



# Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Development Plan

## Sustainability Appraisal

May 2015

## Contents

### GLOSSARY

### NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	8
2.0	THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK.....	15
3.0	METHODOLOGY.....	17
4.0	THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK & THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN OBJECTIVES ..	20
5.0	SITE ALTERNATIVES .....	23
6.0	THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES ...	27
7.0	ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION.....	91
8.0	MITIGATING ADVERSE EFFECTS .....	92
9.0	MONITORING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PLAN .....	93

### Appendices

**Appendix 1:** SEA Checklist

**Appendix 2:** Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Protocols

## Glossary of Terms

<b>AA</b>	Appropriate Assessment
<b>AONB</b>	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
<b>AQMA</b>	Air Quality Management Areas
<b>CS</b>	Core Strategy
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency
<b>JHHNP</b>	Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan
<b>PPPs</b>	Plans, policies and programmes
<b>SA</b>	Sustainability Appraisal
<b>SAC</b>	Special Area of Conservation
<b>SEA</b>	Strategic Environmental Assessment
<b>SODC</b>	South Oxfordshire District Council

## Non-Technical Summary

This is a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Submission Draft Version (May 2015) of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan (JHHNP). The JHHNP will set out a vision for the future of the area to 2027, providing a strategy to manage improvements and a land use framework for development. If supported at referendum, the JHHNP will gain statutory status and form part of the adopted Development Plan.

A Neighbourhood Plan must meet a number of basic conditions set out within the Localism Act 2011. These basic conditions include the requirement that the making of the Neighbourhood Plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations. Where a Neighbourhood Plan could have significant environmental effects, it may fall within the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and therefore require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

An Appropriate Assessment (AA) considering the potential impacts of the relevant South Oxfordshire Core Strategy policies that provide the strategic planning framework for the JHHNP has been previously undertaken as part of the South Oxfordshire District Council's (SODC) Submission Core Strategy (December 2012). The AA concludes that there would be no adverse impacts on sites of European habitats or species as defined under the European Union's Habitats Directive 92/43/EED.

A SA extends the concept of SEA as a process through which to assess the environmental as well as social and economic impacts of a policy, plan or programme and its likely contribution to the delivery of sustainable development overall. The SA fully incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.

In February 2015 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) revised guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Neighbourhood Planning and SEA. The key change is the introduction of a new Stage A: Screening process to determine whether the neighbourhood plan in question is likely to have significant environmental effects. As part of this new stage, the revised guidance outlines that the key statutory consultees should be consulted on whether an SEA is required. Notwithstanding the fact that the revised guidance was published at an advanced stage in the JHHNP process, as set out within paragraph 1.6 of the JHHNP Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, October 2013, Henley Town Council, as lead body in the production of the JHHNP, decided to carry out a SA that fully incorporated the requirements of the SEA Directive from the outset. The principal reason being that from the outset SEA was clearly required given the plan's intention to make land use allocations. SA is widely regarded as best practice for producing balanced plans.

Consultation on the SA Scoping Report was undertaken in October 2013, parallel to consultation on the Issues and Options stage of the Neighbourhood Plan. The SA Scoping Report set out the intended scope of, and methodology for, appraising the Neighbourhood Plan. Feedback from this consultation has been

taken account of, and the evidence base updated where necessary. As set out above relevant guidance set out within the PPG, which was published after the Scoping Report was prepared, has also informed the JHHNP and the preparation of the SA.

The 18 Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Objectives were informed by a review of other plans and policies, notably South Oxfordshire Core Strategy's own Sustainability Objectives. Following consultation it was not considered that the Sustainability Objectives required amending further. These Sustainability Objectives therefore now provide the sustainability appraisal framework for this appraisal of the JHHNP. The 18 objective are:

Sustainability Objectives	
1	To help provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
2	To help to create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce anti-social behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.
3	To improve access for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.
4	To maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion and support voluntary, community and faith groups.
5	To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds.
6	To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.
7	To conserve and enhance biodiversity.
8	To protect and enhance the town's open spaces and countryside and in particular, those areas designated for their landscape importance.
9	To protect and enhance the town's historic environment including archaeological resources and to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.
10	To seek to address the causes of climate change by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Securing sustainable building practices which conserve energy, water resources and materials;</li> <li>b) Maximising the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources;</li> <li>c) Ensuring that the design and location of new development is resilient to the effects of climate change.</li> </ul>
11	To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment.
12	To seek to minimise waste generation and encourage the re-use of waste through recycling, composting or energy recovery.
13	To improve efficiency in land use and reduce development pressure on the countryside and natural resources/material assets, such as landscape, minerals, biodiversity and soil quality.
14	To ensure stable levels of employment and facilitate inward investment within the district.
15	To assist in the development of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A thriving market town economy in Henley on Thames;</li> <li>b) Small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy; and</li> <li>c) A range of industries providing primarily for the higher value knowledge based economy as</li> </ul>

	well as reflecting lower value and more rural activities.
16	To assist in the development of a skilled workforce to support the long term competitiveness of the district by raising education achievement levels and encouraging the development of the skills needed for everyone to find and remain in work.
17	To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector.
18	Support community involvement in decisions affecting them and enable communities to provide local services and solutions.

The May 2014 draft JHHNP preferred options (and alternatives) were appraised against the 18 SA objectives contained within the sustainability appraisal framework, with an assessment made concerning the predicted social, economic and environmental effects of the options. The options were assessed according to the criteria set out in table 1 below. A copy of the May 2014 JHHNP interim SA is available online at: [www.jhhnp.co.uk](http://www.jhhnp.co.uk).

Table 1: Assessment Criteria

Positive		Uncertain	Neutral	Negative	
++	+	?	0	-	--
Significant positive effect on the objective	Positive effect on the objective	Uncertain effect on the objective	No effect on the objective	Negative effect on the objective	Significant effect on the objective

In light of the public and statutory body feedback on the May 2014 draft JHHNP and interim SA report and further information and evidence that had come to light, a number of objectives and policy changes were proposed. The key changes are outlined within the introduction of the February 2015 Pre Submission JHHNP. These objectives and policy changes were appraised against the SA objectives contained within the SA framework using the same criteria within table 1. The results are presented in the tables in Section 6 of the main February 2015 interim SA report. A copy of the February 2015 JHHNP interim SA is available online at: [www.jhhnp.co.uk](http://www.jhhnp.co.uk).

In light of the public and statutory body feedback on the February 2015 draft JHHNP and interim SA report and further information and evidence that has come to light, a number of further policy changes have been made. The majority of further policy changes are minor. However, in light of further evidence and public consultation feedback all of the policies contained within the May 2015 Submission JHHNP have been reappraised against the SA objectives. The results are presented in the tables in Section 6 of the May 2015 Submission JHHNP SA report.

At each stage in the preparation of the JHHNP, having identified and described the likely effects of each option, we have evaluated their significance. When forming a judgement on whether a predicted effect will be significant, we gave consideration where appropriate and possible to the magnitude and duration over

time. This process included consideration of mitigation to prevent, reduce or offset the adverse effects of the options.

The conclusion of the assessment of the JHHNP objectives and policies is that, with the exception of having a significant negative effect on the loss of greenfield land, they will have no significant environmental effects and will promote sustainable development. In meeting the level growth prescribed by the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, a number of site allocations were necessary on greenfield land due to the limited availability of deliverable and developable previously developed land within Henley. The policies have been clearly selected and drafted to ensure that any potential for negative impacts is avoided through site selection and effective policy wording.

Preparing the JHHNP has required the use of planning judgement to strike the right balance between the technical suitability and community acceptability of the JHHNP. In some cases, this can lead to policies that may not be the most sustainable of all the potential choices made, but they are nonetheless sufficiently sustainable so that they will lead to no significant environmental effects.

However, the conclusion remains that in a number of cases, the JHHNP should deliver positive effects for local residents and businesses as Henley meets its development needs in the period up to 2026. Reasonable alternative policy options have been assessed within the SA report to compare and contrast the options chosen, but in no case does the alternative perform better, against the chosen policy and there is therefore no case for policy changes as a result.

SEA guidance requires measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects of implementing the plan. Where practical the SA report identifies the likely negative and positive impacts each policy has on achieving sustainability objectives based on the SA framework set out. It demonstrates that the policies of the JHHNP will positively contribute towards delivering the social, economic and environmental objectives set out in the SA framework. Where any potential significant negative and negative effects were identified, it was concluded that the policies in the JHHNP, South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, or the NPPF, and guidance within the PPG adequately alleviated or mitigated the impacts, particularly over the medium to longer term. The loss of some greenfield land to meet Henley's development needs is unavoidable.

Henley Town Council, Harpsden Parish Council and SODC will jointly monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the JHHNP using available data. The purpose of monitoring is to provide information on the social, environmental and economic effects of planning policy documents help determine the extent to which objectives, targets and programmes are being met. Monitoring will also allow the Councils' to know if it is necessary to trigger contingency plans, such as those outlined in the JHHNP, should performance fall below expectations, or circumstances significantly change.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This is a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Submission Draft Version (May 2015) of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan (JHHNP). The JHHNP will set out a vision for the future of the area to 2027, providing a strategy to manage improvements and a land use framework for development. If supported at referendum, the JHHNP will gain statutory status and form part of the adopted Development Plan.
- 1.2 A Neighbourhood Plan must meet a number of basic conditions, as set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 and applied to Neighbourhood Plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These basic conditions include the requirement that the making of the Neighbourhood Plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations. Where a Neighbourhood Plan could have significant environmental effects, it may fall within the scope of the Environmental Assessment Regulations 2004 (which seeks to implement European Union Directive 2001/42/EC) and therefore require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).
- 1.3 An Appropriate Assessment (AA) considering the potential impacts of Core Strategy Policy HEN1 (which relates specifically to Henley) has been previously undertaken as part of the South Oxfordshire District Council's (SODC) Core Strategy (December 2012). The Core Strategy supporting text to Policy HEN1 encourages the site allocations process to consider identifying land to deliver up to 450 new homes at Henley. For the purpose of the AA, the only sites considered relevant are Special Areas of Conservation (SACs). The AA concludes that there would be no adverse impacts on sites of European habitats or species as defined under the European Union's Habitats Directive 92/43/EED as a result of policy HEN1.
- 1.4 A SA extends the concept of SEA as a process through which to assess the environmental as well as social and economic impacts of a policy, plan or programme and it's likely contribution to the delivery of sustainable development overall. The SA fully incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.
- 1.5 In February 2015 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) revised guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Neighbourhood Planning and SEA. The key change is the introduction on a new Stage A: Screening process to determine whether the neighbourhood plan in question is likely to have significant environment effects. As part of this new stage, the revised guidance outlines that the key statutory consultees should be consulted on whether an SEA is required. Notwithstanding the fact that the revised guidance was published at an advanced stage in the JHHNP process, as set out within paragraph 1.6 of the JHHNP Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, October 2013, Henley Town Council, as lead

body in the production of the JHHNP, decided to carry out a SA that fully incorporated the requirements of the SEA Directive from the outset. The principal reasons being that SEA was clearly required from the outset given the plan's intention to make land use allocations to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy HEN1. SA is also widely regarded as best practice for producing balanced plans.

- 1.6 Consultation on the SA Scoping Report was undertaken in October 2013, parallel to consultation on the Issues and Options stage of the JHHNP. The SA Scoping Report set out the intended scope of, and methodology for, appraising the JHHNP (Tasks A1 to A5). The JHHNP Sustainability Objectives set out in the Scoping Report were informed by a review of other plans and policies, notably SODC's Core Strategy's own Sustainability Objectives, and an appraisal of the key characteristics specific to Henley and Harpsden as identified in the Baseline Report. A summary of the key statutory consultee responses and how they have been taken into account are provided below:

Statutory consultee	Summary of consultee response	Response to consultee feedback
Environment Agency	The baseline refers to the South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) 2009. However, this has been superseded by the SFRA 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Vale of White Horse District Council SFRA 2013</li> </ul>
Natural England	Under section 10, Environment and Landscape, add a further sub-section setting out information about soil quality and related Agricultural Land Classifications. In paragraph 10.1 and 13.15 make reference to County Wildlife Sites / Sites of Importance for Natural Conservation (SINCs). Appendix 13: Summary of SHLAA sites consider adding columns in relation to biodiversity and soils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add text on soil and agriculture</li> <li>Reference SINCs</li> </ul>
Heritage England (formally English Heritage)	Add further background detail of the historical development of Harpsden. Add further background on Henley's conservation areas and Registered Parks and Gardens. Add reference to Listed Buildings and local heritage assets. Separate SA objective 9 onto two objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add text on Harpsden historical development and listed buildings</li> <li>Add text on Henley Conservation Areas and Registered Parks and Gardens</li> <li>Make reference to importance of archaeology and heritage assets.</li> <li>Retain Objective 9 as a single objective to align with the SODC SA that has been subjected to independent examination.</li> </ul>

1.7 Following consultation the Baseline Report has been subsequently updated. Both the Scoping Report (October 2013) and updated Baseline Report (December 2013) are available online at [www.jhhnp.co.uk](http://www.jhhnp.co.uk). In light of the feedback from the statutory consultees it was not considered that the Sustainability Objectives required amending further. These Sustainability Objectives therefore now provide the framework SA for this appraisal of the JHHNP's objectives and policies. A summary of the key plans, policies and programmes relevant to the production of the JHHNP and the key sustainability issues for Henley and Harpsden are set out below:

#### Key Plans, Policies and Programmes

- a) National Planning Policy Framework 2012;
- b) National Planning Practice Guidance 2014;
- c) Oxfordshire 2030;
- d) Our place, our futures: South Oxfordshire's Sustainable Community Strategy 2009 – 2026;
- e) Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2030;
- f) Economic Development Strategy for Oxfordshire 2006 – 2016;
- g) The Thames Waterway Plan 2006 – 2011;
- h) Chilterns AONB Management Plan and Framework for Action 2008 – 2013;
- i) South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2013;
- j) South Oxfordshire District Council Core Strategy 2012;
- k) South Oxfordshire Housing Strategy 2008 – 2011;
- l) Henley on Thames Action Plan 2013 – 2014.

