

South Oxfordshire District Council
Local Plan 2011 - 2034 – Publication Version

Settlement Assessment Background Paper
2018

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	2
1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.0 NATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT	3
3.0 LOCAL CONTEXT – THE ROLE OF THIS ASSESSMENT	4
4.0 METHODOLOGY	5
5.0 RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT	8
Appendix 1: Revised Settlement Hierarchy	9
Appendix 2: Services and facilities scoring	11
Appendix 3: Proximity scoring	13
Appendix 4: Public transport scoring	14
Appendix 5: Table of changes made to Settlement Assessment	15
Appendix 6 – Settlement Hierarchy	17
Appendix 7 – Settlements not in the Hierarchy	23

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Having a strong understanding of the nature of the towns and villages in South Oxfordshire is a key part of our evidence base and essential to forming a robust strategy for the future of our district in our Local Plan 2011-2034.
- 1.2. The starting point for this assessment is the Settlement Assessment Background Paper prepared as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy 2012. Significant weight is given to how the settlements are categorised as shown in Appendix 4 of the Core Strategy as this document is the only version to have been scrutinised through examination, as such any deviation from this established position would require justification.
- 1.3. Prior to this review two further assessment were commissioned to support the development of the emerging Local Plan for South Oxfordshire in 2016 and 2017. This background paper updates the Settlement Assessment Background Paper published October 2017. To fully understand the evolution of the background paper and the reasons for the changes it is necessary to read this assessment in the context of what has come before.
- 1.4. In order to ensure that our settlement hierarchy is still an accurate reflection of the role of our settlements, we have updated the information we have on each settlement, reviewed our settlement assessment and updated the settlement hierarchy accordingly.
- 1.5. We have also reviewed the methodology used to calculate each settlement's 'score'. We have focussed on factors that give the most accurate picture of a places' sustainability and suitability for growth. This report sets out the changes that have been made and the reasons for the changes. Full list of changes made can be found in **Appendix 5**.
- 1.6. As a result of changes to the scoring methodology and reviewing data held on each settlement. The overall score for some settlements has changed resulting in some changes from the last publication version 2017, with one settlement Swyncombe being removed from the Hierarchy and two settlements Berrick Salome and Cuddesdon being upgraded to smaller villages in line with how they were categorised in the Core Strategy. The revised hierarchy is in **Appendix 1**, this table only highlights the changes from the Core Strategy not any of the subsequent versions.
- 1.7. We realise that services and facilities are constantly changing, and this review is a snapshot in time and should be read as such. The settlement hierarchy will be reviewed periodically to take account of any changes.

2.0 NATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT

- 2.1 The revised [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) was published on 24 July 2018 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how

these are expected to be applied. This revised Framework replaces the previous NPPF published in March 2012.

- 2.2 The NPPF states that “Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area”.¹
- 2.3 For rural areas such as South Oxfordshire, the NPPF states that “housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby”.²
- 2.4 In regard to locations where development should not be allowed the NPPF states ‘Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside’³, except in the case of one or more of the five circumstances listed in that paragraph.
- 2.5 The NPPF also states the importance of managing patterns of growth and focusing development on “locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes”, whilst recognising that “opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making”.⁴
- 2.6 It also states the requirement for Local Plans to be supported by up to date evidence, “the preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned”.⁵

3.0 LOCAL CONTEXT – THE ROLE OF THIS ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) are currently preparing a new local plan called the Local Plan 2011-2034. This is to take account of the increased housing need for South Oxfordshire identified by the [Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment](#) (SHMA), and also to accommodate some of

¹ Paragraph 9 of the NPPF

² Paragraph 78 of the NPPF

³ Paragraph 79 of the NPPF

⁴ Paragraph 103 of the NPPF

⁵ Paragraph 31 of the NPPF

Oxford City's additional housing need, which they have indicate they are not be able to provide for within their administrative boundary.

