood which adjoins the south of the site. The site contains a house and a smallholding bordered by low-level development on the north and eastern boundaries. Impact: Medium Adverse
PST-04 What would be the visual impact?	Any development on this site would be visible from the restricted byway that forms the northern border of the site and degrade the view of walkers using the byway to join or leave the Chiltern Way. The LVIA assesses the impact on visual amenity as Major Adverse. Impact: Very High Adverse	The site is clearly visible from Woodcote footpath 2, which runs along the length of the site, and The Mill Stone, a house adjacent to the north-east corner of the site. Visibility from Beech Lane is limited to one residence having a restricted view through the thin tree line that bounds the western edge of the site. Impact: Medium Adverse
CONTIGUITY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – Development of this site would extend the boundary of the village and change the eastern side of the dry valley with significant visual impact. Mitigation, by sympathetic location of new homes and substantial landscaping could significantly reduce the adverse impact given that views are still available on the western side of the footpath. Residual Impact: Acceptable with mitigation

PST- 05 Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Approximately one-half the site is adjacent to housing or other buildings – including a commercial fencing operation. Impact: Acceptable
PST-06 Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?	Development of this site would extend the built-up area of the village. Impact: High Adverse	Yes. Housing on this site would extend the boundary of the developed area to the base of the currently undeveloped dry valley. Impact: Medium Adverse
HERITAGE	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-07 Heritage Would development on the site be likely to affect the Impact of any heritage asset, including its setting?	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No - the site does contain an undated Chalk Pit (PRN 9147) although this would not prevent development. The site does not abut or impact upon the setting of any heritage asset. Impact: Acceptable
PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY	Mitigation – the lack of a footpath along Tidmore Lane presents no significant hazard if pedestrians walk to the village facilities via the development planned for Chiltern Rise which provides a continuous footpath link. Warning signs at either end of Tidmore Lane should be considered. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation	Mitigation – None required – essential village facilities are accessible on foot, by invalid chair or with a pushchair along a continuous footpath for, in most cases, an acceptable distance. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-08 Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?	No – pedestrian, wheelchair, invalid carriage or pushchair users would need to walk in the Tidmore Lane (a restricted byway) and then along the busy Reading or Oxford Roads to reach a village footpath	Yes Impact: Acceptable

	Impact: Adverse	
Walking distances PST-09 Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?	Yes – although not ideal at some 900m this is considered manageable. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – 700m although with the exception of a small uphill stretch the walk is largely level and well-paved. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-10 Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?	No - there is a bus stop some 200m from the site. Impact: Acceptable	No, there is a bus stop some 375m distant at the Coop store. Impact: Acceptable
PST-11 Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?	At some 350m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a shop. Impact: Acceptable	No, there is a Co-op store some 375m distant. Impact: Acceptable
PST-12 Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?	At some 375m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a bus stop. Impact: Acceptable	Yes, the distance to the Village Hall is some 900m along a largely level, well-paved route. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-13 Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?	At less than 400m from the schools this site is within the recommended walking distance to school. Impact: Acceptable	Yes, the distance to the schools is some 1000m along a largely level, well-paved route Impact: Low Adverse
ROAD SAFETY AND CONGESTION	Mitigation –mitigation would require the conversion of part of a restricted byway into a two-lane road. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation.	Mitigation - none required with proposed increase in traffic volumes. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-14 Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 150m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard.	No. Development will generate additional vehicle movements along what is a short, narrow lane. For a small number (nine) new

	Impact: Low Adverse	homes the volume is considered acceptable. Visibility is poor for traffic moving from Wood Lane into Beech Lane where it joins Behoes Lane but safety can be improved by clearer road markings at the junction. Impact: Acceptable
PST-15 Is the main route from the site a narrow road?	Yes – access is likely to be from Tidmore Lane, a restricted byway. Impact: High Adverse	Yes, although low traffic volumes and the lack of a through route reduce potential access problems. Impact: Acceptable
PST-16 Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?	No – the access to this site would be via the main Chiltern Rise site allocated in WNP1. Impact: Acceptable	Yes. This is a short, narrow lane with cars frequently parked, making access to service vehicles occasionally difficult. Impact: Low Adverse
FLOOD RISK	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-17	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable
ECOLOGY	Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-18 Is the site ecologically valuable?	In 2015 the Council's Countryside Officer, in assessing the site for an associated planning application identified the hedgerow along the boundaries to be species rich and classified as a Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat. The grassland habitat that forms the majority of the site was also found to be species rich with a very high	No. The site is largely unimproved closely cropped grassland with no significant trees. A hedge separates the site from the fencing company abutting the north-eastern boundary. A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent.

	percentage of herb cover compared to many other grassland habitats. In addition, bat surveys in 2015 showed the presence of common pipistrel bats on site. Impact: High Adverse	Impact: Acceptable
ECONOMY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-19 Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?	No change. Impact: Acceptable	Development will neither reduce nor increase employment opportunities. Impact: Acceptable

Table 3.4: New Housing Site Appraisal (part 5 of 5)

Table 3.4 includes a re-appraisal of the WNP1 site WNP19: The Smallholding. The other sites allocated for housing in WNP1 are not reappraised because:

- WNP01: Chiltern Rise Cottage and surrounding Land has planning permission and is currently under development;
- WNP02: Woodcote Garden Centre has planning permission and is currently under development;
- WNP16: Former Reservoir Site is awaiting approval for a new planning application following changes to a previous approval; and
- WNP18: Former Bus Depot is developed and occupied.

Table 3.5 presents the appraisal of the three proposed employment sites

- WNP2-25 Land west of Church Farm
- WNP2-98 Paddock by Wards Farm
- WNP2-43 Land east of Greenmore - Bishops Yard + additional land

Although pedestrian access to village facilities, such as the Village Hall or schools, has less relevance to employment sites, the assessment was included here for completeness.

Site Number & Name Framework Test	25 Land west of Church Farm Employment	98 Paddock by Wards Farm Employment	43 Land east of Greenmore - Bishops Yard + additional land Employment and housing
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT	Mitigation – although not major development it would result in the loss of greenfield land in the AONB which can only be disguised. Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation –none – development will cause a small loss of greenfield land in the AONB. Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – although not major as a single site in addition to the loss of greenfield land in the AONB policies covering the development of the sites to: (i) ensure that development does not abut; (ii) provide green corridors between each site; and (iii) limit the developable area to reduce the scale of the development, will be required. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation
PST-01 Is the size greater than 1.5HA?	No – at 0.29HA the incursion into the AONB is not considered major. Impact: Low Adverse	No – at 0.14HA the incursion into the AONB will be negligible. Impact: Acceptable	No – at 0.3HA the incursion into the AONB is but not considered major. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-02 Does the site abut another potential or allocated site?	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	No – there are no sites allocated, with planning permission or submitted for consideration for inclusion in this plan. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site abuts sites 27 and 29 potentially creating a site of approaching 2HA which, if developed, would constitute a major development in the AONB. Impact: Medium Adverse
LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	Mitigation – any minor impact on the landscape can be effectively mitigated by protecting the existing hedge/tree boundaries, alongside the western edge of	Mitigation - landscape buffer planting along the south eastern boundary, could help to provide some filtering effect on	Mitigation - development will result in the loss of a paddock that contributes to both the local landscape and longer views. The small size of the site makes buffer planting