#### Key Sustainability Issues

Sustainability Problem		Evidence of the problem	
	<i>Environmental</i>		
1.	Landscape deterioration	<p>In some areas of South Oxfordshire the condition of the landscape has deteriorated and is in need of repair, restoration or reconstruction.</p> <p>Large-scale development on the edge of settlements is potentially inappropriate within the rural and unspoilt landscape of South Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Henley on Thames has considerable areas of high quality</p>	

		landscape surrounding the settlement including the AONB. The strategy for these is conservation, with some limited areas identified as in need of repair in the Harpsden Valley.
2.	Loss of biodiversity	Fragmentation and loss of key habitats and species as a result of neglect, harmful agricultural practices and the direct and indirect effects of urban development and climate change.
3.	Rate of disposal of waste to landfill	The percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting was approximately 70% in 2009/10, which means the SODC is exceeding national targets of at least 40% by 2010, 45% by 2015, and 50% by 2020.
4.	Road traffic congestion and consequent adverse environmental, economic and safety impacts	At peak times traffic congestion occurs around major road junctions and town centres. 62% of the resident population travel to work by car which is significantly higher than the national average. Rat-running to avoid congestion can lead to a greater risk of accidents occurring.
5.	Flood risk	<p>Low-lying parts of the Thames valley are subject to flooding at least once a year and are designated flood risk zones by the Environment Agency (EA). Heavy winter rainfall storms are expected to increase in intensity due to climate change</p> <p>The River Thames borders Henley on Thames, which is affected by flood zone 2 and 3, and has experienced flooding in the last 10 years.</p>
6.	Risk of drought	Global warming is likely to result in periods of drought spanning more than one season or one year, presenting a serious threat to water supplies. Over the next 20 years summer rainfall in this region is likely to reduce by 10-20%.
7.	Climate change	Oxfordshire's main areas of climate-related vulnerability are increasing intense downpours and higher temperatures
8.	Energy Consumption	Domestic energy consumption and CO2 emissions in South Oxfordshire are higher than the Oxfordshire, South East and UK averages. The number of buildings being certified to Ecohomes or BREEAM standards is very low.
<b>Social problems</b>		
9.	Shortage of affordable and the cost of general market housing.	Henley is the most expensive area in the district to purchase accommodation across nearly all housing types and is also the most expensive place to rent.
10.	Lack of appropriate size of housing.	The main shortfall in both the affordable and general market housing sectors is for two bedroom accommodation
11.	Social and economic costs of an ageing population.	<p>South Oxfordshire's population is predicted to have a growing proportion of older people and fewer younger people</p> <p>Between 2012 and 2026, combining the two wards of Henley North and Henley South, the population is projected to increase by 1%. However, the 65 and over age group is anticipated to increase by 16.1% whilst the 0-29 year old age group will decrease by 5.1%.</p>
12.	Social exclusion caused by poor access to services and jobs in the rural areas.	Access to health and social care services, shops and employment is difficult for residents without use of a private car in small settlements, where public transport services are limited

13.	Lack of indoor and outdoor community sports facilities.	Existing deficiencies in Henley include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22.02 hectares of parks and gardens</li> <li>• 1.3 hectares of allotments</li> <li>• 2 neighbourhood play areas</li> <li>• equivalent of 2 badminton courts at a sports hall</li> <li>• leisure elements at the swimming pool</li> <li>• multi-use games area</li> <li>• 10 junior and mini football pitches</li> <li>• 2 rugby pitches</li> </ul>
14.	Fear of crime and antisocial behaviour.	Despite relatively low levels of crime, community safety has consistently been a priority for local people and anti-social behaviour remains a major concern
	<b><i>Economic problems</i></b>	
15.	Pockets of deprivation in an otherwise affluent area.	The district as a whole and much of the Neighbourhood Plan area are in the least deprived 20% in the country. The 'Lower Super Output Area' in the northern part of Henley shows deprivation in the top 60% most deprived in the country. This area is therefore relatively deprived compared to the rest of Henley and South Oxfordshire District.
16.	Ageing resident population structure.	South Oxfordshire's population is predicted to have a growing proportion of older people and fewer younger people  Between 2012 and 2026, combining the two wards of Henley North and Henley South, the population is projected to increase by 1%. However, the 65 and over age group is anticipated to increase by 16.1% whilst the 0-29 year old age group will decrease by 5.1%.
17.	Workforce skills in the resident working age population.	Skill shortages are an obstacle to business success.
18.	Road traffic congestion.	At peak times traffic congestion occurs around major road junctions and town centres. 62% of the resident population travel to work by car which is significantly higher than the national average. Rat-running to avoid congestion can lead to a greater risk of accidents occurring.
19.	The availability of sufficient housing and its high cost.	The average house price in 2007 was 10 times the average wage of the local resident workforce. In consequence people find it increasingly difficult to afford a home within easy reach of their employment. This impacts on the economy as wage pressures feed into prices and as firms find it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain staff. It also adds to traffic congestion as more and more people commute significant distances to work.  Henley is the most expensive area in the district to purchase accommodation across nearly all housing types and is also the most expensive place to rent.
20.	Investment in the infrastructure necessary to support future growth in housing and economic development.	It is of national concern that investment in infrastructure (such as roads, public transport, health and social care, water supply, drainage, sport and leisure) has not in the past and may not in the future be adequate to support development. Critical infrastructure needed to support growth includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary School capacity</li> <li>• Secondary school capacity</li> <li>• Healthcare.</li> </ul>

21.	Threats to the vitality and viability of town and village centres.	<p>The vitality and viability of town and village centres in South Oxfordshire is being challenged. The threats to these centres include changing patterns of consumer spending and travel, increasing competition from larger town centres and relocation of businesses to out-of-centre locations.</p> <p>Henley's shopping centre is performing well but its position nationally has fallen by around 40 places since 2003/4.</p>
-----	--	--

1.8 In May 2014 a Pre Submission Draft JHHNP was published for consultation. The consultation documents are available online at [www.jhhnp.co.uk](http://www.jhhnp.co.uk). An interim SA of the May 2014 Pre-Submission Draft JHHNP was published alongside the JHHNP. In light of the consultation responses and additional information coming forward, a number of further alternative policy options were considered. The main policy changes are outlined within the introduction of the February 2015 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP. A summary of the key statutory consultee responses to the interim SA of the May 2014 Pre-Submission Draft JHHNP and how they were been taken into account are provided below:

Statutory consultee	Summary of consultee response	Response to consultee feedback
Environment Agency	No specific SA feedback. However, further information and guidance on the Highlands farm Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest, contamination and water resources was provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration of the SSSI, contamination and water resources has been given in preparing the JHHNP and the SA outcomes.</li> </ul>
Natural England	Overall the interim SA document covers the issues and topics Natural England would expect to see in such a document and is in line with advice that would be offered by Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No changes required.</li> </ul>
Heritage England (formally English Heritage)	Heritage impacts for some of the site options have not given sufficient considered heritage impacts. Greater weight should be given to protecting and enhancing heritage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage site assessment outcomes were reviewed</li> <li>• Greater heritage impact consideration was given as part of subsequent SA assessments</li> <li>• Additional heritage policy and mitigation/ avoidance measures were incorporated.</li> </ul>

1.9 As an iterative process, to inform the February 2015 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the alternative policy options and other significant wording policy changes were subjected to appraisal against the SA Framework.

1.10 In light of the public and statutory body feedback on the February 2015 draft JHHNP and SA report and further information and evidence that has come to light, a number of further policy changes

have been made. The majority of further policy changes are minor and principally relate to increasing heritage and landscape policy emphasis. All of the policies contained within the May 2015 JHHNP have been reappraised against the SA Framework. A summary of the key statutory consultee responses to the interim SA of the February 2015 Pre-Submission Draft JHHNP and how they were been taken into account are provided below:

Statutory consultee	Summary of consultee response	Response to consultee feedback
Environment Agency	No specific SA feedback. However, further advice was given regarding flood risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific changes required, but further consideration to flood risk has been given.</li> </ul>
Natural England	No specific SA feedback. However, further landscape advice was given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific changes required, but further consideration to landscape impacts has been given.</li> </ul>
Heritage England (formally English Heritage)	No specific SA feedback. However, further heritage advice was given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific changes required, but further consideration to heritage impacts has been given.</li> </ul>

## Structure of the Report

1.11 The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** sets out the Sustainability Objectives which form the framework for appraising the JHHNP;
- **Section 3** describes the methodological approach taken to this SA;
- **Section 4** provides an appraisal of the JHHNP's objectives;
- **Section 5** provides a background on the Site Alternatives;
- **Section 6** provides an appraisal of the JHHNP's policies;
- **Section 7** provides conclusions on the overall assessment;
- **Section 8** outlines the mitigation required to address possible identified adverse effects; and
- **Section 9** identifies means through which to monitor the environmental effects of the JHHNP.

## 2.0 THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK

2.1 Table 2.1 below sets out the JHHNP's Sustainability Objectives which form the SA framework against which the JHHNP's objectives and policies are assessed.

Table 2.1: JHHNP' Sustainable Objectives

	Sustainability Objectives
1	To help provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
2	To help to create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce anti-social behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime.
3	To improve access for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.
4	To maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion and support voluntary, community and faith groups.
5	To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds.
6	To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.
7	To conserve and enhance biodiversity.
8	To protect and enhance the town's open spaces and countryside and in particular, those areas designated for their landscape importance.
9	To protect and enhance the town's historic environment including archaeological resources and to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.
10	To seek to address the causes of climate change by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Securing sustainable building practices which conserve energy, water resources and materials;</li> <li>e) Maximising the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources;</li> <li>f) Ensuring that the design and location of new development is resilient to the effects of climate change.</li> </ul>
11	To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment.
12	To seek to minimise waste generation and encourage the re-use of waste through recycling, composting or energy recovery.
13	To improve efficiency in land use and reduce development pressure on the countryside and natural resources/material assets, such as landscape, minerals, biodiversity and soil quality.
14	To ensure stable levels of employment and facilitate inward investment within the district.

15	To assist in the development of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>d) A thriving market town economy in Henley on Thames;</li><li>e) Small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy; and</li><li>f) A range of industries providing primarily for the higher value knowledge based economy as well as reflecting lower value and more rural activities.</li></ul>
16	To assist in the development of a skilled workforce to support the long term competitiveness of the district by raising education achievement levels and encouraging the development of the skills needed for everyone to find and remain in work.
17	To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector.
18	Support community involvement in decisions affecting them and enable communities to provide local services and solutions.

### 3.0 METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 This methodology follows the broad stages set out in guidance document 'A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive' (September 2005). This SA Report reflects Stages B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects and Stage C: Preparing the SA report; and Stage D: Consulting on the draft Plan and SA report. An SEA compliance checklist has been included within Appendix 1.
- 3.2 Although the PPG was updated in February 2015 to include a new Stage A, the methodology stages used within this SA still applies the stages set out within the SA Scoping Report, October 2013. Stage B within this SA is Stage C within the update PPG methodology and Stage C within this SA is Stage D within the updated methodology; and Stage D within this SA is Stage E within the updated methodology. As the JHHNP and SA process had reached an advanced stage at the time the updated PPG guidance was published the existing methodology structure has been retained to avoid confusion between reports.

#### **B1: Testing the Neighbourhood Plan objectives against the Sustainability Objectives of this framework**

- 3.3 The JHHNP objectives are assessed against the Sustainability Objectives of the framework and classified in terms of compatibility, as set out in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Compatibility rating

✓	Positively compatible
0	Neutral / no effect
X	Negatively compatible

#### **B2: Developing and refining options including reasonable alternatives**

- 3.4 The policies of the JHHNP must be in line with existing higher-tier policies and guidance contained in the SODC Core Strategy (December 2012); the NPPF and the NPPG. Core Strategy Policy HEN1 requires land to be allocated to deliver 400 new homes at Henley. Should the NP not seek to allocate this land SODC would be obliged to do so. The Core Strategy supporting text to Policy HEN1 caps the level of growth that the town would otherwise take on the proportional basis due to the strong constraints of the Thames floodplain and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) requiring land for 400 homes. However taking into account the level of need in Henley the Core Strategy encourages the allocation of an additional 50 dwellings if it proves possible bring the requirement to identify land to deliver up to 450 new homes at Henley.

3.5 In accordance with the Core Strategy the JHHNP process has sought to find land to meet this need through its Policy H1. The options considered were to allocate land for 400 new dwellings; or land for 450 new dwellings. The JHHNP process has sought to develop and refine the site options to meet this policy requirement through the use of spatial site assessment criterion developed by members of the JHHNP's working groups (consulted upon through the Issues and Options Consultation in October 2013) and used as a tool in the decision-making process. The complementary assessment criteria are set out below at Table 3.2. This SA presents the appraisal of the site options using the framework's Sustainability Objectives. Further details of the alternative sites assessment process are set out within Section 5.

Table 3.2: JHHNP Site Assessment Criterion and complementary Sustainability Objectives

NP Site Assessment Criterion		JHHNP Sustainability Objectives of the SA framework
A	Proximity and access to services	3, 6
B	Brownfield / Greenfield	13
C	Traffic Impact	5
D	Integration with Henley	8, 13
E	Benefit to the town	14, 16
F	Impact on landscape	8
G	Impact on heritage	9
H	Impact on ecology	7
I	Flood	11

3.6 The preparation of the JHHNP has been an iterative process, led by a clear vision for the future of Henley. A key part of the SA is evaluating any alternative objective and policy options. Having taken into account further information and the consultation feedback from both the May 2014 and February 2015 consultations, a number of additional alternative objective and policy options have been identified and considered. The various options considered and appraise for each policy are set out within Section 6. In some instances a 'No Policy' option to 'do nothing' has been considered. This option relies upon existing local and national policy guidance including SODC's Core Strategy (December 2012), the NPPF, the PPG and other policies within the JHHNP to guide development.