- 3.2 Additionally, South Oxfordshire along with the other Local Authorities in Oxfordshire have signed up to the countywide Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal which commits to building 100,000 new homes across Oxfordshire between 2011 and 2031 in return for significant Government investment for new homes and infrastructure across the county.
- 3.3 The Local Plan 2011-2034 sets out a strategy for delivering sustainable growth in South Oxfordshire, identifying appropriate areas and sites for development, along with the necessary infrastructure to support this growth. The Local Plan 2011-2034 also sets out policies that will be used for determining planning applications.
- 3.4 This Settlement Assessment Background Paper forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan 2011-2034 and assists by classifying towns, larger villages, smaller villages, and other villages in the settlement hierarchy.
- 3.5 The settlement hierarchy is used to determine the appropriate level of growth that a particular settlement can support and focusses growth to the most sustainable places.
- 3.6 The strategy provides for a network of settlements throughout the district that provide a good range of services. All parts of the district are within about a five-kilometre radius of a town or larger village.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

- 4.1 This assessment is an update on the 2017 Settlement Hierarchy and Settlement Assessment Background Paper prepared for the Publication Version (Regulation 19) of the Local Plan 2011-2033 (October 2017), which itself builds on the settlement hierarchy in the South Oxfordshire [Core Strategy](#).⁶
- 4.2 The review of the settlement hierarchy was conducted as a result of comments received during the consultation on the Publication Version (Regulation 19) of Local Plan 2011-2033 which ran from 11 October to 30 November 2017, this resulted in some changes as to how the settlement score has been calculated, see **Appendix 5** for changes made.
- 4.3 Unlike for the previous assessment (September 2017) we did not contact the parish and town councils to ask them to review the information we had for each of the settlements within their parish. Instead we reviewed the information they provided for the 2017 assessment and any comments that had been made concerning the settlement assessment during the Regulation 19 consultation and

⁶ The settlement hierarchy can be found on p151 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012

used our own local knowledge of the area and internet searches to update the information.

4.4 We reviewed all the bus services that operate in our district to ensure recent cuts to services have been fully acknowledged.

4.5 The assessment focusses on three main criteria:

- the level of services and facilities on offer in each settlement
- the proximity of each settlement to towns and larger villages (including towns outside the district, for example Abingdon), and to employment centres
- access to public transport by bus and train

4.6 In assessing the criteria listed above we took into account how easy it is to access them and awarded scores to settlements that had easy access (by foot along a safe route) to a service, facility or public transport links of a nearby settlement.

4.7 The scoring system used to measure the above criteria is set out in **Appendix 2** (Services and Facilities), **Appendix 3** (Proximity) and **Appendix 4** (Public Transport).

4.8 The scores are weighted for some service/facilities to reflect the relative importance of each facility as some services are more essential and used more frequently than others. For example, schools and supermarkets are important facilities that reduce the need to travel by car and support the vitality of the local community. Other facilities such as a village hall or a recreation ground are not weighted as heavily as they do not contribute as significantly to people's day to day needs or reduce the need to travel, although they do contribute to the social objective of sustainable development.

4.9 Having scored each settlement we applied a bench mark against which settlements would be considered for each category:

Total score	Category
0-3	Not featured in hierarchy
4-18	Other village
19-70	Smaller village
71+	Larger village
500+	Town

4.10 The scoring system is used as the starting point for deciding which category each settlement should be in, but the hierarchy is not based solely on a places score. We take a pragmatic approach which recognises the difficulty of applying a solely quantifiable approach to account for a settlements sustainability, taking into account local knowledge of an area.

4.11 When categorising a settlement in the hierarchy a judgement has been made as to the settlements appropriateness for development. The following paragraphs have been used to guide this decision, they have been split into sections which look at different aspects of the settlement which cannot be quantified, as such require a judgement to be made. How this judgement has been applied is shown in **Appendix 6**, in the notes section when the overall score wasn't sufficient to justify its position.