	the track into the industrial site, and along the southern edge of any development, leaving the southern, approximately 30m deep, strip undeveloped and development being no higher than two stories. Residual Impact; Acceptable with Mitigation	distant views of the development on this site. Reducing the impact on visual amenity. Residual Impact; Acceptable with Mitigation	infeasible and even, if possible, would block the long views. Development of the (Old Coal) Yard would not degrade the visual amenity. Thus, the Residual Impacts for: - the paddock is Unacceptable; and - the Old Coal Yard is Acceptable with mitigation.
PST-03 What would be the landscape impact?	This site comprises the northern 45% of a 0.42ha field of unproductive grassland surrounded by high hedging (2-3m) and bounded to the west by the Oxford Road, to the south by the Reading Road while the north and eastern boundaries consist of industrial units. Although washed over by the AONB partial development would be unlikely to change any significant or valued views and the LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape as Neutral. Impact: Acceptable	This is a small (0.14 HA) paddock adjacent to the Wards Farm industrial estate used to dump rubbish. The small size of the site and its location adjacent to the Wards Farm industrial estate limit the value of the landscape's contribution to the surrounding area and the LVIA assesses the impact on the landscape as Medium Adverse. Impact: Acceptable	The site may be considered in two parts: - a paddock fronting onto Greenmore; and - a yard (the Old Coal Yard) screened from Greenmore and the surrounding landscape by trees. The overall characteristic of this side of Greenmore is rural with a small number of well concealed dwellings. The site forms a distinctive gap in the established building pattern. It has an informal and natural road frontage open to view throughout its length. The LVIA assesses the overall effect of the development of the paddock on the landscape as High Adverse. The yard is already designated as an employment site and was, therefore, excluded from the LVIA. It is well screened from the road and surrounding landscape, so has little impact on the landscape. Impact: High Adverse (paddock) Impact: Acceptable (yard)

PST-04 What would be the visual impact?	The site is clearly visible from the track leading to the industrial units and there are views into the site from the car park at the eastern end of the Village Hall. High hedges (2 to 3m) along the eastern boundary and all but 50m of the southern boundary block views into the site from the Oxford Road and crossroads. Development might also be visible from the footpath on the Reading Road and the adjacent industrial units. The LVIA assesses the overall impact on visual amenity as Negligible. Impact: Acceptable	The site is set back from the road, but passers-by have a limited view of the site via the gated entrance. The small size of the site and its location adjacent to the Wards Farm industrial units means that the site will not be distinguishable in distant views. The LVIA assesses the impact on visual amenity as Low Adverse. Impact: Low Adverse	The paddock is clearly visible for its full length from Greenmore and residential properties on the opposite side of the road. The surrounding hedges and trees block any views from the open ground to the south and east. The LVIA assesses the impact on visual amenity as Major Adverse. As above, the yard was not assessed in the LVIA but is well screened from view from all directions. Impact: High Adverse (paddock) Impact: Acceptable (yard)
CONTIGUITY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST- 05 Is the site contiguous with the built area of the village?	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – this site is located adjacent to the developed area of the village. Impact: Acceptable
PST-06 Does the site extend the boundary of the village beyond the existing build line?	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable	No – this site lies within the built-up area of the village. Impact: Acceptable
HERITAGE	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-07 Heritage Would development on the site be likely to	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable	No – development of this site will have no effect on any heritage asset or its setting. Impact: Acceptable

affect the Impact of any heritage asset, including its setting?			
PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None required Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None available although, overall the site is beyond the preferred walking distances and may encourage car use. Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-08 Is there a continuous footpath to the village amenities (surgery, shop, Village Hall, schools, etc)?	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – access to important villages facilities by foot, invalid chair or with a push chair is possible. Impact: Acceptable
Walking distances PST-09 Is the pedestrian distance to surgery greater than 400m?	No – at less than 350m this site is in easy walking distance for those wishing to visit the surgery. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – at some 1000m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – at some 1100m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-10 Is the pedestrian distance to a bus stop greater than 400m?	No – there is a bus stop some 100m from the site. Impact: Acceptable	No – there is a bus stop some 375m from the site. Impact: Acceptable	No – there is a bus stop some 325m from the site. Impact: Acceptable
PST-11 Is the pedestrian distance to a shop greater than 400m?	No – at some 275m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a shop. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – at some 450m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – at some 700m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
PST-12 Is the pedestrian distance to VH or CC greater than 400m?	No – at some 10m this site is less than the recommended walking distance to a bus stop. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – at some 500m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse	Yes – at some 1000m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse

PST-13 Is the pedestrian distance to WPS/Langtree greater than 500m?	No – at less than 125m from the schools this site is within the recommended walking distance to school. Impact: Acceptable	No – at 500m from the schools this site is within the recommended walking distance to school. Impact: Acceptable	Yes – at some 800m this site is not ideal at but considered manageable. Impact: Low Adverse
ROAD SAFETY AND CONGESTION	Mitigation – parking controls opposite this site would be of benefit. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation	Mitigation – an off-road car park will be required both to accommodate the cars regularly parked on Greenmore and the additional traffic produced by the additional users of the site. Parking restrictions on this part of Greenmore should also be applied. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation	Mitigation – Parking restrictions on this part of Greenmore should be applied. Residual Impact: Acceptable with Mitigation
PST-14 Is the site close to a traffic hotspot?	Yes – traffic would enter and leave this site some 100m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Medium Adverse	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 500m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable	No – traffic would enter and leave this site some 800m from the nearest location of congestion and road hazard. Impact: Acceptable
PST-15 Is the main route from the site a narrow road?	No – the Reading Road has the capacity for large vehicles such as buses to pass. Impact: Acceptable	No – Greenmore is wide enough at this point to allow vehicles to pass. Impact: Acceptable	No – Greenmore is wide enough at this point to allow vehicles to pass. Impact: Acceptable
PST-16 Is the main route from the site restricted by on-street parking?	No – although the site is relatively close to the War memorial crossroads and opposite the Village Hall vehicles are rarely parked on the Reading Road, at this location. Impact: Acceptable	Yes - on-street parking reduces this part of Greenmore to a single lane during the working day (including Saturdays). That, and the poor visibility arising from a bend in the road create a considerable hazard for drivers. Impact: High Adverse	Yes - on-street parking close to this this part of Greenmore reduces the road to a single lane during the working day (including Saturdays). Impact: High Adverse
FLOOD RISK	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable

PST-17	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable	Government records show no history of flooding in this site. Impact: Acceptable
ECOLOGY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-18 Is the site ecologically valuable?	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable	A study by the Thames Valley Ecological Records Centre showed no evidence of ecological sensitivity on this site or land adjacent. Impact: Acceptable
ECONOMY	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable	Mitigation – None Residual Impact: Acceptable
PST-19 Would development of the site add to, lose, or leave employment in the parish unchanged?	This site would add to the space for employment development in the village Impact: Acceptable	This site would add to the space for employment development in the village. Impact: Acceptable	This site would add to the space for employment development in the village. Impact: Acceptable

Table 3.5: Employment Site Appraisal

Test Site Number	MAJOR DEVELOPM'T	LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	CONTIGUITY	HERITAGE	PEDESTRIAN ACCESS	ROAD SAFETY & CONGESTION	FLOOD RISK	ECOLOGY	ECONOMY
1 Hilltop Field	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
2. Land at Yew Tree Farmhouse	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
3. Land behind Scrooby	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
4. Rear of 16 Bridle Path	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
6. Wood Lane	Acceptable with mitigation	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
9. Beechwood Court	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation
16. North of Beech Lane	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
20. Fox Covert Farm	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
27. Land at Black Lion	Acceptable with mitigation	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
29. Land at Greenmore	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
30. Land west of Garden Centre	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
34. Hildred Fields	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
43b. Bishop's Paddock	Acceptable with mitigation	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
45. Chiltern Rise 2	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable
WNP1-19 The Smallholding	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable

Table 3.6 Housing Site Option Appraisal Summary

Note: Site 43 has been divided into two sites: 43a – the Old Coal Yard and 43b the Paddock to allow the possibility of developing the Old Coal Yard.