**Stage B3 & B4: Predicting and evaluating the effects of the plan**

- 3.7 Where the implementation of the JHHNP's objectives or policies is likely to change the existing *situation*, the effects are assessed in terms of the nature of the effect (positive, negative, neutral, or uncertain) and where possible and appropriate its magnitude and duration over time. Table 3.3 sets out the terminology used within the appraisal matrices within Section 6 of the Report.

Table 3.3: Key for assessment of effects

Positive		Uncertain	Neutral	Negative	
++	+	?	0	-	--
Significant positive effect on the objective	Positive effect on the objective	Uncertain effect on the objective	No effect on the objective	Negative effect on the objective	Significant effect on the objective

- 3.8 Predictions are supported by evidence, such as JHHNP Working Group research, baseline information, discussions or consultation with statutory and non-statutory consultees which helped those carrying out the SA to reach their conclusions. The key evidence base documents include: JHHNP Scoping Report; JHHNP Housing Site Assessment; JHHNP Land Availability Assessment; and evidence submitted by individuals and developers as part of the JHHNP process, which is available on line at: <http://www.jhhnp.co.uk>. A schedule setting out the assessment protocols applied for each SA Objective is included in Appendix 2.

**B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects**

- 3.9 Throughout the assessment process, where impacts have been identified appropriate mitigation and/ or avoidance measures have been identified where possible. Further consideration of mitigating adverse effects is provided within Section 6 and 8.

**B6: Proposing measures to monitor the environmental effects of the plan**

- 3.10 The significant adverse environmental effects of the implementation of plans must be monitored to identify any unforeseen adverse effects and to enable appropriate remedial action to be taken. Consideration of monitoring the JHHNP is provided within Section 9.

## 4.0 THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK & THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN OBJECTIVES

- 4.1 This section appraises the JHHNP's objectives and predicts the significance of the impact upon the Sustainability Objectives of the SA framework. Table 4.1 demonstrates the key for the comparison between the Neighbourhood Plan objectives and the SA Objectives.
- 4.2 Following the May 2014 Draft JHHNP consultation an additional heritage objective was included (EO7); principally to take into account feedback from Heritage England. In addition to this new objective a number of minor work changes were made to some of the objectives. However, the minor changes made did not fundamentally change the intention of the objectives.

Table 4.1 Comparison Key.

✓ Positive compatibility
0 Neutral/ No Effect
X Negative compatibility

Table 4.2: JHHNP Objectives

Neighbourhood Plan Objectives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
HO1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓
HO2	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0
HO3	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0
HO4	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓
HO5	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓
TO1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓
TO2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Neighbourhood Plan Objectives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TO3	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TO4	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓
TO5	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓
RO1	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓
RO2	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0
RO3	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0
RO4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0
RO5	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓
RO6	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	✓
SO1	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓
SO2	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓
SO3	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓
SO4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓
SO5	0	0	✓	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓
SO6	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO7	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓
EO1	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0
EO2	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓
EO3	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0
EO4	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0

Neighbourhood Plan Objectives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EO5	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0
EO6	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	✓	0	0	0	0	✓
EO7	0	0	0	0	✓	0	0	0	✓	0	✓	0	0	0	0	0	0	✓

**Compatibility of the JHHNP Objectives and the SA framework Sustainability Objectives**

4.3 It is important that the objectives of the JHHNP are in accordance with the Sustainability Objectives of the framework. The majority of the objectives of the JHHNP are positively compatible with or have a neutral effect on the SA framework where there is no association between the objectives.

## 5.0 SITE ALTERNATIVES

- 5.1 As set out within Section 3 to align with the adopted Core Strategy Policy HEN1 requirements the JHHNP process seeks to identify land to deliver 400 to 450 new homes. In addition to this the JHHNP also seeks to allocate land to support the economy and town centre and improve and enhance existing social and community facilities as well as the provision of new facilities and services where possible.
- 5.2 As part of the JHHNP process a number of sites have been promoted by landowners and developers as having the potential to accommodate residential, employment, retail, or mix-use development. The following schedules summarises those sites that have been promoted for development and considered appropriate through the Land Availability Assessment; Housing Site Assessment; and feedback from public consultation:

### Residential Development

- 5.3 The following sites have been promoted / considered for residential development:

Site Alternatives	
1	Site A: Land West of Fair Mile
2	Site H: Mill Lane Former Jet Garage
3	Site U: Wilkins
4	Site M: Highlands Farm
5	Site J: 357 Reading Road
6	Site C: Gillotts School
7	Site V: TA Centre
8	Site F: Chilterns End
9	Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works
10	Site Z: 118 Grey's Road
11	Site X: Henley Youth Club
12	Site B: Tree Tops
13	Site G: Lucy's Farm (Drawback Hill)
14	Site L: Sheephouse Farm
15	Site N: Thames Farm
16	Site Q: Mount Ida
17	Site R: Waterman's Spinney
18	Site P:Wyevale
19	Site K: Parkside

Employment Development

5.4 The following sites have been promoted / considered for employment use.

Site Alternatives	
1	Site P: Former Wyevale Garden Centre
2	Site W: Henley Railway Station Car Park, South
3	Site AE: Land at Newton Road

Mixed-use Development

5.5 The following sites have been promoted / considered for residential-led mix use development:

Site Alternatives	
1	Site H: Mill Lane Former Jet Garage
2	Site M: Highlands Farm
3	Site J: 357 Reading Road
4	Site V: TA Centre
5	Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works
6	16-18 Hart Street (Former Latino's night Club)
7	Site P: Former Wyevale Garden Centre
8	Site W: Henley Railway Station Car Park

**Housing Site Alternatives**

5.6 Given the relative compact nature of Henley it was considered early in the process by the Housing Working Group, with SODC input, that looking to develop alternative spatial strategy options for distributing housing growth would not lead to significantly different alternatives. An alternative spatial strategy approach to SA/ SEA was therefore not considered a reasonable alternative.

5.7 As the collective housing supply potential from the housing sites was greater than 450 new homes. In light of this, individual sites were considered for their potential in helping to deliver the housing requirement vis-à-vis other potential housing sites.

5.8 As outlined above as part of the JHHNP process 19 reasonable alternative housing sites were identified as being deliverable and developable and therefore potential suitable alternatives to help deliver residential development in Henley and Harpsden over the period covered by the JHHNP. Although 19 sites were considered suitable for housing, a number of reasonable alternative

housing number options on a number of sites were identified by the Housing Working Group and promoted for developers throughout the JHHNP process. The various alternative site options considered for housing throughout the JHHNP process are summarised below. A summary of the overall SA outcome (preferred or rejected option) for each site option at each stage is also provided:

JHHNP May 2014 Policy H1 housing site alternative options:

Site Alternative Options	Outcome
Site C: Gillotts School (50 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works (53 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site F: Chilterns End (27dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site H: Mill Lane, Reading Rd (55 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site J: 357 Reading Road (30 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site K: Parkside (15 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site M: Highlands (190 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site U: Wilkins (20 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site V: TA (10 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site A: Fair Mile (parcel A and A1)	Rejected Option
Site B: Tree Tops	Rejected Option
Site G: Lucy's Farm	Rejected Option
Site L: Sheep House	Rejected Option
Site N: Thames Farm	Rejected Option
Site P: Wyevale Garden Centre	Rejected Option
Site Q: Mount Ida	Rejected Option
Site R: Waterman's Spinney	Rejected Option

February 2015 Policy H1 housing site alternative options (new options highlighted in light green):

Site Alternative Options	Outcome
Site A: Land West of Fair Mile (Parcel A and A1)	Preferred Option
Site H: Mill Lane Former Jet Garage (55 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site U Wilkins (20 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site M: Highlands Farm (190 dwellings)	Rejected Option
Site M: Highlands (140 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site J: 357 Reading Road (30 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site C: Gillotts School (50 dwellings)	Preferred Option

Site V: TA Centre (10 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site F Chilterns End (27 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works (53 dwellings)	Rejected Option
Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works (42 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site Z: 118 Grey's Road (13 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site X: Henley Youth Club (23 dwellings)	Preferred Option
Site B: Tree Tops	Rejected Option
Site G: Lucy's Farm	Rejected Option
Site L: Sheep House	Rejected Option
Site N: Thames Farm	Rejected Option
Site Q: Mount Ida	Rejected Option
Site R: Waterman's Spinney	Rejected Option
Site P: Wyevale Garden Centre	Rejected Option
Site K: Parkside (15 dwellings)	Rejected Option

- 5.9 No new alternative housing site options were identified following the February 2015 Draft JHHNP consultation. However, in light of further information and technical feedback received all of the housing site alternative options have been reappraised against the SA objectives.

### **Economic and Mix-Use Development Alternatives**

- 5.10 Given adopted Core Strategy Policy HEN1 seeks to strengthen commerce in the town centre through retail-led, mixed-use development and identify additional retail and leisure floorspace the JHHNP allocates land for economic and mixed-use developments. However, unlike the housing sites, only a limited amount of land was promoted for economic and community uses. All suitable sites (as confirmed through the JHHNP Land Availability Assessments) promoted for economic and mixed-use development were subjected to SA assessment, but the alternative options considered related to the specific uses and quantum of development on each site as opposed to a site by site comparison.

## 6.0 THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES

6.1 This section appraises the JHHNP's policies and predicts the significance of the impact upon the Sustainability Objectives of the SA framework. The results of this appraisal helps to identify and describe the likely sustainability impacts of the JHHNP. Further details of the criteria framework used to help inform assessment is included in Appendix 2.

### Residential Sites

6.2 Table 6.1 evaluates the JHHNP objectives for the allocation of houses against the sustainable appraisal objectives.

**Table 6.1: Policy H1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Policy Alternative: Identify land for up to 400 new homes	+	?	+	0	?	0	-	-	-	?	0	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
Identify land for up to 450 new homes	++	?	+	0	?	0	-	-	-	?	0	?	+	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options:

6.3 A key requirement of the JHHNP is to be in general conformity with the policy contained within the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (2012). Therefore in accordance with Policy HEN1 of the Core Strategy one policy alternative is to identify land for up to 400 homes. However, the Core Strategy supporting text also refers to looking to identify land for up to 450 homes. Identifying land is for up to 450 homes is therefore considered to be a reasonable alternative.

6.4 Although the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment indicates that the housing requirement in South Oxfordshire should be increased and South Oxfordshire are currently in the very early stages of reviewing the Core Strategy it is not considered reasonable at this time for the

Neighbourhood Plan to consider higher housing numbers above that outlined within the adopted Core Strategy. Doing so would be premature of the outcome of the emerging Local Plan.

**Preferred Option:**

6.5 The preferred option is to identify land for up to 450 new homes.

**Assessment Comment:**

6.6 Both policy options performed broadly the same as they related to the delivery of housing. However, identifying land for up to 450 new homes was the preferred option as it would have a greater potential to provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.7 Only allocating land for 400 new homes is a less proactive and positive policy towards meeting Henley's identified housing needs.

**Table 6.2: Policy H1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Site A: Land West of Fair Mile (90 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	-	--	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0
Site A: Land West of Fair Mile (40 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	-	--	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0
Site A1: Land West of Fair Mile (20 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	-	--	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0
Site H: Mill Lane Former Jet Garage	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site U: Wilkins	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site M and M1: Highlands Farm (190 dwellings)	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	--	--	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	0

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Site M: Highlands Farm (140 dwellings)	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	--	--	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	0
Site M1: Highlands Farm (30 dwellings)	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	--	--	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	0
Site J: 357 Reading Road	++	?	++	0	?	+	++	+	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site C: Gillotts School (85 dwellings)	++	?	-	0	?	-	+	-	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
Site C: Gillotts School (50 dwellings)	++	?	-	0	?	-	+	-	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
Site V: TA Centre (10 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	--	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0
Site F: Chilterns End (27 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0
Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works (53 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site E: Stuart Turner and Empstead Works (42 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site Z: 118 Grey's Road (13 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site Z: 118 Grey's Road (26 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0
Site X: Henley Youth Club (23 dwellings)	++	?	+	-	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0
Site X: Henley	++	?	+	-	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Youth Club (31 dwellings)																		
Site B: Tree Tops	++	?	+	0	?	-	-	--	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
Site G: Lucy's Farm (Drawback Hill)	++	?	++	0	?	-	-	-	+	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0
Site L: Sheephouse Farm	++	?	+	0	?	+	-	-	+	?	--	?	-	0	0	0	0	0
Site N: Thames Farm	++	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	+	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0
Site Q: Mount Ida	++	?	-	0	?	-	-	+	+	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0
Site R: Waterman's Spinney	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	-	+	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0
Site P: Wyevale	++	?	-	0	?	-	-	+	+	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	0
Site K: Parkside	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	+	-	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.8 As set out within Section 1 and the consultation statement, in light of site specific information and feedback from public consultation, the Policy H1 site options and outcomes have been refined and reassessed as the JHHNP has been prepared. In response to public feedback and advice from statutory bodies as part of the Pre Submission Draft JHHNP 2015 consultation, further consideration and emphasis has been given to heritage, flood risk and landscape impacts. The policy had been previously been refined in response to public feedback and advice from statutory bodies as part of the Pre Submission Draft JHHNP 2014 consultation, with further consideration being given in particular to ecology impacts. In response to feedback from SODC regarding alignment with the Core Strategy the proposed indicative phasing of site delivery was removed from the policy and the H1 total allocation requirements revised from 400 to 450 homes.

### **Summary of Options**

- 6.9 Given the relative compact nature of Henley it was considered early in the process that looking to develop alternative spatial strategy options for distributing housing growth would not lead to significantly different alternatives. This view was also supported by SODC. In light of this, individual sites were considered for their potential in helping to deliver the housing requirement.
- 6.10 As part of the JHHNP process 27 alternative site options were therefore identified as reasonable alternatives to help deliver residential development over the period covered by the JHHNP. Although only 19 sites were promoted/considered for housing, a number of alternative housing number options on a number of sites were identified by the Housing Working Group (Sites: A, M, C, X, Z and E) and promoted for developers following the Pre-Submission consultation in May 2014.