Balance of criteria

4.12 In addition to a settlements' score, we also looked at the balance between the three main criteria of: access to services and facilities; proximity to places and employment; and access to public transport. A judgment was made as to a settlements' ranking in the hierarchy where it had scored highly against one criteria but very low against another, placing greater emphasis on the need for a settlement to have some services of its own. For example, Cane End was removed from the 2017 hierarchy for this reason as although it scored relatively highly as it has access to a good bus service, it is a very small collection of houses with no services or facilities needed for day to day needs and is not within walking distance of any. This is particularly important in light of significant changes to rural bus services in recent years.

Scale/urban form

4.13 The scale of a settlement has been considered, isolated groups of housing with no facilities that are not within walking distance (along a safe route) of a town or larger village do not feature in the hierarchy as these are not appropriate places for new development. In some case settlements with a low score due to lack of facilities and connections to neighbouring areas have remained in the Hierarchy when it has been considered to be of a suitable scale for limited growth.

The scale is not decided by population size but by its built form, in part as census data is by Parish not individual settlements as such scores could be misleading, it would also be reliant on the most recent census which is 2011 which would not take account of any subsequent changes to a settlement. A perspective approach is taken looking at the areas appropriateness for development, it is also based on other settlements within that category to maintain an acceptable range.

The settlements development pattern is also an important consideration, for example Ipsden has a good facility score and is of a reasonable size when taken as a whole however the settlement is dispersed and not considered appropriate for a higher level of growth as such remains an 'other village'.

Connectivity

4.14 The assessment also recognises the interconnectivity between smaller settlements and how groupings of settlements support each other by providing a range of facilities across the different locations. Facilities score can be shared

between settlements when they are within easy access of each other. However, it may not be appropriate to rank each settlement the same particular when considering other factors like the scale and development pattern of each settlement. An example of this is Highmoor Cross, Highmoor and Witheridge Hill which have the same score for facilities due to access between the settlements however the scale of Highmoor Cross makes the settlement a more appropriate location for development than the other two as such it is ranked higher.

Not considered

- 4.15 The Settlement Assessment does not consider physical or planning land use constraints that may limit the opportunities for settlements to grow when scoring and subsequently ranking each settlement. The purpose is to provide base line information which can be used to guide policy and assist in decision making. Any development proposals in settlements considered appropriate for development through this assessment and the Local Plan will be considered against relevant development plan and national policies and will be judged on a case by case basis. This includes any development in settlements washed over by Green Belt or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designations that would be subject to complying with local and national policies relating to these designations.

5.0 RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The revised settlement hierarchy to support the Local Plan 2011-2033 is set out at **Appendix 1**.
- 5.2 **Appendix 5** is a table highlighting the changes that have been made to this assessment and differences between this assessment and the 2016 assessment.
- 5.3 **Appendix 6** shows the settlements ranked from highest to lowest score and includes comments on any justification for a deviation from the Core Strategy or from the thresholds applied to each category.
- 5.4 **Appendix 7** shows the settlements considered during the assessment process but not included in the Settlement Hierarchy.

Appendix 1: Revised Settlement Hierarchy

The settlements shown in purple are those that did not feature in the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy and have now been added. The settlements shown in green are those that were previously classed as 'Smaller' villages and are now in the 'Other' village category.