Test Site Number	MAJOR DEVELOPM'T	LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT	CONTIGUITY	HERITAGE	PEDESTRIAN ACCESS	ROAD SAFETY & CONGESTION	FLOOD RISK	ECOLOGY	ECONOMY
25. Land west of Church Farm	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
98. Wards Farm Paddock	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
43a. Bishop's Yard (the Old Coal Yard)	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable

Table 3.7 Employment Site Option Appraisal Summary

3.5 Appraisal of Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives

A lack of undeveloped land within the built-up area of the parish locates all new development on green-field land in the AONB with a potential impact on the landscape quality. The appraisal shows that, with mitigation, eight sites could be developed without an unacceptable adverse impact on sustainability:

Site
2. Land at Yew Tree Farmhouse
3. Land behind Scrooby
9. Beechwood Court

Site
30. Land west of Garden Centre
WNP1-19 The Smallholding

Site
25. Land west of Church Farm
43a Bishops Yard
98. Wards Farm Paddock

These eight sites are further appraised (Table 3.8) against the Sustainability Objectives of the Plan to assess their contribution to achieving these objectives.

Sustainability Objectives

Table 3.8 of this Appraisal reproduces Table 5.1 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report⁴ which presented the sustainability objectives of WNP2.

En01	To protect and enhance the parish open spaces and countryside and, in particular, the Chilterns AONB.
En02	To protect sensitive wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity in the parish, and ensure that current ecological networks are not compromised and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced.
En03	To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds and including light pollution.
En04	To obtain the efficient use of land and reduce development pressures on the countryside and natural resources such as landscape, biodiversity and soil quality.
En05	To reduce the need for travel by car, to shorten the length and duration of journeys in the parish and to reduce traffic congestion in the parish.
En06	To seek to address the causes and effects of climate change by: (i) securing sustainable building practices which conserve energy, water resources and materials; (ii) maximising the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources; and (iii) ensuring that the design and location of new development is resilient to the effects of climate change.
En07	To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment.
SO1	To improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.
SO2	To maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion.
SO3	To help provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
SO4	To protect and enhance the Parish's historic assets and significance.
SO5	To ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.
SO6	To help to create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.
Ec01	To assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.

Table 3.8: Sustainability Objectives

⁴ Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2035: Sustainability Appraisal, Scoping Report

Site Number and Name Sustainability Objective (summary)	2. Land behind Yew Tree Farm	3. Land behind Scrooby	9. Beechwood Court
EnO1 - protect and enhance the parish open spaces, countryside and the Chilterns AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation There will be a new element in the landscape, but it does not constitute a major intrusion into the AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation There will be a new element in the landscape, but it does not constitute a major intrusion into the AONB.	Acceptable This is a small, previously developed site largely enclosed by woodland that does not constitute a major intrusion into the AONB
EnO2 - protect sensitive wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity in the parish, and ensure that current ecological networks are not compromised and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced ⁵ .	Acceptable This site is classed as 'other neutral grassland' (UKHab) and in 'poor' condition (Defra Metric 3.0)	Acceptable This site is classed as 'modified grassland' in poor condition.	Acceptable This site is classed as 'other neutral grassland' in poor condition.
EnO3 - reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds and including light pollution.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.
EnO4 - obtain the efficient use of land and reduce development pressures on the countryside and natural resources such as landscape, biodiversity and soil quality.	Acceptable with mitigation Housing of this site represents a loss of an undeveloped paddock in the AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation Housing of this site represents a loss of an undeveloped paddock in the AONB.	Beneficial This is a previously developed site being converted to housing.
EnO5 - reduce the need for travel by car, to shorten the length and duration of journeys in the parish and to reduce traffic congestion in the parish.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.
EnO6 - seek to address the causes and effects of climate change with sustainable building practices, the use of renewable energy, and designing and locating for resilience to the effects of climate change.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies applied to the extent possible during the conversion of the existing buildings.
EnO7 - reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy, and the environment.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

⁵ Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan Sites Preliminary Ecological Assessment, Ecology By Design Ltd. September 2021

	This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.	This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.	This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.
S01 - improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.	Acceptable This site is within acceptable walking distance of all community services.	Acceptable This site is within acceptable walking distance of all community services.	Acceptable Some services, notably the surgery and Village hall may not be within acceptable walking distances for the old or infirm.
S02 - maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion.	Acceptable – although smaller sites encourage new residents to integrate more quickly into the wider village community.	Acceptable – although smaller sites encourage new residents to integrate more quickly into the wider village community.	Acceptable –the current buildings lend themselves to conversion into retirement homes enabling residents to both downsize into a more manageable home and remain in their community.
S03 - provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	Beneficial This site will provide a mix of new open-market homes of varying sizes.	Beneficial This site will provide a mix of new open-market homes of varying sizes.	Beneficial This site will provide new smaller homes for residents.
S04 - protect and enhance the Parish's historic assets and significance.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.
S05 - ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.
S06 - create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.
Ec01 - assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.	Neutral although additional residents could become new clients.	Neutral although additional residents could become new clients.	Acceptable These are not used as commercial premises and their conversion to homes will have no impact on local employment prospects.

Table 3.9: Appraisal of Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives (part 1 of 3)

Site Number and Name Sustainability Objective (summary)	30. Land west of Garden Centre	WNP1-19 The Smallholding	25. Land west of Church Farm
EnO1 - protect and enhance the parish open spaces, countryside and the Chilterns AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation There will be a new element in the landscape, the site is bounded on three sides and, with mitigation, would not constitute a major intrusion into the AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation There will be a new element in the landscape although as the site is already partially developed and part of the transition to the adjacent ancient woodland, careful design and landscaping would protect the countryside of the AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation There will be a new element in the landscape, but the site abuts an existing development and, subject to mitigation, would not constitute a major intrusion into the AONB.
EnO2 - protect sensitive wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity in the parish, and ensure that current ecological networks are not compromised and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced.	Acceptable This site classed as 'semi-improved grassland' and in moderate condition.	Acceptable This partially developed site is grassland in poor condition.	Acceptable This site is classed as 'modified grassland' in good condition.
EnO3 - reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds and including light pollution.	Beneficial This site is within acceptable walking distance of all community services and will provide off-road parking for the Reading Road reducing both congestion and local air pollution.	Acceptable This objective is realised through design policies and the location is close enough to community services to reduce the need for motor vehicle use.	Acceptable with mitigation Additional employment will bring new delivery, despatch, and client traffic movements with associated CO ₂ emissions.
EnO4 - obtain the efficient use of land and reduce development pressures on the countryside and natural resources such as landscape, biodiversity and soil quality.	Acceptable with mitigation Housing of this site represents a loss of an undeveloped paddock in the AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation This site is partially developed as a smallholding and although there will be some loss of open, ecologically poor land on the edge of the built-up area the impact can be reduced by careful design and mitigation.	Acceptable with mitigation Development of this site represents a loss of an undeveloped paddock in the AONB.
EnO5 - reduce the need for travel by car, to shorten the length and duration of journeys in the parish and to reduce traffic congestion in the parish.	Beneficial This site is within acceptable walking distance of all community services and will provide off-road parking at a congested location on the Reading Road.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.	Beneficial This site will contain additional car parking to avoid exacerbating existing congestion on the Reading Road.
EnO6 - seek to address the causes and effects of climate change with sustainable building practices, the use of renewable energy, and designing and locating for resilience to the effects of climate change.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.