### **Preferred Options**

- 6.11 The preferred options are Sites, A, H, U, M, J, C (50 dwellings), V, F, E (42 dwellings), Z (13 dwellings) and X (23 dwellings). In addition to these Sites A1 and M1 were also preferred options as reserve sites should Site C not be granted planning permission by 1<sup>st</sup> January 2020, considering a number of known delivery issues.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.12 Site A has a number of negative and significant negative outcomes relating to ecology, biodiversity, landscape, heritage and efficient use of land. Access to the site would be via the Fair Mile and potentially would result in the loss of one or more TPO trees. Furthermore the site lies within a Conservation Area with Listed Buildings within close proximity. Heritage impact and the potential loss of TPO trees will need to be given significant consideration. However, there was an emphasis through public consultation on greater dispersal of allocations around the town. This site would assist with dispersing growth. Appropriate design measures could also be put in place through the development management process to mitigate or reduce heritage and landscape impacts, particularly over the medium to long term.
- 6.13 As previously developed sites, Site's H, U, J, V, F, E, Z, X performed well against the environmental objectives. Public consultation feedback supported a focus on allocating previously developed sites within Henley. These sites therefore all achieve significant positive outcomes against Objective 9 which looks to reduce development pressure on the countryside.

- 6.14 Sites H, U, M, J, E and Z have existing employment related use classes on the site. Development of the site for housing is likely to result in the loss of land that is or has previously been use for employment. As these are sites comprise vacant employment land, or declining and unviable economic activities the redevelopment of these sites to housing is considered to have a minor negative impact on Henley and Harpsden's local economy. The loss of jobs resulting from the redevelopment of these sites can be mitigated through mixed-use allocations – i.e. residential with some other job creating uses. The overall employment strategy for the JHHNP is to encourage intensification and higher density employment to make use of limited available land.
- 6.15 Site V lies within a Conservation Area with Listed Buildings are within close proximity. Heritage impacts will need to be given significant consideration. Appropriate design measures could also be put in place through the development management process to mitigate or reduce heritage impacts, particularly over the medium to long term.
- 6.16 Sites X (23 dwellings) has previously been used for community uses. The loss of this site for community use could have negative impacts for access to community facilities. The loss of community facility land could be mitigated over the medium to long term through the delivery on enhanced or new community facilities
- 6.17 In response to public consultation and District Council's feedback on retail need, the reduced level of housing option on the site E (42 dwellings) is now also the preferred option, alongside a greater mixed use element.
- 6.18 Sites M and M1 lie within the AONB and there is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and Site of Special Scientific Interest (Highlands Farm Pit) within the sites area. However, development within close proximity of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the SSSI could be avoided/ mitigated through design. Any development should be set back from the heritage asset to ensure it is protected. Although within the AONB, the site is partly previously developed land with existing commercial operations. Housing development on the site would make effective use of the previously developed land which was strongly supported through public consultation. Appropriate design measures could be put in place through the development management process to mitigate or reduce significant landscape impacts, particularly over the medium to long term. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment could also further help identify and mitigate landscape impacts as part of the development management process. In response to public consultation the reduced level of housing option on the site (140 dwellings) is also the preferred option. A Site M1 is also a preferred option as a reserve housing site should planning permission for Site C not be forthcoming.

6.19 Site C has a number of negative outcomes relating to potential heritage, landscape and loss of sports fields. However, the strategic Core Strategy policy encourages support for meeting the school's accommodation needs. Housing development to assist the schools comprehensive redevelopment was received some support through public consultation. The policy identifies the need to meet the NPPF requirements in terms of playing field development. The negative outcomes can be mitigated or reduced through design measures as part of the development management process, as well as through alternative sports provision.

**Why were the other options rejected?**

6.20 The options rejected are Sites: A (90 dwellings), M and M1 (190 dwellings), Site C (85 dwellings), Site E (53 dwellings), B, G, L, N, Q, R, P, K, X (31 dwellings) and Z (26 dwellings).

6.21 As greenfield Sites G, L, N, R and K resulted in a number of negative outcomes relating to ecology, biodiversity and landscape impacts. Sites R and K have blanket TPO's so development on these sites is likely to result in the loss of a number of TPO trees. Site K is also within close proximity to a number of Listed Buildings and adjoins a Conservation Area. One of the JHHNP housing objectives is to encourage the reuse of previously developed land. These sites achieved a negative outcome against objective 13 as they are all greenfield sites. Allocating Site P for residential use was considered to be in conflict with Core Strategy Policy CSR1; and Site K in conflict with a number of Core Strategy policies (as highlighted in the district council's feedback on the 2014 pre-submission plan).

6.22 Site B was rejected due to the impact on the AONB which would result in a significant negative outcome and loss of public open space. The site was also rejected through public consultation feedback.

6.23 The higher density development options on Sites: A (90 dwellings), X (31 dwellings) and Z (26 dwellings) were rejected following a policy decision to ensure that the development suitably responds to the character of the surrounding area and achieves an appropriate dwelling mix with sufficient open space and parking.

6.24 In response to public consultation feedback Site M and M1 for 190 dwellings option was rejected. The Site E (53 dwellings) option was also rejected following consultation feedback and the outcome of appraisal of Policy SP3 which showed an increased amount of B1 Use Class floorspace, but a reduced number of dwellings on the site would provide significant economic benefits.

6.25 Although within the JHHNP area, Sites Q, N and P are not located within or on the edge of the Henley. The strategic Core Strategy policy looks to focus new housing growth within or on the edge

of Henley. These sites were therefore been rejected as they conflict with the strategic Core Strategy Policy HEN1.

**Table 6.3: Policy H2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
H2: Design Brief – Prescriptive stage approach	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	++
No Policy and rely on the SODC's decision making process)	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.26 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

### Summary of the Options

6.27 To include a policy that enables the residents and businesses within the Neighbourhood Area to actively shape and influence development proposals coming forward through frontloading the decision-making process. An alternative option would be to rely on the existing development management decision-making process led by South Oxfordshire District Council.

### Preferred Option

6.28 The preferred option is to include a policy requiring a development brief to be prepared for allocated sites and other significant development within the Neighbourhood Area.

### Assessment Comment

6.29 Both options scored positive outcomes. However, the Design Brief policy achieved a number of significant positive outcomes as the policy will ensure local residents and businesses within the

neighbourhood continue to have the opportunity to influence the shape, design and form of key development proposals.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.30 The development management decision-making process at the District level does not ensure consultation with local residences and businesses is frontloaded. The 'No Policy' option was rejected as this option, as outlined above, did not perform as effectively as the preferred option. The policy to include a Design Brief requirement was supported through public consultation by local residents and statutory consultees.

**Table 6.4: Policy H3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
H3: Type and Size of New Housing (Dwelling Statement)	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
Policy targets based on 2011 Census demographics	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

- 6.31 To include a housing type and mix policy to ensure that development proposals provide the right type and mix of housing to meet Henley and Harpsden's specific housing needs now and over the plan period. In response to public consultation feedback as part of the May 2014 Pre Submission draft JHHNP consultation an alternative policy option was identified based on defining the future housing mix and type targets based on Census 2011 demographic analysis. The other alternative

no policy option is to rely on housing type and mix information produced at the District level, namely the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment.

### Preferred Option

- 6.32 The preferred option is to include a Henley and Harpsden housing type and mix policy requiring the submission of a Dwelling Mix Statement as part of development proposals over 10 dwellings.

### Assessment Comment

- 6.33 All options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option performed slightly more effectively against the objectives as it ensures that the housing type and mix needs of Henley and Harpsden residents now and in the future are met through future developments.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.34 The policy targets based on 2011-based demographics was rejected as it provides insufficient flexibility over the plan period to changing housing type and size needs. The 'No Policy' option was also rejected as would result in the reliance of the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (and subsequent updates) to inform development management decisions. Although the SHMA would be periodically updated, as a district wide assessment it lacks Henley and Harpsden specific detail.

**Table 6.5: Policy H4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
H4: Provision of facilities	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

- 6.35 To include a policy clearly setting out that new housing proposals should contribute to the provision of new facilities in the town, or to leave emphasis on the importance of providing essential new

facilities within the Neighbourhood Plan area to negotiations as part of SODC's decision-making process.

### Preferred Option

6.36 The preferred option is to include a policy outlining the need for new housing proposals to contribute to the provision of new facilities.

### Assessment Comment

6.37 Both options scored positively. However, the preferred option performed slightly more effectively against the objectives, namely Objective 3 and 4.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.38 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it is considered essential that new residential development mitigates the impact of increasing population demand on the full range of services, facilities and amenities in Henley and Harpsden.

**Table 6.6: Policy H5**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
H5: Infill and self-build dwellings	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	+
No Policy	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.39 In light of feedback from the 2014 and 2015 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

**Summary of the Options**

6.40 To include a policy encouraging infill and self-build dwellings on sites that meet the site assessment criteria used to assess the JHHNP allocated sites, or reliance on development management decision making based on the strategic policies within the Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework, and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

**Preferred Option**

6.41 The preferred option is to include a Henley and Harpsden specific site criteria policy which encourages infill and self-build developments in appropriate and sustainable locations.

**Assessment Comment**

6.42 A policy supporting infill and self-build scored positively against the objectives, particularly at ensuring that local factors are taken into account when infill and self-build developments are proposed. Self-builds are encouraged by the NPPF.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.43 The ‘No Policy’ option was rejected as it is considered necessary to ensure local site assessment factors are taken into account in bringing forward infill and self-build proposals.

**Table 6.7: Policy H6**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
H6: Contingency	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	++
No contingency policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.44 In light feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP and the 2015 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP consultation the policy has been refined notably to include reference to the reserve sites in the JHHNP. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

### Summary of the Options

6.45 To include a contingency policy to proactively address unforeseen delivery for planning policy changes; or no policy which does not commit Henley Town Council and Harpsden Parish Council to monitor and address delivery issues.

### Preferred Option

6.46 The Preferred Option is to include a proactive and positive policy to address unforeseen delivery or planning policy change circumstances.

### Assessment Comment

6.47 The Preferred Option scored positively against the objectives as the policy will help ensure housing and economic growth is delivered in a timely manner.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.48 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was a more proactive approach towards housing delivery and supporting the local economy.

**Table 6.8: Policy T1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
T1: Impact of development of the transport network	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy (reliance on SODC development management process)	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### **Policy Refinement**

- 6.49 To light of feedback from the 2014 and 2015 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.50 To include a Henley and Harpsden specific development threshold policy requiring development proposals to assess and appropriately mitigate transport and air quality impacts and identify and maximise walking and cycling opportunities; or the reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.51 The preferred option is the inclusion of a Henley and Harpsden specific policy requiring the impact of development on the transport network to be assessed and appropriately mitigated.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.52 The inclusion of a policy scored positively against the objectives compared to the no policy option. The preferred option ensures that the local impact of development on the transport network is taken into account and appropriately mitigated. The policy is considered to have a significant positive outcome against improving travel choice and accessibility.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.53 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it is considered necessary to ensure that the impact of development on Henley's transport network is appropriately taken into account and, where possible, mitigated through the decision-making process.

**Table 6.9: Policy T2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
T2: Cycling routes	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.54 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

**Summary of the Options**

6.55 To include a policy encouraging a safe cycling network and improvement to cycling storage and facilities within the town centre; or rely on strategic South Oxfordshire and Oxfordshire County Council policy mechanisms.

**Preferred Option**

6.56 The Preferred Option is to include a policy encouraging the creation of a safe cycling network.

**Assessment Comment**

6.57 The preferred option scores positively against the objectives, particularly in relation to improving health and transport choices.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.58 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was the more positive approach.

**Table 6.10: Policy SCI1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SCI1: Provision of social and community infrastructure	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

### Summary of the Options

- 6.59 To include a policy clearly setting out that new development should contribute to the provision of new social and community infrastructure; or to leave emphasis of the importance of providing new infrastructure to negotiations as part of SODC's decision-making process.

### Preferred Option

- 6.60 The preferred option is to include a policy outlining the need for new development proposals to contribute to the provision of new social and community infrastructure.

### Assessment Comment

- 6.61 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option performed slightly more effectively against the objectives as it ensures that essential local facilities and community services are provided as part of all new development proposals.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.62 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it is considered essential that new development mitigates the impact of increasing demand on the full range of local facilities and community services, in Henley and Harpsden.

**Table 6.11: Policy SCI2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SCI2: Comprehensive renewal of Gillotts School, including enabling development for up to 85 dwellings	++	?	-	0	?	-	+	-	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
SCI2: Comprehensive renewal of Gillotts School including enabling development for up to 50 dwellings	++	?	-	0	?	-	+	0	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
Comprehensive renewal of Gillotts School without supporting development	0	?	-	0	?	-	+	-	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	?	-	0	?	-	+	-	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.63 In response to public consultation an alternative policy option has been identified which limited the enabling residential development to 50 dwellings. An alternative to supporting the renewal of the school without residential development was also identified. In light of additional information, further analysis has also been undertaken regarding the sites accessibility, landscape, ecology and flood risk. The policy has been further refined considering the 2015 pre-submission consultations, notably from Sport England.

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.64 To include a policy supporting the comprehensive renewal of Gillotts School with residential-led enabling development comprising of up to 85 dwellings; or up to 50 dwellings; support the comprehensive renewal of Gillotts school without supporting any residential-led enabling development; or not including a policy supporting the renewal of the school.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.65 The Preferred Option is to support the comprehensive renewal of Gillotts School referencing the enabling of residential development of up to 50 dwellings.

### **Assessment Comment**

Alongside the significant positive outcomes, the preferred option achieves a number of negative outcomes against some of the objectives, although none are significant. On balance the lower level of proposed housing was preferred to reflect the low density adjacent development and number of on-site constraints. The lower unit number was considered to still help support the comprehensive redevelopment of the school and provide a significant benefit of delivering new housing, while reducing the level of playing field area loss. The loss of the playing field area would be mitigated through rationalising and maximising the use of the remaining playing fields, in line with the NPPF criteria.

Appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures can be achieved through design and development management processes to reduce the other identified negative impact outcomes of the preferred option, particularly over the medium to long term.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.66 Not having a policy that supports the principal of comprehensive redevelopment of the Gillotts School buildings potentially conflicts with the strategic Core Strategy policy for Henley. Deliverability of the comprehensive redevelopment of the school site is unlikely to be possible without some form of residential enabling development. Therefore a policy which did not support enabling development was rejected. The high level of enabling development on the site would have a greater impact on the character of the area. High quality alternative provision is required to offset the loss of playing fields. Failure to achieve planning on the site by 1<sup>st</sup> January 2020 would result in the reserve sites being implemented.

**Table 6.12: Policy SCI3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SCI3: Renewal and enhancement of community facilities	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.67 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

**Summary of the Options**

6.68 To include a policy actively encouraging and supporting the renewal and enhancement of existing community facilities; or to rely on market and community actions.

**Preferred Option**

6.69 The preferred option is to include a policy outlining that support will be given to proposals that support the renewal and enhancement of existing community facilities.

**Assessment Comment**

6.70 The Preferred Option assessed outcomes were more positive than no having a policy. The policy was also supported by public consultation feedback.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.71 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option achieved a more positive outcome against improving access to community facilities and services as well as helping to maintain and improve health, well-being and community cohesion and community groups.

**Table 6.13: Policy SCI4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SCI4: Community Right to Build	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	++
No Policy	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+

**Summary of the Options**

- 6.72 To include a policy that support proposals through the Community Right to Build legislation; or reliance on community groups to identify the existence of Community Right to Build legislation.

**Preferred Option**

- 6.73 The preferred option is to include a policy supporting Community Right to Build proposals.

**Assessment Comment**

Both options score broadly the same. However, including a policy helps support community involvement in potential decision-making about taking forward Community Right to Build proposals.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.74 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach. Including a policy on supporting community right to build projects was supported through public feedback.

**Table 6.14 Policy: SCI5: Henley College**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Policy SCI5 Henley College	?	?	+	?	?	?	?	0	0	?	+	?	+	0	0	+	0	+
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

- 6.75 To reflect feedback from the 2014 pre-submission consultation, and further consideration, a new policy has been identified which supports the future renewal of Henley College. At present there are no deliverable plans or proposals relating to how the College could be renewed through redevelopment.

### Preferred Options

- 6.76 The preferred option is to support Henley College in meeting its needs should renewal of the college require redevelopment proposals including housing development.

### Assessment Comment

- 6.77 A policy supporting the renewal of the College site achieved a more positive outcome compared to the 'no policy' option. Although many assessment outcomes are uncertain given there are no deliverable plans or proposals relating to how the Collage could be renewed through development. However, given no significant negative outcomes were identified, appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures are likely to be able to achieved through any design and development management processes to reduce any identified negative impacts arising from the preferred option, particularly over the medium to long term. The preferred option will help support the Core Strategy aim of supporting the Colleges future accommodation needs.

### Why were the other options rejected?

- 6.78 Not having a policy that supports education facilities within Henley conflicts with the strategic Core Strategy policy for Henley. Including a policy also achieved a more positive outcome as it helps supports education improvements and assisting in the creation of a skilled workforce.

**Table 6.15: Policy TCE1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE1: Henley Town Centre	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	++	0
No Policy	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0

### Summary of the Options

6.79 To include a Henley Town Centre specific policy, or reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

### Preferred Option

6.80 The Preferred Option is the inclusion of a Henley Town Centre specific policy. This new policy will encourage new retail, leisure, hotel and office development which should be located within the defined town centre boundary, or follow a sequential approach under specific criteria.

### Assessment Comment

6.81 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option performed more effectively against the objectives as it provides a locally specific policy framework to support Henley Town Centre's vitality and viability.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.82 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was a more positive and proactive approach to Henley Town Centre.

**Table 6.16: Policy TCE2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE2: Market Place Hub	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	++	0
No Policy	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0

### Summary of the Options

6.83 To include a Henley market hub policy, or reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

### Preferred Option

6.84 The preferred option is the inclusion of a Henley market hub policy which will support new development and change of use application to use class A3 within the northern part of Market Square, support retaining and enhance of the market area for market stalls and support the provision of cycle storage.

### Assessment Comment

6.85 The preferred option achieves significant positive outcomes for supporting local business and tourism economy. The option also makes efficient use of land helps improve access to community facilities and services through the supporting the provision of a covered cycle storage facility.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.86 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.17: Policy TCE3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE3: Hotel and Bed Space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	++	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	0

**Summary of the Options**

- 6.87 To include a Henley hotel and bed space policy, or reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

**Preferred Option**

- 6.88 The preferred option is the inclusion of a Henley hotel and bed space policy which would support Henley as a tourist destination.

**Assessment Comment**

- 6.89 The preferred option achieves more positive outcomes against the objectives than the 'No Policy' alternative, particularly support for the tourism economy.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.90 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.18: Policy TCE4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE4: Employment and residential above shops	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0
No Policy	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

6.91 To include a policy supporting employment and residential use above shops; or reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework, as well as existing Permitted Development Rights and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

### Preferred Option

6.92 The preferred option is the inclusion of an employment and residential use above shops which will help support the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre and local economy.

### Assessment Comment

6.93 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option provides further local support and encouragement to making more efficient and effective use of existing space above local shops.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.94 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.19: Policy TCE5**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE5: Town centre car park management	0	0	+	0	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0
No Policy	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0

**Summary of the Options**

6.95 The inclusion of a policy which supports and encourages Henley Town Centre car park management proposals; or reliance on measures identified through South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council town centre car parking policies, plans and strategies.

**Preferred Option**

6.96 The preferred option is the inclusion of policy encouraging the introduction of an enhanced town centre car park management system.

**Assessment Comment**

6.97 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option provides further local support to improving town centre car parking management within Henley. The introduction of an enhanced town centre car park management system is locally supported.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.98 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.20: Policy TCE6**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE6: 16 – 18 Hart Street (Former Latino’s Night Club) limiting development to A3 or B1 Use Class only	0	+	0	0	?	0	0	0	-	?	+	?	++	+	++	0	++	+
TCE6: 16-18 Hart Street (Former Latino’s Night Club) limiting development to A1, A3, B2 and D2 Use Class	0	+	0	0	?	0	0	0	-	?	+	?	++	+	+	0	++	+
No Policy	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	--	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	+	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.99 To response to public consultation feedback to the 2014 Pre Submission draft JHHNP an alternative policy approach has been proposed which increases the number of supported Use Classes on the site. Further site analysis information has also been considered.

**Summary of the Options**

6.100 To include a policy that encourages the change of use of a vacant brownfield site to A1 retail or B1 office use, with a particular emphasis on the site’s potential use for a covered market, office accommodation for small and medium sized businesses, and sensitive design. An alternative option is to increase the types of Use Classes supported on the site to include A3 and D2 uses. The third alternative option, in an absence of any such supporting policy, is to rely upon existing Core Strategy policy and the NPPF which also require sensitive design of development in Conservation Areas, and do not restrict the site’s change of use to the proposed town centre uses.

**Preferred Option**

6.101 The preferred option is to include a policy promoting the change of use of the site for the A1 shopping, A3 restaurants and cafes, B1 office or D2 assembly and leisure use classes.

**Assessment Comment**

6.102 Both policy options to specify the supported Use Classes on the site perform broadly equal. However, the increased flexibility in use classes is likely to provide further support Henley’s tourism sector through the potential provision of restaurants and café uses. The no policy options achieves less positive outcomes as there is no firm policy support to encourage the re use of the building. There are Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and other heritage impacts associated with bringing the buildings back into active use that will need to be given significant consideration. However, appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures can be achieved through design and development management processes to reduce any heritage impact outcomes associated with bringing the buildings back into use, particularly over the medium to long term.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.103 The ‘No Policy’ option did not perform as effectively against the objectives as the preferred option. The increased flexibility in the supported town centre uses on the site provides greater alignment with the NPPF’s town centre first policy approach and the Government’s approach to supporting town centres.

**Table 6.21: Policy TCE7**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
TCE7: Town Centre Action Plan	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	++
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+

**Summary of the Options**

6.104 To include a policy that encourages new development proposals that are within or will have an effect on the town centre to identify how they have considered the priorities set out in the Town

Centre Action Plan. The alternative option, in an absence of any such supporting policy, is to rely upon the Town Centre groups existing capacity to achieve their own objectives.

**Preferred Option**

6.105 The preferred option is to include a policy requiring new development proposals to identify how they have considered the actions of the Henley Town Centre Action Plan.

**Assessment Comment**

6.106 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option provides greater support to the delivery of the community’s Town Centre Action Plan.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.107 The ‘No Policy’ option was rejected as this option, as outlined above, did not perform as effectively as the preferred option in helping to ensure that new development proposals affecting the town centre have given appropriate consideration to the Town Centre Action Plan.

**Table 6.22: Policy E1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
E1: Supporting Henley’s economy (refined)	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.108 In light of Environment Agency flood risk feedback as part of the Pre Submission Draft JHHNP in 2015 the provision of employment floorspace as part of the Station Car Park (Site W) has been removed from the policy options. Allocating land within the Flood Plain was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.109 To include a policy that promotes Henley's economy through the allocation of new employment sites, the intensification of an existing employment site, and supports the growth of office space within the town centre. The alternative 'No Policy' option would rely upon existing policies and guidelines contained within the Core Strategy and NPPF which direct new employment to town centre locations but do not allocate new employment sites in Henley.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.110 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating additional sites for employment use, promoting the intensification of existing employment and the increase in office space in Henley town centre.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.111 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option is shown to have the greater benefit in terms of proactively encouraging stable levels of employment in Henley as a whole through supporting the delivery of new employment uses and the intensification and physical improvements to the Reading Road Industrial Estate.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.112 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as this option, as outlined above, provided a greater level of support and therefore positive outcomes for the economy.

**Table 6.23: Policy E2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
E2: Former Wyevale Garden (Site P) Centre Limit to B1 and supporting A1/ D2 Use Classes	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	+	+	?	+	?	+	+	+	0	0	0
E2: Former Wyevale Garden Centre (Site P) Limit to B1, B2 and D1 Use Classes	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	+	+	?	+	?	+	+	++	0	0	0
No Policy	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	+	+	?	+	?	+	+	+	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.113 In order to take into account additional information received and the consultation feedback following the May 2014 draft JHHNP the wording of the policy has been refined in relation to the supported uses on the site.

### Summary of the Options

6.114 To include a policy that allocates a former garden centre (sui generis Use Class providing employment opportunities) for a mix of B1 and A1/D2 retail and leisure uses; or a mix of B1, B2 and D1 uses. The alternative option is to rely on the existing decision-making process led by South Oxfordshire District Council.

6.115 As set out within Table 6.2: Policy H1 and paragraphs 6.17 to 6.21 the site was promoted and assessed for residential development. However, the site was as rejected housing site alternative option.

### Preferred Option

6.116 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for a mix of B1, B2 and D1 uses.

### Assessment Comment

6.117 The three alternative options achieved broadly the same outcome. However, restricting retail use is considered more preferable in supporting the vitality and viability of Henley Town Centre as the main focus for new retail development. Including a policy supporting wider employment use class activities on the site, as opposed to the existing sui generis garden centre use, will help support the local economy by providing greater employment activity uses on the site and give the market greater confidence in bringing the site forward.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.118 Public consultation has confirmed support for redevelopment of the site. The 'No Policy' option would limit the redevelopment support to only the sites existing sui generis garden centre use. For this reason so this option was rejected as an objective of the JHHNP is to support the local economy. To ensure future retail development is focused at Henley the policy supporting retail A1 retail on the site was rejected.

**Table 6.24: Policy E3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
E3: Henley Railway Station Car Park, South. Limit development to B1 and B8 Uses	0	?	0	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	--	0	++	++	++	+	0	0
E3: Henley Railway Station Car Park, South. Limit development to B Uses and a Hotel and flood risk assessment and mitigation	0	?	0	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	0	0	++	++	++	+	++	0

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
requirements																		
No Policy	0	?	0	0	?	0	++	++	+	?	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.119 In order to take into account additional information received and the consultation feedback following the May 2014 Draft JHHNP and alternative option was identified which increased B use class flexibility to include B2 uses and included reference to provision of a hotel. In light consultation feedback and information regarding flood risk additional policy wording has been incorporated.

### Summary of the Options

6.120 Allocate the site for B1 or B8 business use; or B1 Uses (includes B1, B2 and B8 Uses) and a hotel. The other alternative option is a 'no policy' option which relies on the existing decision making process led by South Oxfordshire District Council.

### Preferred Option

6.121 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for B use Class and a hotel.

### Assessment Comment

6.122 Development of the site would have a possible significant adverse impact on the risk of flooding. However, it has been identified that further technical assessment would have the potential to confirm that the site is not at risk of flooding. To mitigate any significant flood risk impacts, additional policy wording has been included which should ensure a neutral policy outcome against Objective 10. Increasing the range of B use classes will result in a significant positive outcome for supporting the local economy and helping to attract inward investment. The inclusion of a requirement for a hotel will provide a significant positive outcome against supporting the local tourism economy.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.123 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as this option would provide limited support to Henley's business and tourism economy. In light of evidence confirming the need for increased accommodation within Henley an approach that did not support hotel provision was rejected.

**Table 6.25: Policy E4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
E4: Land at Newton Road	0	+	0	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	+	++	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	0	++	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

- 6.124 In order to take into account the local planning authority's comments on the February 2014 pre-submission JHHNP, the policy wording has been amended to allow for a greater diversity of employment uses.