Towns		
Didcot	Henley	Thame
Wallingford		
Larger villages		
Benson	Cholsey	Sonning Common
Berinsfield	Crowmarsh Gifford	Watlington
Chalgrove	Goring	Wheatley
Chinnor	Nettlebed	Woodcote
Smaller villages		
Aston Rowant	Great Milton	Playhatch
Aston Upthorpe/Aston Tirrold	Harpsden	Rotherfield Peppard
Beckley	Highmoor Cross	Sandford-on-Thames
Berrick Salome	Holton	Shiplake Cross
Binfield Heath	Horspath	South Moreton
Brightwell-cum-Sotwell	Kidmore End	South Stoke
Britwell Salome	Kingston Blount	Stadhampton
Burcot	Lewknor	Stanton St John
Checkendon	Little Milton	Stoke Row
Clifton Hampden	Long Wittenham	Sydenham*
Cuddesdon	Littleworth (nr Wheatley)	Tetsworth
Culham	Lower Shiplake	Tiddington
Dorchester	Marsh Baldon	Towersey
East Hagbourne	Moulsford	Warborough & Shillingford NE of A4074
Ewelme	North Moreton	Whitchurch on Thames
Forest Hill	Nuneham Courtenay	
Garsington	Peppard Common	
Other villages		
Bix	Greys Green	Preston Crowmarsh
Brightwell Baldwin	Henton	Pyrton
Chiselhampton	Highmoor	Roke
Cuxham	Ispden	Rotherfield Greys
Chazey Heath	Kingwood Common	Russell's Water
Christmas Common	Lower Assendon	Shillingford SW of A4074
Crays Pond	Middle Assendon	Sonning Eye
Crocker End and Catslip	Milton Common	Stonor
Crowell	Mongewell	Tokers Green
Drayton St Leonard	Moreton	Toot Baldon
Dunsden Green	North Stoke	Waterperry
Emmington*	North Weston	West Hagbourne
Gallowstree Common	Nuffield	Whitchurch Hill/Hill Bottom
Great Haseley	Postcombe	Witheridge Hill

The list below shows the settlements that have been removed from the settlement hierarchy. They were all previously classed as 'Other' villages but our review has resulted in them being downgraded due to receiving a low score for services and facilities, combined with their distance from other higher order settlements and lack of good public transport links.

Removed from Hierarchy 2018
Swyncombe

Removed from Hierarchy 2017
Stoke Talmage
Little Whittenham
Waterstock
Shepherd's Green
Satwell
Hailey
Maidensgrove
Huntercombe
Cane End
Cookley Green
Mapledurham
Exlade Street

*For the purpose of this assessment Emmington is considered to encompass the settlement around the Inn at Emmington and the housing on the other side of the B4445, this is consistent with the approach taken in the Core Strategy. Although they may have postal addresses as Sydenham, in terms of this assessment and recent planning decisions a clear separation has been made between Emmington and the main settlement of Sydenham located to the west separated by open fields.

Appendix 2: Services and facilities scoring

The scores assigned to each service/facility were weighted to be responsive to the relative importance of each. Those seen as more important to daily life were given a greater score. To emphasise the difference between the value of the facility types those considered as higher value in this assessment are displayed below in **Bold** and the lower value facilities in Grey.

Services/facilities	Score
Supermarket	4
Convenience store	2
Post office	2
Pharmacy	2
Other shops	2
Petrol Station	1
Bank	1
ATM	1
Other financial services	1
Restaurants, Pubs and cafes	2
Take-away	2
Primary school	2
Secondary school	4
Further education	2
Crèche/nursery	2
Hospital	4
GP surgery	4
Clinic	2
Dentist	2
Library	1
Village/community hall	1
Place of Worship	1
Theatre	1
Cinema	1
Leisure centre	1
Sports club	1
Formal Public park/garden	1
Sports pitch	1
Multi Use Games Area	1
Playground	1

Allotments*	1
Public Open space	1

The total services and facilities score for each settlement was doubled to give greater weight to this component of the overall score.

*Allotments; a maximum of 1 point was awarded if a settlement has an allotment.

Appendix 3: Proximity scoring

Settlements scored points based on their proximity to towns, larger villages and employment areas.

	Up to 2km	2.1km to 5km	>5km
Town	10	5	0
Larger village			
Employment area			

Employment areas were identified from our [Employment Land Review](#)⁷. A threshold of 20 hectares was set as this covers all of the major employment areas in and around the district.

List of employment areas:

Howberry Park (South Oxfordshire)
Milton Park (Vale of White Horse)
Harwell (Vale of White Horse)
Culham Science Centre (South Oxfordshire)
Oxford Science Park (Oxford City)
Hithercroft Industrial Estate (South Oxfordshire)

⁷ South Oxfordshire Employment Land Review, September 2015

Appendix 4: Public transport scoring

Bus service

The table below shows the scores given to each settlement dependent on their bus service, if any.