En07 - reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy, and the environment.	Neutral This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.	Neutral This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.	Neutral This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.
S01 - improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.	Acceptable This site is within acceptable walking distance of all community services.	Acceptable This site is within acceptable walking distance of all community services.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.
S02 - maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion.	Beneficial – the provision of an off-road car park will reduce congestion, with the consequent reduction in local air pollution, and improve road safety opposite the entrance to Langtree school.	Acceptable –smaller sites encourage new residents to integrate more quickly into the wider village community.	Beneficial This site would offer new sources of income to local employees.
S03 - provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	Acceptable This site will provide a mix of new open-market and affordable homes of varying sizes.	Beneficial This site will provide a mix of new open-market and affordable homes of varying sizes.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.
S04 - protect and enhance the Parish' historic assets and significance.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.
S05 - ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.
S06 - create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.
Ec01 - assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.	Neutral although additional residents could become new clients.	Neutral - although additional residents could become new clients.	Beneficial This site is for new employment purposes.

Table 3.9: Appraisal of Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives (part 2 of 3)

Sustainability Objective (summary) \ Site Number and Name	43a. The Old Coal Yard (Bishops Yard) Greenmore	98. Wards Farm Paddock.
EnO1 - protect and enhance the parish open spaces, countryside and the Chilterns AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation There will be a new element in the landscape although as the site is an old coal yard and screened by trees and adjacent woodland, careful design and landscaping would protect the countryside of the AONB.	Significant Positive This is a small extension to an existing industrial site which subject to mitigation, would not constitute a major intrusion into the AONB.
EnO2 - protect sensitive wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity in the parish, and ensure that current ecological networks are not compromised and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced.	Acceptable This site is classed as 'other neutral grassland' in poor condition.	Acceptable This site is classed as 'other neutral grassland' in poor condition. The cover of 'undesirable species' exceeds 5% of the total habitat area (approximating 20%).
EnO3 - reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds and including light pollution.	Acceptable with mitigation Additional employment will bring new delivery, despatch, and client traffic movements with associated CO ₂ emissions.	Acceptable with mitigation Additional employment will bring new delivery, despatch, and client traffic movements with associated CO ₂ emissions.
EnO4 - obtain the efficient use of land and reduce development pressures on the countryside and natural resources such as landscape, biodiversity and soil quality.	Acceptable with mitigation This site is an old coal yard and any loss of open, ecologically poor, land on the edge of the built-up area the impact can be reduced by careful design and mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation Development of this site represents a loss of an undeveloped paddock in the AONB.
EnO5 - reduce the need for travel by car, to shorten the length and duration of journeys in the parish and to reduce traffic congestion in the parish.	Acceptable This site is positioned within acceptable walking distance of all community services thus reducing the need for motor vehicle use.	Beneficial This site will contain additional car parking to relieve congestion on Greenmore.
EnO6 - seek to address the causes and effects of climate change with sustainable building practices, the use of renewable energy, and designing and locating for resilience to the effects of climate change.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.	Neutral This objective is realised through design and renewable energy policies.
EnO7 - reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy, and the environment.	Neutral This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.	Neutral This site is neither vulnerable to flooding nor would development increase the flood risk.

SO1 - improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.
SO2 - maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.
SO3 - provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.	Neutral This site is for employment purposes.
SO4 - protect and enhance the Parish' historic assets and significance.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.	Acceptable No heritage assets are impacted.
SO5 - ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through design policies.
SO6 - create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.	Neutral This is achieved through site design policies.
Ec01 - assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.	Beneficial This site is for new employment purposes.	Beneficial This site is for new employment purposes.

Table 3.9: Appraisal of Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives (part 3 of 3)

Site Number and Name	2. Land behind Yew Tree Farm	3. Land behind Scrooby	9. Beechwood Court	WNP1-19 The Smallholding	30. Land west of Garden Centre
Sustainability Objective (summary)					
En01 - protect and enhance the parish open spaces, countryside and the Chilterns AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation
En02 - protect sensitive wildlife habitats, enhance parish biodiversity, ensure ecological networks are not compromised and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
En03 - reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds, including light pollution.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Beneficial
En04 - obtain the efficient use of land and reduce development pressures on the countryside and natural resources such as landscape, biodiversity and soil quality.	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Beneficial	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation
En05 - reduce the need for travel by car, to shorten the length and duration of journeys in the parish and to reduce traffic congestion in the parish.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Beneficial
En06 - seek to address the causes and effects of climate change with sustainable building practices, the use of renewable energy, and designing and locating for resilience to the effects of climate change.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
En07 - reduce the risk of flooding and its detriment to public well-being, the economy, and the environment.	Neutral.	Neutral.	Neutral.	Neutral	Neutral.
SO1 - improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
SO2 - maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Beneficial
SO3 - provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Acceptable
SO4 - protect and enhance the Parish' historic assets.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
SO5 - ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 - create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Ec01 - assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.	Neutral	Neutral	Acceptable	Neutral	Neutral

Table 3.10: Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives Appraisal Summary (part 1 of 2)

Site Number and Name Sustainability Objective (summary)	25. Land west of Church Farm	43a Bishops Paddock Greenmore	98. Wards Farm Paddock.
En01 - protect and enhance the parish open spaces, countryside and the Chilterns AONB.	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Significant Positive
En02 - protect sensitive wildlife habitats, enhance parish biodiversity, ensure ecological networks are not compromised and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
En03 - reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds, including light pollution.	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation
En04 - obtain the efficient use of land and reduce development pressures on the countryside and natural resources such as landscape, biodiversity and soil quality.	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation	Acceptable with mitigation
En05 - reduce the need for travel by car, to shorten the length and duration of journeys in the parish and to reduce traffic congestion in the parish.	Beneficial	Acceptable	Beneficial
En06 - seek to address the causes and effects of climate change with sustainable building practices, the use of renewable energy, and designing and locating for resilience to the effects of climate change.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
En07 - reduce the risk of flooding and its detriment to public well-being, the economy, and the environment.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 - improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO2 - maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion	Beneficial	Neutral	Acceptable
SO3 - provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO4 - protect and enhance the Parish' historic assets.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
SO5 - ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 - create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Ec01- assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial

Table 3.10: Acceptable Sites against the Sustainability Objectives Appraisal Summary (part 2 of 2)

Section 4: Additional Policy Appraisal

4.1 Introduction

This section appraises the policies particular to the updated Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan (WNP2) against the Plan Objectives to determine their sustainability impact.

4.2 Sustainability Objectives

Table 3.8 of this Appraisal reproduces Table 5.1 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report⁶ which presents the sustainability objectives of WNP2. These comprise the sustainability objectives of the current made Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2027 (WNP1) plus objectives:

- **EnO7** to reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy, and the environment.
- **SO4** to protect and enhance the Parish' historic assets and significance.
- **EcO1** to assist in the development of small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy.