### Summary of the Options

- 6.125 The Policy E4 option allocates the site for B1 business activities, or other suitable commercial uses. In contrast the 'No Policy' option requires any proposals for the site to be assessed against the existing policies within the Core Strategy and NPPF. Core Strategy Policy HEN3 currently designates the site as within an employment area.

### Preferred Option

- 6.126 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for B1 use or other suitable commercial uses.

### Assessment Comment

- 6.127 Both of the options scored well against the framework objectives; however the inclusion of a policy reaffirms local support for the development of the vacant site for employment use. Given the

proximity to residential properties consideration will need to be given to noise and air related impacts associated with any employment use on the site. Any noise and air related impacts could be mitigated or avoidance measures put in place as part of the design and development management process. Policy wording could be included to ensure appropriate consideration is given as part of the development management process.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.128 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it was considered to be a less positive option as no local policy support would be given to bringing the vacant site forward.

**Table 6.26: Policy EN1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EN1: Environmental Protection	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.129 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

**Summary of the Options**

6.130 To include a policy that supports the protection and enhancement of, and public access to, the river edge, key views, the ANOB and Harpsden Valley, existing and new open and green spaces; or, the reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework.

**Preferred Option**

6.131 The preferred option is the inclusion of a policy which provides environmental protection to identified local resources.

**Assessment Comment**

6.132 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option achieved significant positive outcomes against helping to protect open spaces and ensuring community involvement in decisions – as the key views has been identified and confirmed through the JHHNP process.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.133 The ‘No Policy’ option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.27: Policy EN2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
EN2: New and replacement green infrastructure and public open spaces	0	0	++	++	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.134 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

### Summary of the Options.

6.135 To include a policy requiring new residential development to provide new and replacement green infrastructure and public open spaces; or to leave emphasis of the importance of providing new green infrastructure and public open spaces to negotiations as part of SODC's decision-making process.

### Preferred Option

6.136 The preferred option is to include a policy outlining the need for new residential proposals to provide new and replacement green infrastructure and public open spaces.

### Assessment Comment

6.137 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option achieve significant positive outcomes for helping to improve access to new and enhanced parks and gardens and contributing to health.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.138 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.28: Policy EN3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EN3: Improve existing green spaces	0	0	++	++	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

6.139 To include a policy that actively encourages and support improvements to existing green spaces within the Neighbourhood Area; or to rely on market and community actions and/or strategic South Oxfordshire District Council green space plans policies and strategies.

**Preferred Option**

6.140 The preferred option is to include a policy supporting improvements to existing green spaces.

**Assessment Comment**

6.141 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option achieved significant positive outcomes for supporting improvements to existing local green spaces.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.142 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.29: Policy EN4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EN4: Biodiversity	0	0	++	++	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
No Policy	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.143 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined to include additional emphasis on the need to reduce the deficit of green space. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

**Summary of the Options**

6.144 To include a policy that promotes the protection and enhancement of existing urban and rural biodiversity and seek gains in biodiversity through creating new habitats to foster greater ecological diversity; or the reliance on strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework.

**Preferred Option**

6.145 The preferred option is to include a biodiversity improvement and enhancement policy.

**Assessment Comment**

6.146 The inclusion of a biodiversity policy achieves significant positive outcomes for supporting improvements to the level of existing green spaces and urban and rural biodiversity.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.147 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.30: Policy EN5: Historic Environment**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EN5: Historic Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Summary of the Option**

6.148 This policy has been added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. To include a policy that supports the conservation and enhancement of the heritage assets in order to contribute towards the local distinctiveness, character and sense of place; or to rely on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Preferred Options**

6.149 The preferred option is the inclusion of a policy which provides protection to the historic environment of Henley and Harpsden.

**Assessment Comment**

6.150 The preferred option achieves a significant positive outcome against objective 9.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.151 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach to maintain and enhance heritage and cultural assets.

**Table 6.31: Policy EN6: Contamination**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EN6: Contamination	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Summary of Options**

6.152 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. The policy supports the use of initial risk assessments on sites that could be at risk from previous contamination which could affect the community or water resources; or to have a reliance on the strategic policies of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Preferred Options**

6.153 The preferred option is the inclusion of a policy which provides contamination protection from brownfield sites.

**Assessment Comments**

6.154 Both alternative policy options perform the same. However, the policy option is preferred as it help to emphasises the need for development proposals to assess and appropriately address contamination.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.155 The 'no policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more proactive approach to contamination.

**Table 6.32: Policy EN7: Water Resource**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
EN7: Water Resources	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Summary of Options**

- 6.156 This policy has been added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. The policy supports the protection of water resources across Henley and Harpsden or; have a reliance on the strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework.

**Preferred Option**

- 6.157 The preferred option is the inclusion of a policy which provides protection over the water resource in Henley and Harpsden.

**Assessment Comment**

- 6.158 Both alternative policy options perform the same. However, the policy option is preferred as it helps to emphasises the need for development proposals to appropriately protect water resources.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.159 The 'No Policy' was rejected as the preferred option is a more proactive approach to water resource protection.

**Table 6.33: Policy DQS1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
DQS1: Local Character	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.160 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

**Summary of the Options**

6.161 To include a policy that ensures that all new development is sensitive and makes a positive contribution to the local character of the Neighbourhood Area. The No Policy option is the reliance on the strategic local character policies contained within Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

**Preferred Option**

6.162 The preferred option is to include a local character policy.

**Assessment Comment**

6.163 The assessment concluded that both options performed broadly equal against the SA objectives. However, the inclusion of a local character policy was supported through public consultation feedback.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.164 As both policies performed equally effective it is considered reasonable to include a policy that emphasises the need to ensure that all new development is sensitive and makes a positive contribution to the local character.

**Table 6.34: Policy DQS2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
DQS2: Low Carbon sustainable development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

- 6.165 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome.

### Summary of the Options

- 6.166 To include a policy that encourages residential development to achieve a higher Code for Sustainable Homes than the minimum required by Building Regulations; or the reliance on strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and subsequent incremental changes to Building Regulations.

### Preferred Option

- 6.167 The preferred option is to support and encourage the construction of exemplar high quality sustainable development. The policy approach achieves a significant positive outcome against seeking to address the causes of climate change.

### Assessment Comment

- 6.168 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option achieved a significant positive outcome against seeking to address the causes of climate change.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.169 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.35: Policy DQS3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
DQS3: Local sourcing of construction materials and labour	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	++	+	0	0	0
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0

**Summary of the Options**

6.170 To include a policy that encourages the local sourcing of construction materials and labour; or the continuation of the existing approach to sourcing construction materials and labour.

**Preferred Option**

6.171 The preferred option is to include a policy encouraging the appropriate use of local construction materials and labour.

**Assessment Comment**

6.172 The preferred option achieve significant positive outcomes against supporting the local economy and helping to address the causes of climate change through securing sustainable building practices. The option also helps to reduce journey distances.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.173 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.36: Policy DQS4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
DQS4: Community Energy Projects	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++
No Policy	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Summary of the Options**

6.174 To include a policy that encourages the delivery of community energy projects; or the reliance on strategic policies within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Preferred Option**

6.175 The preferred option is to include a policy encouraging and supporting proposals that deliver community energy projects.

**Assessment Comment**

6.176 A community energy projects policy scored significant positive against supporting and encouraging the delivery of sustainable renewable energy. The option was supports community involvement in decisions affecting them and enables local residents and businesses to deliver local renewable energy proposals and solutions.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.177 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

**Table 6.37: Policy SP1**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Site M and M1: Highlands Farm (190 dwellings) with a C2 element; 0.5ha of B1 Use Class SME space; 500sqm community hub; and sports pitches and facilities with a site specific Design Brief	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	-	-	?	+	?	+	++	++	0	0	++
Policy H1: Site M allocated for up to 140 dwellings with a C2 element; 0.5ha of B1 Use Class SME space; 500sqm community hub; and sports pitches and facilities with a site specific Design Brief	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	-	-	?	+	?	+	++	++	0	0	++
Policy H1: Site M allocated for up to 140 dwellings, 0.5ha of B1 Use Class with 2,000sqm of SME space 500sqm community hub, sports pitches and facilities with a	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	-	-	?	+	?	+	++	++	0	0	++

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
site specific Design Brief																			
No Policy	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	--	--	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	0	

### Policy Refinement

6.178 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined, notably to reduce the site area and allow for a future phase, should it be required, as well as a lower quantum and density of housing. The level of proposed housing aligns with the revised Policy H1 requirement; the employment element includes reference to 2,000m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace (indicative); and removal of the specific requirement for C2 Use Class dwellings. The policy outcomes have also been reviewed and updated in light of further information and feedback from the May 2014 and February 2015 Draft JHHNP consultations.

### Summary of the Options

6.179 The alternative housing number options for Site M were assessed as part of the Policy H1 assessment. The alternative options are therefore: to allocate the site for up to 140 dwellings (Policy H1 requirement) with a C2 element; 0.5ha of B1 Use Class SME space; 500sqm community hub; and sports pitches and facilities with a site specific Design Brief; or allocate the site for 140 dwellings (Policy H1 requirement), 0.5ha of B1 Use Class with 2,000sqm of SME space 500sqm community hub, sports pitches and facilities with a site specific Design Brief. A third option was to increase the density on the site to deliver 190 dwellings with a C2 element; 0.5ha of B1 Use Class SME space; 500sqm community hub; and sports pitches and facilities with a site specific Design Brief. The final alternative 'No Policy' option relies on Policy H1 and the remaining design detail to be determined solely through the South Oxfordshire District Council development management process.

### Preferred Option

6.180 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for up to 140 dwellings (Policy H1 requirement); 0.5ha of B1 Use Class SME space; 500sqm community hub; and sports pitches and facilities with a site specific Design Brief.

### Assessment Comment

6.181 The Design Brief achieves a positive outcome in respect of supporting community involvement compared to reliance on the SODC development management process. Allocating 0.5ha of employment land will have a significant positive outcome for the local economy, but providing an indicative floorspace area figure has the potential to provide greater certainty to developers what is envisaged by the Town Council and local residents. Henley Town Council, Harpsden Parish Council and Housing Working Group considered is preferable to align with the national guidance change on C2 uses and housing requirements. The inclusion of the need for a design brief will ensure that any significant negative impacts, such as proximity to heritage assets or landscape, will be reduced, particularly over the medium to long term, through mitigation measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the detailed development management process.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.182 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the option achieved less positive outcomes, in particular the loss of existing employment uses and jobs on the site. The Design Brief requirement and new to provide employment uses on the site was also supported through public consultation. The option of a larger site area delivering 190 units was rejected as following a Town Council and Housing Working Group policy decision regarding quantum of development and impacts on the Greys Road area. The option comprising a C2 element was rejected as it was considered to be more preferable to align with national guidance on C2 uses and housing figures.

**Table 6.38: Policy SP2**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP2: Mill Lane Former Jet Garage (Site H) with a site specific design brief	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0

### **Policy Refinement**

- 6.183 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome. Further assessment consideration has been given in light of additional site information.

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.184 Policy SP2 provides guidance in respect of the allocation of a site for residential use under Policy H1. The option requires that any proposed development on the site creates a Design Brief detailing the incorporation of elements in the proposals (including maximising the opportunity presented by the change in levels across the site, delivers high quality design in terms of built form and public realm providing an exceptional gateway into the town). The alternative 'No Policy' option requires the detail of development on this site to be determined solely through the South Oxfordshire District Council development management process.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.185 The preferred option is to include a policy providing guidance on the allocation of the site for residential use and requiring the undertaking of a Design Brief this achieves a significant positive outcome against ensuring continued public involvement in how the site is designed and brought forward.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.186 Both options scored positively. However, the provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The policy guidance ensures that any further negative impacts identified will be mitigated through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the detailed development management process.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.187 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed.

**Table 6.39: Policy SP3**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP3: Empstead Works/ Stuart Turner with a site specific design brief and H1 housing requirement (53 dwellings) and 1,000sqm of B1 Use Class	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	0	?	+	?	++	+	+	0	0	++
SP3: Empstead Works/ Stuart Turner with a site specific design brief and H1 housing requirement (42 dwellings) and 3,000sqm of B1 Use Class	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	0	?	+	?	++	++	++	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0

**Policy Refinement**

6.188 The policy approach has been updated order to take into account additional information received and the consultation feedback following the May 2014 draft JHHNP consultation. The policy options have been refined and assessed in light of further information.

**Summary of the Options**

6.189 The policy options are to allocate the site for the Policy H1 housing requirement with 1,000sqm of B1 floorspace and 53 dwellings or 3,000sqm of B1 floorspace with 42 dwellings. Both policy

options require a Design Brief. The alternative 'no policy' option is for proposals to be assessed against existing policies in the Core Strategy, NPPF, and through the South Oxfordshire District Council development management process. The 'No Policy' option would also not specifically allocate any job creation uses on the site as part of the sites redevelopment.

**Preferred Option**

The preferred option is the Policy H1 housing requirement of 42 dwellings with 3,000sqm of B1 floorspace and a Design Brief.

**Assessment Comment**

6.190 Both policy options scored positively against the objectives. However, the increase level of B1 floorspace performed better against the economic objectives, facilitated by a reduction in the residential allocation. The provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The policy guidance ensures that negative impacts, such as impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, will be mitigated through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through South Oxfordshire District Council's development management process.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed. The 1,000sqm of B1 floorspace and the 'No Policy' alternatives have a less positive economic outcome compared to 3,000sqm of B1 floorspace. These options were therefore rejected.

**Table 6.40: Policy SP4**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
SP4: Chiltern's End (27 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0	0

### **Policy Refinement**

- 6.191 The policy approach has been updated order to take into account additional information received and the consultation feedback following the May 2014 Draft JHHNP consultation and February 2015 pre-submission consultation. The policy options have been refined and assessed in light of further information.

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.192 The Policy SP4 option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and defines the extent of the developable area; the allocating the site in accordance with Policy H1 but also requiring a Design Brief to ensure the landscape and environment amenity surrounding the site is taken into account. The alternative 'No Policy' option does not defining the extent of the developable area.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.193 The preferred option is to include a Policy allocating the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and the requirement to produce a Design Brief to demonstrate how environment and landscape aspects have been taken into account.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.194 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that clearly defining the extent of the site will assist in providing the community with certainty of the extent of the development area.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.195 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed.