	Score
No service	0
1-5 per day	0
6+ per day (but less than 1 per hour)	2
1 per hour	5
2 per hour	7
3 + per hour	10

Train service

The table below shows how each settlement with a train station has scored. As there are only 6 stations that serve our settlements they are scored individually based on the service and frequency they provide.

Station	Score	Rational
Didcot	25	High frequency, with high speed service available
Goring, Cholsey, Pangbourne	20	Medium frequency, on a mainline
Culham	15	Low frequency, on a mainline
Henley-on-Thames, Lower Shiplake	10	Low frequency, not on a mainline

Appendix 5: Table of changes made to Settlement Assessment

2017 Assessment	Changes made for 2018	Reason for Change
Towns automatically score 100 points. Need to update scoring system to reflect location of larger villages. Proximity score works for smaller settlements but not for towns and larger villages.	Additional score applied to Towns removed	Towns score points from the facilities and services they contain this doesn't need to be counted twice by awarding points for proximity to those same services
N/A	Includes a score for Allotments	Considered an important local service/facility missed from previous assessments
Public park/garden used to in broad sense to characterise all public open space	The definition/use of Public park/garden changed to mean formal gardens	To mark a clear separation between recreational space that will be found in most settlements and formal parks and gardens
Public park/garden used to in broad sense to characterise all public open space	Add field for 'Public open Space'	To consider the value of less formal amenity and recreational space and mark a distinction between the different types
Hotels and other accommodation types received 1 point	Remove score for Hotels and other Accommodation types	Value to settlement not considered sufficient to warrant scoring, however other services provided at a Hotel for example a restaurant would be scored separately
N/A	Include score for ATM	Access to cash is still necessary particularly in smaller settlements
Petrol stations that offer food (eg M&S food) score 1 point	Include score for Petrol Station separately to food store or other service located in same building	Old system penalised services that shared a building. considered important service which is in decline in the district and warrants recording separately.
Scored A3 Restaurants and Cafes and A4 Pubs separately	Combine score for A3 Restaurants and Cafes and A4 Pubs	To avoid confusion and potential double counting the scoring system has been simplified, as most pubs will sell food and restaurants sell alcohol.
Whitchurch on Thames scored points for facilities that were located in Pangbourne to ease of access	Reviewed scoring for proximity to nearest Larger Village to include Pangbourne	The proximity of Pangbourne to Whitchurch-on-Thames is a unique example where the majority of services are provided in a neighbouring Large Village outside of the district.

Settlement Added as other village	Swyncombe has been removed from the Settlement Hierarchy	Score was originally assigned in error as it included all services in the parish.
Place of Worship recorded but no score awarded	Add place of worship	Places of worship can act as a community facility in a similar way to village halls providing a public meeting space
N/A	Proximity score reviewed and standardised approach taken to locating centre point where proximity is measure from. Resulted in some amendments to settlement scores.	To be able to clear demonstrate and justify why a score had been given.
Public transport scores of 5, 10, 15 or 20 could be awarded depending on level of service	The score for public transport was halved to be as follows 2, 5, 7 or 10.	This was done as a number of smaller settlements were scoring highly based largely on public transport score and not for services or facilities present in the settlement, given a potentially misleading picture of the settlements sustainability. This is more important as funding has been withdrawn from rural bus service, so to avoid situation were settlement scores highly for bus which is subsequently withdrawn a lower score is given.
Pubs/restaurants and Take away were award 1 points per facility	Multiply has been added to score for Pubs/restaurants and Take away	A multiply was added in order to place greater emphasis on a settlements facilities in the total score.
Threshold by category 0-5 Not featured in Hierarchy 5-15 other village 16-79 Smaller Village 80+ larger Village 500+ Town	Threshold by category 0-3 Not Featured in hierarchy 4-18 Other Village 19-70 Smaller Village 71+ Larger Village 500+ Town	Thresholds of each category within the settlement assessment has been amended to better reflect total score awarded, to take in to account the changes made to the assessment.