4.3 Policies

Appendix A contains a list of the policies, coded as below, contained within WNP2.

Code	Policy Area
C	Community Well-Being Policies
T	Traffic and Transport Policies
EM	Employment and Skills Policies
E	Countryside and Environment Policies

Code	Policy Area
H	Housing Policies
D	Design Policies
HS	Housing Site Policies
ES	Employment Site Policies

Many of these (listed in Table 4.1) are retained policies.

Table 4.1: Retained Policies

C1	Assets of Community Value
C2	Sports facilities at the Schools
C3	Communications Infrastructure
T1	Traffic Congestion
T3	Safe Travel to School
T4	Parking at the Co-operative store
T5	Traffic Calming along Goring Road
T6	Pedestrian footways
EM1	Heavy Goods Traffic
E2	Historic Environment
H2	Tenancy Mix
H5	Affordable Housing on Exception Sites
H6	Type of Homes
D1	Good Design
D2	Light Pollution
D3	Secure by Design

⁶ Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2035: Sustainability Appraisal, Scoping Report

Four WNP1 Policies are retained under different numbers. These are listed in Table 4.3.

HS2	Chiltern Rise Cottage, Reading Road	(unchanged from WNP1 Policy HS3)
HS3	Woodcote Garden Centre, Reading Road	(unchanged from WNP1 Policy H4)
HS4	Former Reservoir Site, Greenmore	(unchanged from WNP1 Policy HS5)
HS5	The Smallholding, land at the end of Wood Lane	(unchanged from WNP1 Policy HS7)

Table 4.2: Retained Renumbered Policies

4.4 Approach

Policies HS6, HS7, HS8, HS9, ES1, ES2 and ES3 allocate sites for the development of new homes or industrial units. The sustainability impact of allocating these was appraised in Section 3 of this document.

The policies listed in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 were appraised as part of the production of the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013- 2027 and their impact shown to be overwhelmingly positive. They have not, therefore, been reappraised.

Table 4.3 identifies the new and amended policies in WNP1. Their impact on sustainability and the achievement of the sustainability objectives is appraised in Table 4.4.

Table 4.3

New Policies to be appraised.

C4	Community facilities and services
C5	Schools
T2	Parking for the Library and Community Centre
T7	Residential car parking spaces
E1	Green space and Landscaping
E3	Biodiversity and Wildlife Support
E4	Settlement Boundary
E5	Local Green Spaces
E6	Important Views
E7	Solar Energy Arrays
H1	Number of New Homes
H3	Affordable Housing
H4	Allocation of Affordable Housing
H7	Size of Homes
H8	Scale of New Development
H9	Infill Housing in the AONB
H10	Backland Infill Development in the AONB
D4	Renewable Energy
D5	Sustainable Homes
D6	Sustainable Transport
HS1	Site Allocations

4.5 New Policy Appraisal

Policy Sustainability Objective	C4 Community facilities and services	C5 Schools	T2 Parking for the Library and Community Centre
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO3 – minimise pollution	This policy requires proposals to limit noise, fumes and smells. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
EnO4 – efficient use of land	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	This policy requires developments to provide adequate off-street parking and minimise the impact on highway safety and the road network. Significant Positive	This policy requires developments to minimise the impact on highway safety and the road network. Significant Positive	This policy supports additional off-road car parking at currently congested locations and thus reducing congestion and associated emissions. Significant Positive
EnO6 – address climate change	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	This policy supports the provision of additional community facilities. Significant Positive	Neutral	This policy assists those with physical or other constraints to use the library. Significant Positive
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 1 of 7)

Policy Sustainability Objective	T7 Residential car parking spaces	E1 Green space and landscaping	E3 Biodiversity and Wildlife Support
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	Neutral	This policy protects open spaces within the built-up area of the village. Significant Positive	Neutral
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	Neutral	This policy protects open spaces within the built-up area of the village, including those that support wildlife. Significant Positive	This policy requires substantial measures to protect and improve wildlife features. Significant Positive
EnO3 – minimise pollution	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO4 – efficient use of land	Neutral	Neutral	This policy reduces the loss of wildlife habitat. Significant Positive
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	This policy supports the provision of adequate domestic parking spaces thus reducing on-street parking and associated congestion. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
EnO6 – address climate change	Neutral	This policy protects open spaces some covered with trees that absorb carbon. Significant Positive	Neutral
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	Neutral	This policy protects amenity spaces used by residents for exercise. Significant Positive	Neutral
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	Neutral	This policy protects amenity spaces used by residents for exercise. Significant Positive	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 2 of 7)

Policy Sustain'y Objective	E4 Settlement Boundary	E5 Local Green Spaces	E6 Important Views
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	This policy protects the open landscape of the AONB by limiting development outside the built area of the village. Significant Positive	This policy designates green spaces to be conserved. Significant Positive	This policy designates important views for preservation. Significant Positive
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	This policy protects wildlife habitats outside the built area of the village. Significant Positive	This policy supports green spaces and thus the habitat for wildlife. Significant Positive	Neutral
EnO3 – minimise pollution	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO4 – efficient use of land	This policy maximises the use of suitable locations within the built area of the village. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	Limiting the extension of the village beyond the existing boundary ensures that new development will be within reasonable walking distance of village facilities. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
EnO6 – address climate change	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	This policy ensures that new development will be within reasonable walking distance of village facilities. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	Neutral	This policy supports the social and health benefits arising from local green spaces. Significant Positive	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 3 of 7)

Policy Sustainability Objective	E7 Solar Energy Arrays	H1 Number of New Homes	H3 Affordable Housing
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO3 – minimise pollution	This policy supports the installation of solar panels thus reducing CO2 emissions and pollution associated with electricity generation. Significant Positive	New building will add to light pollution. Significant Negative	Neutral
EnO4 – efficient use of land	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO6 – address climate change	This policy supports the use of solar panels and reduces CO2 emissions that contribute to climate change. Significant Positive	The built environment contributes some 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. Additional homes will add to emissions. Significant Negative	Neutral
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	Neutral	This policy allocates additional housing to the parish thus increasing the opportunity for people to live in a decent home. Significant Positive	This policy supports the development of affordable housing in the parish, increasing the opportunity for those unable to access open market housing to live in a decent home. Significant Positive
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 4 of 7)

Policy Sustainability Objective	H4 Allocation of Affordable Housing	H7 Size of Homes	H8 Scale of New Development
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	Neutral	Neutral	This policy supports the conservation of the countryside by prioritising smaller sites Significant Positive
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO3 – minimise pollution	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO4 – efficient use of land	Neutral	This policy supports the efficient use of land by restricting the number of larger (4, or more bedroomed) new homes. Significant Positive	This policy reduces the pressure on land in the AONB by requiring that housing needs be met on a number of smaller sites. Significant Positive
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO6 – address climate change	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	This policy requires those with a strong local connection to be given priority when allocating affordable homes thus strengthening local cohesion. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	This policy gives priority to those with a strong local or employment connection in the allocation of the new affordable housing. Significant Positive	Smaller homes are more affordable and thus this policy increases the opportunity for people to live in a decent home. Significant Positive	Neutral
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 5 of 7)