**Table 6.41: Policy SP5**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP5: 357 Reading Road (30 dwellings) with a site specific design brief, 200m <sup>2</sup> of retail, and replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and AFC facilities if required.	++	?	++	0	?	+	++	+	+	?	+	?	++	+	+	0	0	++
SP5: 357 Reading Road (30 dwellings) with a site specific design brief, 1,440m <sup>2</sup> of retail, and replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and AFC facilities if required.	++	?	++	0	?	-	++	+	+	?	+	?	++	+	-	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	++	0	?	+	++	+	+	?	+	?	++	+	+	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.196 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome. Further assessment consideration has been given in light of additional site information.

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.197 The options for Policy SP5 are allocating the site for mixed use development comprising 30 dwellings and ancillary (200sqm) retail, and replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and Football Club (if required); allocating the site or mixed-use development comprising 30 dwellings, 1,440 sqm of retail and ancillary works; or a No Policy option which allocates the site for 30 dwellings and the detail of development on this site to be determined solely through the South Oxfordshire District Council development management process. The 'No Policy' option would also not specify the provision of aspects such as retail, or replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and Football Club (if required). Both policy options would require a Design Brief.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.198 The preferred option is to include a Policy allocating the site for residential development comprising 30 dwellings and ancillary (200sqm) retail, and replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and Football Club (if required). The policy also requires the undertaking of a Design Brief.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.199 The policy achieves a range of positive and significant positive outcomes compared to the No Policy Option. The policy guidance ensures that negative impacts will be mitigated through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through South Oxfordshire District Council's development management process. Specifying the provision of (200sqm) retail, and replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and Football Club (if required) has positive community and economic impact outcomes. Allocating the site was also supported through public feedback.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.200 The option comprising 1,440sqm of retail space was rejected as the out of town location of the site could have a negative impact on the vitality and viability of Henley town centre. Furthermore the out of centre location is likely to generate higher levels of journeys by car and other motorised modes in comparison to a retail development of this size within Henley town centre. The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed. Delivery of 200sqm) retail and replacement car parking for Henley Hockey and Football Club (if required) would also be uncertain.

**Table 6.42: Policy SP6**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP6: Wilkins Removals (20 dwellings)	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	+
No Policy	++	?	+	0	?	++	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.201 In light of feedback from the 2014 Pre Submission Draft JHHNP the policy has been refined. However, the changes made are not considered to have significantly changed the policy approach or policy outcome. Further assessment consideration has been given in light of additional site information.

### Summary of the Options

6.202 The Policy option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and defined the allocated area. The alternative 'No Policy' option does not define the extent of the allocated site.

### Preferred Option

6.203 The preferred option is to include a Policy defined the extent of the area allocated.

### Assessment Comment

6.204 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that clearly defining the extent of the site will assist in providing the community with certainty of the extent of the development area. The impact of the loss of employment land can be reduced/ mitigated through the allocation of mixed use sites within the JHHNP.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.205 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed.

**Table 6.43: Policy SP7**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP7: TA Centre (Site V) with site specific design brief	++	?	-	0	?	++	++	++	--	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	++
SP7: TA Centre (Site V) with site specific design brief and increased heritage and pedestrian and cycle criteria elements	++	?	-	0	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	++	0	?	++	0	++	--	?	0	?	++	-	0	0	0	0

### Policy Refinement

6.206 The policy approach has been updated order to take into account additional information received and the consultation feedback following the May 2014 draft JHHNP consultation. The policy options have been refined and assessed in light of further information.

### Summary of the Options

6.207 The Policy option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and requires a Design Brief. An alternative option is to increase the aspects covered by the Design Brief to increase heritage protection and pedestrian and cycle usage. The 'No Policy' option requires any proposals for the site to be assessed against the existing Core Strategy and policy guidance set out in the NPPF.

### Preferred Option

6.208 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for residential use and requiring the undertaking of a more prescriptive heritage and transport Design Brief to be prepared in consultation with Henley Town Council.

### Assessment Comment

6.209 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The policy guidance seeks to ensure that negative impacts, particularly heritage and transport, are mitigated through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through South Oxfordshire District Council's development management process.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.210 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed. Public consultation supported additional heritage and cycle and pedestrian criteria.

**Table 6.44: Policy SP8**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP8: Land West of Fair Mile (Site A) with a site specific design brief	++	?	+	0	?	+	-	-	-	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	++
SP8: Land West of Fair Mile (Site A) with a site specific design brief with additional heritage emphasis	++	?	+	0	?	+	-	-	0	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	++

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
No Policy	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	-	--	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

6.211 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. The Policy option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and requires a Design Brief. The 'No Policy' option requires any proposals for the site to be assessed against the existing Core Strategy and policy guidance set out in the NPPF. A further policy option was included following to the February 2015 JHHNP consultation to add further emphasis to the setting of neighbouring Listed Buildings and Conservation Area.

### Preferred Option

6.212 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for residential use and requiring the undertaking of a Design Brief, with additional heritage emphasis, to be prepared in consultation with Henley Town Council.

### Assessment Comment

6.213 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The policy guidance ensures that significant negative and negative impacts will be mitigated and reduced, particularly over the medium to long term, through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through SODC's development management process. The Design Brief process with additional heritage emphasis will ensure that significant consideration is given towards avoidance and/or mitigation measures, particularly in relation to proximity to Listed Buildings, the loss of any TPO trees and the setting on the Conservation Area through the detailed development management process.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.214 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed. The No Policy option would also potentially result in less consideration of the

development proximity to Listed Buildings, the loss of any TPO trees and the setting on the Conservation Area.

**Table 6.45: Policy SP9**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP9 Henley Youth club (Site X) for 23 dwellings	++	?	+	-	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	++
SP9 Henley Youth club (Site X) for 31 dwellings	++	?	+	-	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	++
No policy	++	?	+	-	?	++	++	++	-	?	+	?	++	0	0	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

6.215 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received during and after the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. The Policy options allocate the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 either for 23 or 31 dwellings; and requires that proposals demonstrate through the Design Brief. The 'No Policy' option requires any proposals for the site to be assessed against the existing Core Strategy and policy guidance set out in the NPPF.

### Preferred Option

6.216 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for residential use comprising 23 dwellings and requiring the undertaking of a Design Brief to be prepared.

### Assessment Comment

6.217 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The Design Brief will help ensure that negative impacts will be avoided, or reduced through mitigation through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the development management process.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.218 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed. The higher density development option was rejected following a policy decision to ensure that the development suitably responds to the character of the surrounding area and achieves an appropriate dwelling mix with sufficient open space and parking.

**Table 6.46: Policy SP10**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP10: 118 Grey's Road (Site Z) for 13 dwellings with a site specific design brief	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	++
SP10: 118 Grey's Road (Site Z) for 26 dwellings with a site specific design brief	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	++
No policy	++	?	+	0	?	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	++	-	-	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

6.219 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received during and after the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. The Policy option allocates the site for residential use for either 13 or 26 dwellings in accordance with Policy H1 and requires that proposals demonstrate through the Design Brief. The 'No Policy' option requires any proposals for the site to be assessed against the existing Core Strategy and policy guidance set out in the NPPF.

### Preferred Options

6.220 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for residential use and requiring the undertaking of a Design Brief to be prepared.

**Assessment Comment**

6.221 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The Design Brief will help ensure that negative impacts will be avoided, or reduced through mitigation through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the development management process.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.222 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed. The higher density development option was rejected to following a policy decision to ensure that the development suitably responds to the character of the surrounding area and achieves an appropriate dwelling mix with sufficient open space and parking.

**Table 6.47 Policy SP11**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP11: Gillotts School Field (Site C) with a site specific design brief	++	?	-	0	?	0	.+	0	+	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	-	0	?	-	.+	-	-	?	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	+

**Summary of the Options**

6.223 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. To include a policy that allocates Gillotts School Field for up to 50 residential units in accordance with Policy H1 and requires the production of a Design Brief. The residential units are enabling development to support the comprehensive redevelopment of the school. The alternative option is to rely on the existing decision making process led by South Oxfordshire District Council.

### Preferred Options

6.224 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for residential use and requiring the undertaking of a Design Brief to be prepared in consultation with Henley Town Council.

### Assessment Comment

6.225 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that provision of design and development guidance ensures local priorities are incorporated. The Design Brief will help ensure that negative impacts, particularly in respect of landscape and loss of any trees will be avoided, or reduced through mitigation through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the development management process.

### Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.226 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach towards ensuring continued community engagement to influence how sites are developed.

**Table 6.48: Policy SP12**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP12: Reserve Site: Highland's farm adjacent (Site M1) with a site specific design brief	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	-	0	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	++	0	?	-	+	--	--	?	+	?	+	-	-	0	0	0

### Summary of the Options

6.227 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. To include a policy that allocates part of Highlands Farm, adjacent to Site M, as a part reserve for 30 dwellings should the Gillotts School redevelopment not deliver housing by 1 January 2020. A design brief would be required for the development. The alternative option is to not include a specific reserve site.

**Preferred Option**

6.228 The preferred option is to include a reserve site allocation in case Gillotts school does not come forward.

**Assessment Comment**

6.229 The reserve site is within the AONB and there is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and Site of Special Scientific Interest within the wider Highlands Farm site. However, development within proximity of the Scheduled Ancient Monument can be avoided through design. The Design Brief will help ensure that negative impacts, particularly in respect of landscape will be avoided, or reduced through mitigation through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the development management process. Inclusion of a reserve site helps to provide housing delivery certainty to the local community should the Gillotts School site not come forward.

**Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

6.230 The no policy option was rejected as this option provided limited certainty on how and where the housing allocated to Gillotts school would be delivered if the Gillotts school redevelopment did not come forward.

**Table 6.49: Policy SP13**

Policy Alternatives	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
SP13: Reserve Site: Land west of Fair Mile adjacent Site A1)	++	?	+	0	?	+	-	0	-	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	++
SP13: Reserve Site: Land west of Fair Mile adjacent Site A1) with additional heritage emphasis	++	?	+	0	?	+	-	0	0	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	++
No Policy	++	?	+	0	?	+	--	-	--	?	+	?	--	0	0	0	0	0

### **Summary of the Options**

- 6.231 This policy was added following further information and consultation responses received from the May 2014 JHHNP consultation. To include a policy that allocates land west of the Fair Mile, adjacent to Site A as a part reserve for 20 dwellings should the Gillotts School redevelopment not deliver housing by 1 January 2020. A design brief would be required for the development. The alternative option is to not include a specific reserve site. A further policy option has been included following to the February 2015 JHHNP consultation to add further emphasis to the setting of neighbouring listed buildings and the Conservation Area.

### **Preferred Option**

- 6.232 The preferred option is to include a reserve site allocation in case Gillotts school does not come forward with added heritage emphasis within the Design Brief.

### **Assessment Comment**

- 6.233 Inclusion of a reserve site helps to provide housing delivery certainty to the local community should the Gillotts School site not come forward. The Design Brief will help ensure that negative impacts, particularly in respect of heritage, landscape and biodiversity will be avoided, or reduced through mitigation through measures incorporated as part of the design process and agreed through the development management process.

### **Why were the other Option(s) rejected?**

- 6.234 The no policy option was rejected as this option provided limited certainty on how and where the housing allocated to Gillotts school would be delivered if the Gillotts school redevelopment did not come forward. Added heritage emphasis within the preferred option ensures significant consideration is given to the avoiding and mitigating heritage impacts as part of the detailed development management process.

## 7.0 ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The conclusion of the assessment of the JHHNP objectives and policies is that, with the exception of having a significant negative effect on the loss of greenfield land, they will have no significant environmental effects and will promote sustainable development. In meeting the level growth prescribed by the adopted Core Strategy (Policy HEN1) a number of site allocations were necessary on greenfield land due to the limited availability of deliverable and developable previously developed land. The policies have been clearly selected and drafted to ensure that any potential for negative impacts is avoided through site selection and effective policy wording.
- 7.2 Preparing the JHHNP has required the use of planning judgement to strike the right balance between the technical suitability and community acceptability of the JHHNP. In some cases, this can lead to policies that may not be the most sustainable of all the potential choices made, but they are nonetheless sufficiently sustainable so that they will lead to no unavoidable significant environmental effects.
- 7.3 However, the conclusion remains that in a number of cases, the JHHNP should deliver positive effects for local residents and businesses as Henley meets its development needs in the period up to 2026. Reasonable alternative policy options have been assessed within this report to compare and contrast the options chosen, but in no case does the alternative perform better, and in most cases as well, against the chosen policy and there is therefore no case for policy changes as a result.

## **8.0 MITIGATING ADVERSE EFFECTS**

8.1 SEA guidance requires measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects of implementing the plan. Where practical this report identifies the likely negative and positive impacts each policy has on achieving sustainability objectives based on the framework set out. It demonstrates that the policies of the JHHNP will positively contribute towards delivering the social, economic and environmental objectives set out in the SA framework. Where any potential significant negative and negative effects were identified, it was concluded that the policies in the JHHNP, South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, or the National Planning Policy Framework adequately alleviated or mitigated the impacts, particularly over the medium to longer term.

## **9.0 MONITORING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PLAN**

- 9.1 Henley Town Council, Harpsden Parish Council and SODC will jointly monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan using available data. The annual SODC Authority Monitoring Report will provide some data at this level.
- 9.2 The purpose of monitoring is to provide information on the social, environmental and economic effects of planning policy documents help determine the extent to which objectives, targets and programmes are being met. Monitoring will also allow the Councils' to know if it is necessary to trigger contingency plans, such as those outlined in Policy H6 of the Neighbourhood Plan, should performance fall below expectations, or circumstances significantly change.