Appendix 6 – Settlement Hierarchy

The following table collates the scores from the three different categories and then categories each settlement based on its overall score and individual judgements, comments have been added to settlements where their categorisation cannot be explained purely by its score having regard for thresholds shown in the table in paragraph 4.9 above. The comments also highlight where there has been a change in since the Core Strategy 2012 version of the hierarchy.

SETTLEMENT(S)	Facilities	Proximity	Public Transport	Total	Notes
Henley-on-Thames	958	0	20	978	No change – Towns
Didcot	792	5	35	832	No change – Towns
Thame	758	0	10	768	No change – Towns
Wallingford	664	30	10	704	No change – Towns
Wheatley	196	0	10	206	No change - Larger Village
Chinnor	180	0	10	190	No change - Larger Village
Goring	152	0	25	177	No change - Larger Village
Cholsey	110	10	27	147	No change - Larger Village
Benson	118	5	10	133	No change - Larger Village
Watlington	130	0	2	132	No change - Larger Village
Sonning Common	122	0	10	132	No change - Larger Village
Berinsfield	96	5	10	111	No change - Larger Village
Woodcote	90	0	7	97	No change - Larger Village
Crowmarsh Gifford	54	30	10	94	No change - Larger Village
Chalgrove	82	0	5	87	No change - Larger Village
Clifton Hampden	44	15	20	79	Scores highly due to proximity and public transport, however facilities score is lower than other settlements in the larger village category.
Nettlebed	66	0	5	71	No change - Larger Village based on facilities score
Whitchurch-on-Thames	36	10	22	68	No change – Smaller Village
Brightwell-cum-Sotwell	50	15	0	65	No change – Smaller Village
Dorchester	52	5	7	64	No change – Smaller Village
Horspath	56	5	0	61	No change – Smaller Village
Warborough & Shillingford NE of A4074	38	10	7	55	No change – Smaller Village
Stadhampton	44	5	5	54	No change – Smaller Village
Culham	24	10	20	54	No change – Smaller Village
Holton	30	10	10	50	No change – Smaller Village
‘Shillingford SW of A4074	24	15	7	46	No change – Other Village. Scores highly due to bus service and its proximity to Wallingford, facilities

					score is high due to access to facilities in Warborough. remains as an Other Village due to scale of settlement and limited facilities provided within boundary of settlement
Garsington	34	5	5	44	No change – Smaller Village
East Hagbourne	32	5	5	42	No change – Smaller Village
Sandford-on-Thames	24	10	7	41	No change – Smaller Village
Peppard Common	24	10	7	41	No change – Smaller Village
Little Milton	40	0	0	40	No change – Smaller Village
Nuneham Courtenay	18	10	10	38	No change – Smaller Village
Tetsworth	38	0	0	38	No change – Smaller Village
Lower Shiplake	16	5	17	38	No change – Smaller Village
Binfield Heath	26	5	7	38	No change – Smaller Village
Stanton St John	32	5	0	37	No change – Smaller Village
Lewknor	22	5	10	37	No change – Smaller Village
Great Milton	36	0	0	36	No change – Smaller Village
Rotherfield Peppard	26	10	0	36	No change – Smaller Village
Shiplake Cross	24	5	7	36	No change – Smaller Village
Ewelme	30	5	0	35	No change – Smaller Village
South Stoke	22	5	7	34	No change – Smaller Village
Stoke Row	34	0	0	34	No change – Smaller Village
Long Wittenham	28	5	0	33	No change – Smaller Village
Mongewell	2	20	10	32	No change – Other Village. Has limited facilities but score reflects access to services and facilities in Crowmarsh Gifford and Wallingford and good bus service.
Aston Rowant	16	5	10	31	No change – Smaller Village
South Moreton	16	15	0	31	No change – Smaller Village
Crowell	10	10	10	30	No change – Other Village. Scores highly due to bus service and its proximity to Chinnor, remains as an Other Village due to limited number and value of facilities and size of settlement
Kidmore End	20	10	0	30	No change – Smaller Village
Checkendon	24	5	0	29	No change – Smaller Village
Towersey	16	5	7	28	No change – Smaller Village
Littleworth	12	10	5	27	Settlement added – Smaller Village,
Kingston Blount	12	5	10	27	No change – Smaller Village
Tiddington	16	0	10	26	No change – Smaller Village
Harpsden	14	5	7	26	No change – Smaller Village
Britwell Salome	20	5	0	25	No change – Smaller Village