Policy Sustainability Objective	H9 Infill Housing in the AONB	H10 Backland Infill Development in the AONB	D4 Renewable Energy
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	Neutral	This policy supports the conservation of the AONB by supporting sympathetic backland development. Significant Positive	Neutral
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO3 – minimise pollution	Neutral	Neutral	This policy supports the reduction of pollution by requiring solar panels on all new buildings. Significant Positive
EnO4 – efficient use of land	This policy reduces the pressure on land in the AONB by supporting residential developments on infill sites. Significant Positive	This policy allows backland development and thus supports the efficient use of land. Significant Positive	Neutral
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO6 – address climate change	Neutral	Neutral	This policy requires measures to reduce the contribution to climate change from new buildings. Significant Positive
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	This policy adds to the availability of new homes thus supporting the provision of decent homes. Significant Positive	This policy supports the sympathetic development of backland and thus adds to the supply of homes. Significant Positive	Neutral
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 6 of 7)

Policy Sustainability Objective	D5 Sustainable Homes	D6 Sustainable Transport	HS1 Site Allocations
EnO1 – protect open spaces & AONB	Neutral	Neutral	This policy allocates development sites selected to have the least negative impact on the AONB. Significant Positive
EnO2 – protect wildlife habitats, enhance biodiversity	Neutral	Neutral	This policy allocates development sites selected to have the least negative impact on wildlife and the local ecology. Significant Positive
EnO3 – minimise pollution	This policy supports the reduction of pollution by requiring thermal efficiency of new buildings. Significant Positive	This policy requires electric vehicle charging points and secure bicycle facilities thus supporting a reduction in pollution. Significant Positive	Neutral
EnO4 – efficient use of land	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
EnO5 – reduce car journeys and traffic congestion	Neutral	Neutral	Two sites include car parks to reduce traffic congestion on adjacent roads. Significant Positive
EnO6 – address climate change	New homes should contain sustainability measures to reduce the contribution to climate change. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
EnO7 – reduce flooding	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO1 – improve access to community facilities	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO2 – improve health & wellbeing	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO3 – provide residents with decent homes	Neutral	Neutral	This policy allocates sites for new housing thus adding to the supply of decent homes. Significant Positive
SO4 – protect historic assets	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
SO5 – high quality design	This policy requires high quality new homes that are highly sustainable. Significant Positive	Neutral	Neutral
SO6 – create safe places	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

EcO1 – assist small firms	Neutral	Neutral	This policy allocates sites for new employment purposes thus assisting the development of small local businesses. Significant Positive
---------------------------	---------	---------	--

Table 4.4: New Policy Appraisal (page 7 of 7)

Objective Policies	En01	En02	En03	En04	En05	En06	En07	SO1	SO2	SO3	SO4	SO5	SO6	Ec01
C4	--	--	P	--	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--
C5	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
T2	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--
T7	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
E1	P	P	--	--	--	P	--	P	P	--	--	--	--	--
E3	--	P	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
E4	P	P	--	P	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--
E5	P	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--
E6	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
E7	--	--	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
H1	--	--	N	--	--	N	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--
H3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--
H4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	P	P	--	--	--	--
H7	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--
H8	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
H9	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--
H10	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	--
D4	--	--	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
D5	--	--	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	P	--	--
D6	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HS1	P	P	--	--	P	--	--	--	--	P	--	--	--	P

Table 4.5: Policy Appraisal Summary

Key	Impact	Impact Code
	Positive	P
	Negative	N
	Neutral	--

Note: SO4 (historic assets) and En07 (flooding) covered by framework on site evaluation

Section 5: Conclusions

5.1 Context

The National Planning Policy Framework requires that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs. The NPPF gives AONBs the highest status of protection in relation to conservation and enhancement and requires that the scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

The parish of Woodcote is located on the Chilterns escarpment above the Goring Gap at the south-western edge of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Local Planning Authority recognises this⁷ as *“the most visually significant and distinctive landform unit within the whole District. It comprises the steep face and top of the Chilterns escarpment, which forms a dramatic backdrop to the low-lying landscape of the vale to the northwest”*.

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability appraisal applies to plans with significant environmental effects. Woodcote’s location entirely within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB), a ‘sensitive’ area, requires that any policies, particularly those that allocate sites for new development, must be subject to sustainability appraisal.

The Sustainability Framework

The Sustainability Framework was established in the Scoping Report distributed to, and approved by, the Statutory Consultees in 2020.

The Requirement

The SOLP35 allocation of 225 new homes to the parish was determined by adding 15% to the number of new homes in 2011 plus the allocation of new homes in the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy. Neither an Objectively Assessed Housing Need nor evidence of exceptional circumstances were advanced by the Local Planning authority to support this requirement for additional development in the AONB.

Strategic Options

Three strategic delivery options were considered, locating all new:

- housing and employment buildings onto a single site within the parish;
- housing in a single site and all employment in separate single site; or
- development (housing and employment) across a small number (5-7) of sites within the parish.

Development Sites

A list of potentially suitable sites was assembled by adding all sites in the South Oxfordshire District Council’s current Strategic Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) to those identified by, but unallocated in, the current Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan, other sites notified to South Oxfordshire District Council; and responses to an advertisement placed in the Henley Standard.

Sites offered for new employment premises were appraised as a potential contributors to local economic sustainability.

⁷ South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (SOLA): Atlantic Consultants

The result was a list of approximately 70 entries which reduced to 16 following the removal of duplicates, sites already developed or allocated for development in WNP1, subsequently withdrawn, or unavailable because of a covenant against development.

5.2 Conclusions

Strategic Options

All options require intrusion into the AONB. The distribution of development across a small number of sites will result in the loss of greenfield land on the edge of the developed area of the parish and intrusions into the landscape but:

- does allow some limited development within the built-up area;
- could be easier to screen albeit potentially intruding into or losing long views;
- does offer a greater opportunity to provide for wildlife; and
- fits better with the character of the village as it has developed since the creation of the AONB.

The option of locating new development across a small number (5-7) of sites within the parish is appraised as the least damaging to sustainability.

Development Sites

In the absence of undeveloped land within the developed area of the parish new homes and employment premises will require the loss of greenfield land in the AONB with a consequent adverse impact on the landscape quality. The appraisal does suggest that, with mitigation, the impact on sustainability of eight sites could be acceptable. These are:

Site
2. Land at Yew Tree Farmhouse
3. Land behind Scrooby
9. Beechwood Court

Site
30. Land west of Garden Centre
WNP1-19 The Smallholding

Site
25. Land west of Church Farm
43a Bishops Yard
98. Wards Farm Paddock

These eight sites are further appraised (Table 3.9) against the Sustainability Objectives of the Plan to appraise their contribution to achieving these objectives and the impact shown to be acceptable.