## APPENDIX 1

## SEA QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

The Quality Assurance Checklist below has been used to ensure that requirements of the SEA Directive have been met and fully integrated into the sustainability process covered in this document. The Quality Assurance Checklist covers both the technical and procedural steps of the sustainability appraisal process and will be updated as the different stages are reached.

Requirements of the SEA Directive	Where met in this Report
The Plan's purpose and objectives are made clear	See Section 1 and 4 of this Report
Sustainability issues including international and EC objectives are considered in developing objectives and targets	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
SA Objectives are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate	Section 2 of this Report and Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
Links with related plans, programmes and targets are identified and explained	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
Conflicts that exist between SA objectives and other plan objectives are identified and described	See Section 4 of this Report
<b>Scoping</b>	
The environmental consultation bodies are consulted in appropriate ways and at appropriate times on the content and scope of the SA report	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
The appraisal focuses on significant issues	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
Reasons are given for eliminating issues from further consideration	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhnp.co.uk">www.jhnp.co.uk</a>
<b>Options / Alternatives</b>	
Realistic alternatives are	See Section 3, 5 and 6 of this Report

Requirements of the SEA Directive	Where met in this Report
considered for key issues and the reasons for choosing them are documented	
Alternatives include 'do nothing' and/or 'business as usual' scenarios wherever relevant	See Section 3, 5 and 6 of this Report
The sustainability effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each alternative are identified and compared	See Section 6 of this Report
Inconsistencies between the alternatives and other relevant plans, programmes or policies are identified and explained	See Section 6 and 7 of this Report
Reasons are given for the selection or elimination of alternatives	See Section 3, 5, 6 and 7 of this Report
<b>Baseline Information</b>	
Relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and their evolution without the plan are described	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhhnp.co.uk">www.jhhnp.co.uk</a>
Characteristics of the area likely to be significantly affected are described, including areas wider than the physical boundary of the plan area where it is likely to be affected by the plan where practicable	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhhnp.co.uk">www.jhhnp.co.uk</a>
Difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods are explained	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhhnp.co.uk">www.jhhnp.co.uk</a>
<b>Prediction and evaluation of likely significant effects</b>	
Likely significant social, environmental and economic effects are identified including those listed in the SEA Directive (biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climate, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape) as relevant	See Section 6 of this Report
Both positive and negative effects are considered and where practicable the duration of effects (short, medium or long term) is addressed	See Section 6 of this Report

Requirements of the SEA Directive	Where met in this Report
Likely secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects are identified where practicable	See Section 6 of this Report
Inter-relationships between effects are considered where practicable	See Section 6 of this Report
Where relevant, the prediction and evaluation of effects make use of accepted standards, regulations and thresholds	See Section 6 of this Report
Methods used to evaluate the effects are described	See Section 2 and 3 of this Report
<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	
Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the plan	See Section 8 of this Report
Issues to be taken into account in development consents are identified	See Section 8 of this Report
<b>The Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>	
Is clear and concise in layout and presentation	Yes
Uses simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms	Yes
Use maps and other illustrations where appropriate	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhhnp.co.uk">www.jhhnp.co.uk</a>
Explains the methodology used	See Section 3 of this Report
Explains who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used	See Section 1 and the JHHNP Consultation Statement
Identified sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (October 2013) available online at <a href="http://www.jhhnp.co.uk">www.jhhnp.co.uk</a> and <a href="#">Section 5 of this Report</a>
Contains a Non Technical Summary	Included at the front of this Report
<b>Consultation</b>	
The SA is consulted on as an integral part of the plan making process	As part of the May 2014 and February 2015 consultation
The consultation bodies, other	As part of the May 2014 and February 2015 consultation

Requirements of the SEA Directive	Where met in this Report
consultees and the public are consulted in ways which give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions on the Draft Plan and SA Report	
<b>Decision making and information and the Decision</b>	
The SA Report and the opinions of those consulted are taken into account in finalising and adopting the plan	At the next stage in the plan-making process
An explanation is given of how they have been taken into account	To be included in the final SA Report
Reasons are given for choices in the adopted plan, in light of other reasonable options considered	To be included in the final SA Report
<b>Monitoring Measures</b>	
Measures proposed for monitoring are clear, practicable and linked to the indicators and objectives used in the SA	N/A
Monitoring is used, where appropriate during implementation of the plan to make good deficiencies in baseline information in the SA	Post plan adoption
Monitoring enables unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage (these effects may include predictions which prove to be incorrect)	Post plan adoption
Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects	Post plan adoption

## APPENDIX 2

### JHHNP SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT PROTOCOLS

SA Objective	The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
1	<p>To help provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home.</p> <p>Policy CSH4 'Meeting housing needs' seeks to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of the current and future households.</p> <p>Policy CSHEN1 'The Strategy for Henley on Thames' seeks to identify land for 400 homes.</p> <p>Policy CSH4 'Meeting Housing Needs' seeks a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households will be sought on all new residential developments.</p>	++	The proposal or site allocation will make a significant contribution to providing existing and future residents with an opportunity to live in a decent home.
		+	The proposal or site allocation will contribute to providing existing and future residents with an opportunity to live in a decent home.
		0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
		-	The proposal or site allocation will potentially reduce opportunities for existing and future residents to live in a decent home.
		--	The proposal or site allocation will significantly reduce opportunities for existing and future residents to live in a decent home.
		?	Uncertain effect on the objective
2	<p>To help to create safe places for people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce anti-social behaviour and reduce crime and fear of crime.</p> <p>Policy CSQ3 'Design' requires new development to be of a high standard and inclusive design that is designed to create a safe community and reduce the likelihood and fear of crime.</p>	++	Will provide safe places within the community.
		+	Potential to provide safe places within the community
		0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
		-	The opportunity for creating or increasing unsafe places within the community.
		--	Will create or increase unsafe places within the community.
		?	Uncertain effect on the objective.
3	<p>To improve access for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.</p> <p>The SODC CS seeks to improve the facilities available in Henley by identifying new services and facilities required to support development.</p>	++	Will increase accessibility to community facilities and services. Site allocation would provide on-site provision of services or facilities. Site allocation is within close distance of the majority of services and facilities.
		+	Has the potential to increase accessibility to community facilities and services. Site allocation is within close distance of the majority of services and facilities.
		0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
		-	Limited potential to increase accessibility to community facilities and services. Site allocation is within an acceptable distance to only a few services and facilities.
		--	No potential to increase accessibility to community facilities and services. Site allocation is not within an acceptable distance to any services and facilities.
		?	Uncertain effect on the objective.

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
4	To maintain and improve people's health, well-being and community cohesion and support voluntary, community and faith groups.	The Core Strategy seeks to promote provision of high quality cultural and health facilities of all ages across the district; which will enable people to adopt healthy lifestyles.	++	Will increase the provision of new health, well-being and community facilities. Site allocation would provide on-site provision of new services or facilities.
			+	Will potentially increase the provision of new health, well-being and community facilities. Site allocation has the potential to provide on-site provision of new services or facilities.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Potential loss of facilities and services.
			--	Will result in the loss of facilities and services.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective
5	To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds.	<p>Policy CSQ2 'Sustainable Design and Construction' seeks to encourage renewable energy use in new and existing developments.</p> <p>The Core Strategy seeks to emphasise the need for sustainable development falling in line with the NPPF which seeks the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	++	Will result in reduction in pollution
			+	Has the potential to reduce pollution.
			0	No positive or negative effect.
			-	Potential to increase pollution
			--	Will result in significantly increased pollution.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective.

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
6	To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.	<p>The Core Strategy seeks to improve congestion in Henley through promoting alternative to car travel.</p> <p>Policy CSM1 'Transport' states that SODC will support measures to enable a modal shift to public transport, cycling and walking particularly where these support the network of settlements in the district.</p> <p>Policy CSM2 'Transport Assessment and Travel Plans' requires all new developments which have transport implications that either arise from the development proposed or cumulatively with other proposals will need to submit a transport assessment.</p>	++	Will significantly improve travel choices and reduce the need and frequency to travel. Site allocation has a high level of multi-modal accessibility to a range of facilities
			+	Has the potential to improve travel choices and reduce the need and frequency to travel. Site allocation has a good level of multi-modal accessibility to a range of facilities
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Limited potential to improve travel choices and reduce the need and frequency to travel. Site allocation has a low level of multi-modal accessibility to a range of facilities
			--	No potential to improve travel choices and reduce the need and frequency to travel. Site allocation has poor multi-modal accessibility to a range of facilities.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective
7	To conserve and enhance biodiversity.	Policy CSB1 'Conservation and Improvement of biodiversity' seeks to avoid the net loss of biodiversity and achieve a net gain across the borough.	++	No known international or national restrictions or designations and will result in a net gain in biodiversity.
			+	No known international or national restrictions or designations and has the potential to result in a net gain in biodiversity.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Local designations and potential to result in the loss of biodiversity
			--	International and national restrictions. Will result in the loss of biodiversity
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
8	To protect and enhance the town's open spaces and countryside and in particular, those areas designated for their landscape importance.	Policy CSEN1 'Landscape' seeks to protect against inappropriate development and where possible enhance the environment.	++	No international or national designations. Site allocation is previously developed land. Will protect existing open spaces and countryside.
			+	No international or national designations. Site allocation is partly previously developed land. Potential to protect existing open spaces and countryside.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Potential for negative impacts on an international or national designation.
			--	Will result in a negative impact on an international or national designation.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective.
9	To protect and enhance the town's historic environment including archaeological resources and to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.	Policy CSEN3 'Historic Environment' seeks to conserve and enhance the historic significance of South Oxfordshire.	++	No impact on known international, national or local heritage or archaeological assets and will protect and enhance an existing asset
			+	No impact on known international, national or local heritage or archaeological assets
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Potential impact on international or national heritage or archaeological asset
			--	Significant impact on international or national heritage or archaeological asset
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
10	To seek to address the causes of climate change by: a) Securing sustainable building practices which conserve energy, water resources and materials; b) Maximising the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources; c) Ensuring that the design and location of new development is resilient to the effects of climate change.	Climate change is a key issue in the Core Strategy.  Policy CSQ2 'Sustainable Design and Construction' sets a number of guidelines that should be incorporated into new developments including the need for SUDS and resilient measures.	++	Will result in significant reductions in climate change causes.
			+	Has the potential to reduce the causes of climate change.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Potential to increase the causes of climate change.
			--	Will result in significant increases in climate change.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective
11	To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment.	National Guidance in the form of circa 609 outlines that by implementing SUDS, Storm water from the site can be polished to an improved standard thus ensuring the development proposals have no adverse effect on wider hydrology/	++	Development in flood zone 1 and would reduce flood risk within Henley
			+	Development in flood zone 1
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Development in flood zone 2
			--	Development in flood zone 3a or 3b
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective
12	To seek to minimise waste generation and encourage the re-use of waste through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	Objective 3 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that all new development is built to the highest viable standards in terms of water and energy efficiency, waste management and sustainable construction management.	++	Will significantly reduce waste generation and improve the re-use of waste
			+	Will potentially reduce waste generation and improve the re-use of waste
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Will potentially increase waste generation.
			--	Will significantly increase waste generation
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
13	To improve efficiency in land use and reduce development pressure on the countryside and natural resources/material assets, such as landscape, minerals, biodiversity and soil quality.	Policy CSEN1 'Landscape' seeks to protect the landscape against inappropriate development.	++	The site allocation is entirely brownfield Proposal would reduce development pressure on the countryside
			+	The majority of the site allocation is brownfield Proposal has the potential to reduce development pressure on the countryside
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	The majority of the site is greenfield Proposal has the potential to increase development pressure on the countryside
			--	The site is entirely greenfield Proposal will result in increased development pressure on the countryside
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective
14	To ensure stable levels of employment and facilitate inward investment within the district.	The SODC Core Strategy seeks to upgrade employment areas and provide better premises.	++	Proposal or site allocation will significantly increase employment and facilitate inward investment.
			+	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to increase employment and facilitate inward investment.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to reduce employment and be a barrier to inward investment.
			--	Proposal or site allocation will result in the loss of employment and be a significant barrier to inward investment.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
15	To assist in the development of: a) A thriving market town economy in Henley on Thames; b) Small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy; and c) A range of industries providing primarily for the higher value knowledge based economy as well as reflecting lower values and more rural activities.	Policy CSEM1 'Supporting a successful economy' seeks to work with businesses to provide an environment which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth.  The CW seeks to address Henley's shopping centres position nationally as this has fallen by around 40 places since 2003/2004 with some shop keepers indicating that business is declining.	++	Proposal or site allocation will significantly assist the local economy.
			+	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to assist the economy.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to result in a negative impact on economy.
			--	Proposal or site allocation will have a significant negative impact on the economy
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective
16	To assist in the development of a skilled workforce to support the long term competitiveness of the district by raising education achievement levels and encouraging the development of the skills needed for everyone to find and remain in work.	Henley College serves a wide catchment area and it makes a significant contribution to the local economy.	++	Proposal or site allocation will significantly improve local skills and education
			+	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to improve local skills and education
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to result in the loss of local skills and education facilities.
			--	Proposal or site allocation will result in the loss of local skills and education facilities.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective.

SA Objective		The SA assumes that:	Rating	Assessment Protocols for the Options
17	To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector.	The SODC Core Strategy seeks to maintain and develop the tourism potential across the whole district.	++	Proposal or site allocation will significantly improve Henley's tourism economy.
			+	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to improve Henley's tourism economy.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to result in a negative impact on Henley's tourism economy.
			--	Proposal or site allocation will result in significant negative impact on Henley's tourism economy.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective.
18	Support community involvement in decisions affecting them and enable communities to provide local services and solutions.		++	Proposal or site allocation will involve the community in future decisions that affect them
			+	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to involve the community in future decisions that affect them.
			0	No positive or negative effect on the objective.
			-	Proposal or site allocation has the potential to result in the community being blocked from future decisions that affect them.
			--	Proposal or site allocation will result in the community being blocked from future decisions that affect them.
			?	Uncertain effect on the objective