Bix	10	10	5	25	No change – Other Village. Has limited range of facilities and bus services, value of facilities in-line with other village category
Chazey Heath	12	5	7	24	No change – Other Village. Although scores well for it category across each criteria, the settlement is small and its score includes services and facilities outside the village but which are accessible, including in neighbouring Tokers Green.
Ipsden	24	0	0	24	Smaller Village to Other Village. Scores quite well on facilities but doesn't have a bus service and the settlement is relatively isolated. the dispersed nature of the settlement and small core mean it has been reclassified as an 'other village'.
Burcot	4	15	5	24	No change – Smaller Village
Forest Hill	18	5	0	23	No change – Smaller Village
North Stoke	6	5	10	21	No change – Other Village. Scores highly due to bus service and its proximity to Crowmarsh Gifford, remains as an Other Village due to combination of limited facilities and their value.
Waterperry	16	5	0	21	No change – Other Village. Majority of facilities found on one site which makes it vulnerable in event of changes in use, no bus service but scores points for its proximity to Wheatley
Cuddesdon	16	5	0	21	No change – Smaller Village
Emmington	4	10	7	21	No change – Other Village. Has very limited facilities but has a reasonable bus service and score points due to its proximity to Chinnor, scale of settlement in line with Other Village category
Sydenham	16	5	0	21	No change – Smaller Village
Moulsford	16	5	0	21	No change – Smaller Village
North Moreton	16	5	0	21	No change – Smaller Village
Beckley	20	0	0	20	No change – Smaller Village
Aston Tirrold/Aston Upthorpe	20	0	0	20	No change – Smaller Village
Highmoor Cross	14	5	0	19	No change – Smaller Village. Has reasonable facilities but lacks bus service. It is recognised that

					Highmoor Cross acts as more of a centre for the 3 settlements of Witheridge Hill, Highmoor and Highmoor Cross as such is ranked higher
Witheridge Hill	14	5	0	19	No change – Other Village. Has limited facilities and close to Nettlebed but does not have a bus service. It is recognised that Highmoor Cross acts as a centre for the 3 settlements of Witheridge Hill, Highmoor and Highmoor Cross as such is ranked higher
Highmoor	14	5	0	19	No change – Other Village. Has limited facilities and no bus service but scores well for its proximity to other settlements. It is recognised that Highmoor Cross acts as more of a centre for the 3 settlements of Witheridge Hill, Highmoor and Highmoor Cross as such is ranked higher
Berrick Salome	14	5	0	19	No change – Smaller Village
West Hagbourne	4	10	5	19	No Change - Other village due to low facilities score
Cuxham	8	5	5	18	Smaller Village to Other Village; changed due to the relatively low facilities score and scale of settlement being small.
Lower Assendon	8	5	5	18	Settlement added – Other Village; previously assessed incorrectly. categorised as other based on facilities on offer and scale of settlement.
Rotherfield Greys	8	10	0	18	No Change - Other village due to low facilities score and scale of settlement
Brightwell Baldwin	12	5	0	17	No Change - Other village due to low facilities score and scale of settlement
Whitchurch Hill/ Hill Bottom	12	5	0	17	Settlements combined, Smaller Village to Other Village (Whitchurch Hill); was categorised as smaller village based on population score no longer counted.
Tokers Green	12	5	0	17	No Change - Other village
Playhatch	10	0	7	17	No Change - Smaller Village. limited facilities but public transport links and relationship to