Appendix A: Policies

C1	Assets of Community Value (Retained Policy) Proposals that will result in either the loss of an Asset of Community Value or in significant harm to an Asset of community value will be strongly resisted.
C2	Sports facilities at the Schools (Retained Policy) Proposals which provide for additional sports facilities, open in character and over and above those which already exist, on the Langtree Academy and Woodcote Primary School sites, and which meet the requirements of the school as well as the wider community, will be encouraged.
C3	Communications Infrastructure (Retained Policy) Proposals which seek the expansion of electronics communication networks and high speed broadband along with improvements to connectivity will be supported where the applicant has fully explored the opportunities to erect apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures; where the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts are kept to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network; and where the development has been sited and designed to minimise the impacts on the character and appearance of the AONB. Applications for residential development will contain a 'Connectivity Statement' and should provide for suitable ducting to enable more than one service provider to provide a fibre connection to individual properties from connection chambers located on the public highway, or some alternative connection point available to different service providers.
C4	Community Facilities and Services Proposals for additional services and facilities within the village will be supported subject to the following criteria being met: - the individual proposal will not generate unacceptable noise, fumes, smell or other disturbance to adjoining residential properties; - the particular proposal will not lead to unacceptable impact on highway safety and the residual cumulative impacts on the road network will not be severe; and - access arrangements and off-street parking can be satisfactorily provided without impinging on adjoining residential and non-residential uses.
C5	Schools Proposals to relocate the Primary School, if necessary, to allow expansion of Langtree Academy without loss of playing fields, will be supported, provided that the new location does not lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not be severe.
T1	Traffic Congestion (Retained Policy) Proposals that accord with the policies in the Plan and result in improvements to the free flow of traffic in the village will be supported. Proposals requiring planning permission and which seek to increase the number of access points or which would involve an increase in traffic generation will need to demonstrate, with a travel plan and transport statement, that they do not further inhibit the free flow of traffic or exacerbate conditions of parking stress, including conflict with larger vehicles, in the following areas: - that section of Reading Road between the War Memorial crossroads and its junction with Greenmore; - the War Memorial crossroads where Reading Road meets Oxford Road, South Stoke Road and Goring Road; and - within a circumference of 200 metres of the crossroads where Beech Lane and Bridle Path meet Goring Road.
T2	Parking for the Library and Community Centre Proposals to provide a number of disabled parking spaces in front of the Library will be supported.
T3	Safe Travel to School (Retained Policy) Proposals to improve the safe delivery of pupils to the Langtree Academy and Woodcote Primary School sites on foot, by bicycle, school buses or by car which would involve changes to the existing site entrances will be supported
T4	Parking at the Co-operative store (Retained Policy) Proposals to provide a limited increase in parking spaces at the Co-operative store will be strongly supported.

T5	Traffic Calming along Goring Road (Retained Policy) Proposals for development which will directly access onto the Goring Road will be required to make provision for, and contribute to, appropriate traffic calming measures at either end of the Goring Road or in the near vicinity of the development.
T6	Pedestrian footways (Retained Policy) All new housing developments must where appropriate and practical provide safe pedestrian access to link up with existing or proposed footpaths, ensuring that residents can walk safely to bus stops, schools and other village facilities.
T7	Residential car parking spaces Proposals for all new homes to be built in Woodcote should provide for one off-street parking space for each bedroom, unless otherwise justified having regard to site-specific circumstances and Oxfordshire County Council parking standards. Proposals for modifications and extensions to existing properties must demonstrate that no parking spaces are lost due to the modifications.
EM1	Heavy Goods Traffic (Retained Policy) Any proposal requiring planning permission to change the use of land in the Parish to General Industrial Use (B2) or distribution and storage uses (B8), or other uses which would generate heavy goods traffic, must demonstrate with the assistance of a Transport Statement that the proposal will not have an unacceptable traffic impact within the village.
E1	Green space and Landscaping For the allocations in this Plan, and for any application for major development, a landscape strategy and visual analysis shall be submitted which will incorporate the following details, where relevant: - existing and proposed hard and soft landscaping; - an outline of the measures to be taken to protect wildlife habitats, including trees and hedgerows during construction; - an analysis of both near and distant views from principal public vantage points and the effect of the proposed development and any planting mitigation on these views; and - details, where appropriate, of how those areas to be retained for open space and/or woodland will be managed in the future.
E2	Historic Environment (Retained Policy) Any designated historic heritage assets in the Parish and their settings, both above and below ground and including listed buildings, and any monuments that may be scheduled or conservation areas that may be created will be conserved and enhanced for their historic significance and their importance to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets.
E3	Biodiversity and Wildlife Support All development proposals should result in a net biodiversity gain of at least 10%, measured by a recognised biodiversity accounting metric against a baseline ecological survey detailing wildlife habitats, including trees and hedgerows, and their condition. Opportunities to incorporate wildlife improvements in and around developments are encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable overall gains for wildlife by implementing measures such as: - retaining and ensuring the ongoing sympathetic management of existing wildlife features, such as mature trees, hedgerows and other forms of wildlife corridor; - providing and ensuring the ongoing retention of roosting features and/or nesting features for birds, such as owl, bat and/or bird box suited to, but not exclusively for swifts, swallows and house martins on each new dwelling or building as an integral part of their design; - ensuring hedgehogs can move between gardens through provision and ensured retention of “hedgehog highways”; - creating wildlife corridors or other features that support wildlife; - encouraging features that support green infrastructure; - providing new green spaces, enhanced for pollinators including butterflies and moths, with native trees and/or hedgerows within the development; and - retaining wildlife strips of scrubland where development results in the loss of scrubland. Where onsite measures are not possible, offsite measures will be considered.

E4

Settlement Boundary

The Settlement Boundary is shown in Fig 9.i.

Proposals for infill development or redevelopment within the boundary will be supported, provided that they accord with the design and development management policies of the Local Plan and other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Proposals for development outside the boundary will only be supported if they are appropriate to a countryside location in the Chilterns AONB.

E5

Local Green Spaces

The areas identified in Table 9.i and Map 9.ii are designated as Local Green Spaces.

New development will not be permitted on land designated as Local Green Spaces except in very special circumstances.

Table 9.i Local Green Spaces	Description	Map Location
	The Village Green	1
	The Allotments.	2
	Folly Field.	3
	The green space bounded by Wittenham Close, Croft Way, Grimmer Way and Hagbourne Close.	4
	The green space bounded by Wood Green and the Goring Road.	5
	The green space bounded by Folly Green and Goring Road.	6
	The green space in Wayside Green	7
	Greenmoor Ponds	8
	Snowdrop Wood, south of the Long Toll development	9
Woodland surrounding the Greenmoor ponds	10	

E6

Important Views

The views identified in Table 9.ii are considered important as valued local views within the AONB.

New development should not intrude upon important views in and out of the settlement area of the Parish and proposals for development that impact on such views must identify the impact and demonstrate how the quality of the landscape will be preserved.

Table 9.ii Valued Views

No	Vantage Point		
	From footpath/road	Towards	Comments
1	411/9/10	Bridle Path	Characteristic AONB landscape
2	411/9/10	Upper Covert Woods	Characteristic AONB landscape
3	411/9/10	Goring Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
4	411/9/10	Shirvells Hill	Characteristic AONB landscape
5	Goring Road	Pot Kiln Lane	Characteristic AONB landscape
6	411/2/10	Fox Covert Woods	Characteristic AONB landscape
7	411/2/10	Wood Lane	Characteristic AONB landscape
8	411/8/10	Behoes Lane	Characteristic AONB landscape
9	411/8/10	South Stoke Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
10	411/8/10	South Stoke Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
11	South Stoke Road	Oxford Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
12	Oxford Road	Reading Road	Valued rural approach to village
13	Tidmore Lane (FP 411/27/10)	A4074	Characteristic AONB landscape
14	411/1/10	Oxford Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
15	411/1/10	A4074	Characteristic AONB landscape
16	Tidmore Lane (FP 411/27/10)	A4074	Characteristic AONB landscape
17	Tidmore Lane (FP 411/27/10)	Reading Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
18	Tidmore Lane (FP 411/27/10)	Reading Road	Characteristic AONB landscape
19	Reading Road	Greenmore	Valued rural approach to village
20	411/19/30	A4074	Characteristic AONB landscape
21	411/19/30	College Wood	Characteristic AONB landscape