					Reading means it remains as Smaller Village
Drayton St Leonard	12	5	0	17	Smaller Village to Other Village; re-categorised based on overall score being below threshold.
Greys Green	6	10	0	16	No Change - Other village
North Weston	0	5	10	15	No Change - Other village
Gallowstree Common	10	5	0	15	Smaller Village to Other Village; re-categorised based on overall score being below threshold.
Dunsden Green	8	0	7	15	Smaller Village to Other Village; small settlement with limited facilities and less weight attached to public transport score.
Preston Crowmarsh	0	15	0	15	Lacks facilities of its own but assessment recognises its proximity to Benson being of high importance and is of a reasonable scale for limited development
Great Haseley	14	0	0	14	Smaller Village to Other Village, although scores relatively highly for facilities it doesn't score for the other two fields and is downgrade based on a balance of criteria
Marsh Baldon	14	0	0	14	No change – Smaller Village. Has a good range of facilities including a school and supports neighbouring smaller settlements.
Sonning eye	14	0	0	14	No Change - Other village
Milton Common	12	0	0	12	No Change - Other village
Pyrton	2	10	0	12	No Change - Other village
Crays Pond	2	10	0	12	No Change - Other village
Nuffield	6	5	0	11	Smaller Village to Other Village; low facilities score and no bus service
Postcombe	10	0	0	10	No Change - Other village
Crocker End and Catslip	0	10	0	10	No Change - Other village
Chiselhampton	4	0	5	9	Smaller Village to Other Village; downgraded due to low overall score.
Henton	4	5	0	9	No Change - Other village
Christmas Common	4	5	0	9	No Change - Other village
Middle Assendon	4	5	0	9	No Change - Other village
Roke	4	5	0	9	No Change - Other village
Toot Baldon	6	0	0	6	No Change - Other village
Stonor	6	0	0	6	No Change - Other village
Moreton	0	5	0	5	No Change - Other village

					Smaller Village to Other Village; downgraded due to low overall score. Remains in hierarchy due to its proximity to larger village and relative scale of settlement.
Kingwood Common	0	5	0	5	
Russell's Water	4	0	0	4	No Change - Other village

Appendix 7 – Settlements not in the Hierarchy

The following settlements have been considered through the settlement assessment, however following the methodology outlined in this report they were not considered suitable location for development and have not been included in the hierarchy. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of every possible settlement within the district, instead it contains a list of settlements that the council has been made aware of and have assessed through this background paper.

Settlement	Facilities	Proximity	Public Transport	Total Score
Adwell	2	0	0	2.00
Albury	2	0	0	2.00
Baldon Row	0	0	0	0.00
Brightwell Upperton	0	5	0	5.00
Brookhampton	0	5	0	5.00
Cane End	0	5	7	12.00
Collins End	0	0	0	0.00
Cookley Green	0	5	0	5.00
Coscote	0	5	5	10.00
Denton	0	5	0	5.00
Easington	2	5	0	7.00
Elsfield	2	0	0	2.00
Exlade Street	4	5	0	9.00
Fulscot	0	5	0	5.00
Hailey	4	5	0	9.00
Harpsden Bottom	0	10	0	10.00
Howe Hill	0	5	0	5.00
Huntercombe End	0	5	0	5.00
Latchford	0	0	0	0.00
Little Haseley	0	0	0	0.00
Little Wittenham	2	0	0	2.00
Maidensgrove	2	0	0	2.00
Newington	2	0	0	2.00
Park Corner	0	10	0	10.00

Path Hill	0	0	0	0.00
Pishill	6	0	0	6.00
Rokemarsh	0	5	0	5.00
Satwell	0	5	0	5.00
Shepherds Green	0	5	0	5.00
Shirburn	2	5	0	7.00
South Weston	2	0	0	2.00
Stoke Talmage	2	0	0	2.00
Swyncombe	2	0	0	2.00
Waterstock	2	0	0	2.00
Wheatfield	2	0	0	2.00
Woodeaton	2	0	0	4.00
Wyfold Court	0	5	0	5.00