E7	Solar Energy Arrays Proposals for a solar energy array will be supported, in principle, having regard to the policies of the Chilterns AONB Management Plan and provided: - It is located and designed to suit the character of the local landscape; - It is effectively screened; - It will not cause significant harmful noise or light pollution; and - It will not cause significant harm to a designated heritage asset.
H1	Number of New Homes Planning permission will be granted for a minimum of 129 new homes to be built in Woodcote in the period to 31st March 2035 on the sites specifically allocated in the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan.
H2	Tenancy Mix (Retained Policy) Proposals for development will need to consider local housing need and should normally provide a tenure mix of 25% of the Affordable homes being for low cost ownership (intermediate housing) unless viability or other local factors show a robust justification for a different mix.
H3	Affordable Housing Proposals for developments that result in a net gain of five or more dwellings or where the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more will be expected to provide a minimum of 40% of affordable housing on the site which will be fully integrated into the development unless a Financial Viability Assessment demonstrates a robust justification for a different percentage. In cases where the: - development is less than 10 homes the contribution to affordable housing may be provided as a financial contribution; 40% calculation provides a part unit then either the number of affordable units must be rounded up to the next whole unit or a financial contribution will be sought equivalent to that part unit.
H4	Allocation of Affordable Housing All new affordable housing in Woodcote provided by the Plan will initially be subject to a local connection, meaning that people with a strong local connection to the village and whose needs are not met by the open market will be first to be offered the tenancy or shared ownership of the home. In this context a strong local connection means an applicant(s): - who has lived in the Parish for 5 of the last 8 years and is currently resident there, or - who has lived in the Parish for at least 5 years and whose parents or children are currently living in the Parish and have at least 10 years continuous residency there, or - who has an essential need to live close to another person, for proven age or medical reasons, who has had a minimum of 5 years permanent and continuous residence in the Parish, or - who needs to live in the Parish to be close to their place of work.
H5	Affordable Housing on Exception Sites (Retained Policy) Proposals for the development of small-scale affordable housing schemes for rural exception sites on the very edge of the village where housing would not normally be permitted by other policies, and submitted in accordance with policy H10 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, will be supported, particularly where they can demonstrate the redevelopment of brownfield land.
H6	Type of Homes (Retained Policy) Approximately two-thirds of new homes on developments of 9 or more new homes should be terraced or semi-detached and one-third detached properties unless viability or other material considerations show a robust justification for a different mix.
H7	Size of Homes This policy directs that new development should favour smaller dwellings. Overall, up to 10% of new homes on developments of 9 or more new homes should have 1-bedroom, up to 25% should have 2 bedrooms, no more than 15% have 4 or more bedrooms and the balance, at least 50%, should have 3 bedrooms unless viability or other material considerations show a robust justification for a different mix.
H8	Scale of New Development Planning permission will be granted for a maximum of 30 new homes on any allocated site.

H9	Infill Housing in the AONB Applications for residential developments on small infill or redevelopment sites within Woodcote will be supported subject to proposals being well designed and meeting all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this plan and the Local Plan, and where such development: - fills a small, restricted gap in the continuity of existing frontage buildings or on other sites within the settlement boundary^{47F}⁸ where the site is closely surrounded by buildings. - will not involve the outward extension of the settlement boundary of the village, as defined in section 9.4 - has regard to the SODC Design Guide, in particular the requirements for separation between habitable rooms in adjacent properties and the provision of amenity space; - does not have a significant impact on the privacy of adjacent properties; - is consistent with the character of the locality; - is not considered to be backland development that is not compliant with policy H10; and - provides for at least one small home with two or fewer bedrooms for every one large dwelling with four or more bedrooms.
H10	Backland Infill Development in the AONB Backland development (the residential development of land behind an existing frontage or placing further dwelling/s behind existing dwelling/s within the existing site) will be supported where the development meets all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this plan and the Local Plan, and where such development: - provides suitable access to the rear properties that is wide enough and far enough from the boundary and any front property to accommodate delivery, service and emergency vehicles without unnecessary disturbance to neighbours or the front property; - provides safe pedestrian access to the rear properties; - does not result in loss of wildlife habitat in a residential garden.
D1	Good Design (Retained Policy) Proposals for all forms of new development must plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design, at the same time demonstrating they have sought to conserve local distinctiveness and the aesthetic qualities of traditional rural settlements and buildings found in the Chilterns AONB. Applications proposing unsympathetic designs which fail to respect the connections between people and places, or are inappropriate to its location, or pay inadequate regard to issues of renewable energy technologies, landscape and biodiversity considerations will not be supported.
D2	Light Pollution (Retained Policy) Proposals for any necessary street and external lighting should comply with the current guidelines established for the Chilterns AONB and for rural areas by the Institution of Lighting Engineers^{48F}⁹
D3	Secure by Design (Retained Policy) New developments should incorporate the principles of ‘Secured by Design’ (SBD^{49F}¹⁰) to ensure that a safe and sustainable community is maintained.
D4	Renewable Energy All new development should contain solar photovoltaic panels and/or solar water heating panels and new dwellings and buildings aligned to maximise energy generation.
D5	Sustainable Homes All new development should: - align dwellings to take maximum advantage of passive solar heating; - be insulated to a high level; and - incorporate sustainable water and drainage systems and storage.
D6	Sustainable Transport All new development should provide: - one electric vehicle charging point for houses with up to two bedrooms; - two electric vehicle charging points for houses with three bedrooms or more; and - secure bicycle storage facilities in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council cycle parking standards.

⁸ See section 9.4

⁹ Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, the Institution of Lighting Engineers, 2005.

¹⁰ www.securedbydesign.com

HS1

Site Allocations

Residential allocations are provided in Table 12.i. The development of, up to and including the number of houses set out in the Table for each development will be supported.
Employment allocations are provided in Table 12.ii. The development of new employment opportunities on these sites will be supported.

Table 12.i	WNP Ref	Type	Site Name Address	Maximum Number of Homes
	WNP1-01	Residential	Chiltern Rise Cottage and surrounding land, Reading Road	24
	WNP1-02	Residential	Woodcote Garden Centre, Reading Road	9
	WNP1-16	Residential	Former Reservoir site, Greenmore	20
	WNP1-18	Residential	Former Bus Depot, Long Toll (development complete)	14
	WNP1-19	Residential	The Smallholding, Land at the end of Wood Lane	9
	WNP2-02	Residential	Land behind Yew Tree Farmhouse 1	5
	WNP2-03	Residential	Land behind Yew Tree Farmhouse 2	4
	WNP2-09	Residential	Beechwood Court, Long Toll	14
	WNP2-30	Residential	Land to the west of Church Farmhouse	30

Table 12.ii	WNP Ref	Site Name Address	Area
	WNP2-43a	Old Coal Yard, Greenmore	0.37 Ha
	WNP2-25	Land west of Church Farmhouse	0.29 Ha
	WNP2-98	Wards Farm	0.14 Ha

HS2

Chiltern Rise Cottage, Reading Road

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS3

Woodcote Garden Centre, Reading Road

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS4

Former Reservoir Site, Greenmore

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS5

The Smallholding, land at the end of Wood Lane

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS6

Land behind Yew Tree Farmhouse 1

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS7

Land behind Yew Tree Farmhouse 2

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS8

Beechwood Court, Long Toll

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

HS9

Land to the west of Church Farm, Reading Road

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

ES1

Bishops Yard

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

ES2

Church Farm

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.

ES3

Wards Farm

The full text of this policy may be found in Section 12.3 of this document.