

# Warborough & Shillingford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan – Post Adoption Statement in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and European Directive 2001/42/EC

20 SEPTEMBER 2019

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 The Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Warborough & Shillingford Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) was ‘made’ (adopted) by South Oxfordshire District Council (the District Council) on 11 October 2018 and now forms part of the South Oxfordshire Development Plan for the determination of planning applications in the Parish.

In preparing the NDP, account was taken of the requirements of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, referred to as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive and its transposing regulations, the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations).

The SEA Directive and transposing regulations seek to provide a high level of protection of the environment by integrating environmental considerations into the process of preparing certain plans and programmes. The aim of the Directive is *“to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development, by ensuring that, in accordance with this Directive, an environmental assessment is carried out of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.”*

In developing the NDP, proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. In terms of SEA and Sustainability Appraisal (SA), the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (paragraph 26, SEA and SA) states:

*“There is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal as set out in section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. However, a qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or order will contribute to achieving sustainable development. A sustainability appraisal may be a useful approach for doing this.”*

Paragraph 27, SEA and SA of the PPG continues:

*“In some limited circumstances, where a neighbourhood plan is likely to have significant environmental effects, it may require a strategic environmental assessment. Draft neighbourhood plan proposals should be assessed to determine whether the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects.”*

Consistent with this guidance, the District Council completed an SEA Screening Opinion (11 April 2017) and concluded that the NDP was likely to have significant effects on the

environment and that an SEA was required. Consequently an SEA was undertaken by Warborough Parish Council comprising of:

- A Scoping Report published for consultation on 18 January 2017
- Sustainability Appraisal Report (incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment) published 31 January 2018 incorporating in appendices:
  - Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (final version, revised based on comments received)
  - Technical Site Assessment Report

In assessing the emerging NDP and also in line with the PPG, the Warborough Parish Council decided to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that was compliant with the SEA Directive but also considered wider social and economic effects. References to the 'Environmental Report' in this Post-Adoption Statement refer to the relevant SA Report.

The reports can be viewed at <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-policy/neighbourhood-plans/warborough-and-shillin>

This Post Adoption Statement represents the conclusion of the SEA process and fulfils the plan and programme adoption requirements of the SEA Directive and SEA Regulations. This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 16 (3) and (4) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which require a statement to be produced on adoption of a plan or programme, to detail, in summary:

- how environmental considerations have been integrated into the NDP (Section 2 of this document);
- how the Environmental Report has been taken into account (Section 3);
- how opinions expressed in response to the consultation on the Draft NDP and Draft Environmental Report have been taken into account (Section 4);
- the reasons for choosing the NDP, as made, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with (Section 5); and
- the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the NDP (Section 6).

## 2 HOW ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS HAVE BEEN INTEGRATED INTO THE NDP

### 2.1 Environmental Considerations in the NDP

#### Preparation of the NDP

Environmental and wider sustainability considerations have been integral to the key decisions made in respect of the policies and proposals of the NDP. The integration of these considerations into the plan making process has principally been achieved through:

- the development of a proportionate evidence base on topics including (inter alia) housing, population and health, transport, landscape, air quality, biodiversity, flood risk, climatic factors;
- engagement with key stakeholders and the public on the emerging NDP and related environmental and sustainability matters;
- the consideration of national planning policy and the objectives of other plans and programmes, including those produced by the District Council; and
- ongoing assessment including SEA (see **Section 2.2**) and screening under the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) in June 2018 where the NDP was screened out from having to do an appropriate assessment].

#### NDP Content

The NDP plans positively to support local development (as outlined in paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework). This aim is expressed in the NDP Vision, which is: *“To preserve and enhance the look and feel of our villages, our community spirit and our countryside whilst supporting our identified housing and community needs”*.

The Vision is supported by 12 Objectives in the NDP which are as follows:

| VILLAGE CHARACTER   |
|---|
| 1. To enhance our strong sense of place, community and local identity.  |
| 2. To ensure that new housing development is in character with the villages, protects the greenbelt and offers a high quality of design within the villages whilst minimising impact on views.          |
| 3. To protect the aesthetic beauty of the villages and the income it generates.   |
| HOUSING   |
| 4. To provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home and providing a mix of housing to better meet local needs especially smaller homes and homes for the elderly. |
| 5. To identify development sites to meet the housing numbers indicated in the Local Plan.   |

|  |
|--|
| 6. To ensure that new development does not cause new, or exacerbate existing, traffic, parking and road safety issues around the village and seeks to improve it.. |
| 7. To maximise integration of the new development with the existing community.   |
| 8. To ensure new development does not cause new, or exacerbate existing, risk of flooding, and seeks to reduce the existing risk.                                  |
| <b>COMMUNITY ASSETS, SERVICES AND FACILITIES</b>   |
| 9. To ensure that local services, recreational facilities and infrastructure are maintained and improved.  |
| 10. To ensure that heritage assets are protected.  |
| 11. To seek opportunities for landscape, recreational and ecological gain whilst minimising the environmental impact of new development.                           |
| <b>ECONOMY AND TOURISM</b>   |
| 12. To enhance the prospects for local businesses by supporting plans for village amenity premises.  |

The NDP contains a number of policies to help realise the Vision and Objectives and help to deliver sustainable development.

Policy VC1 seeks to enhance and protect the village character. It sets out an overarching strategy for the neighbourhood area, seeking to minimise adverse effects of development by ensuring it pays heed to the local character and heritage of the Parish. It focuses new development within the built-up areas and within the housing allocation as set out in Policy H2 of this Plan.

Policies H1-6 promote sustainable development through identifying a housing mix to meet local need (H1 and H6) and an appropriate scale and location of new development (H2 and H3). Policies H4 and H5 ensure that any development is well-integrated into the village and will not exacerbate local concerns over road safety and parking.

Policies C1, C2 and C3 support the delivery of additional infrastructure, and the protection of existing community assets.

Policies E1 and E2 will help to deliver additional employment opportunities in appropriate locations.

## **2.2 Environmental and Sustainability Considerations in the SEA**

To provide the context for the SEA, and in compliance with the SEA Directive, a proportionate review of other relevant plans and programmes was undertaken and the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and its evolution without the NDP were considered; together, they informed the identification of a series of key sustainability issues. This information was set out in the Scoping Report (2017) and informed the Environmental Report.

The key sustainability issues identified through the review of plans and programmes and analysis of baseline information informed, and were reflected in, the objectives and criteria that comprised the framework used to appraise the NDP (the SEA Framework) (see **Table 2.1**). Broadly, the SEA objectives presented the preferred sustainability outcome which usually involved minimising detrimental effects and enhancing positive effects.

**Table 2.1: The SEA Framework**

| <b>Sustainability issues and challenges</b> |                                       | <b>Sustainability objectives</b>   |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| Environmental                               | Biodiversity                          | 1) To conserve and enhance biodiversity and ecological networks.   |
|   | Enhance open spaces and countryside   | 2) To improve efficiency in land use and to conserve and or enhance open spaces, greenbelt and countryside in particular, those areas designated for their landscape importance, minerals, biodiversity and high soil quality. |
|   | Flooding                              | 3) To reduce the risk of, and damage from, flooding.   |
|   | Climate Change                        | 4) To seek to address the causes and effects of climate change.  |
|   | Pollution                             | 5) To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds, especially water, air, light, soil and noise pollution.  |
|   | Waste                                 | 6) To seek to minimise waste generation and encourage the reuse of waste through recycling, compost, or energy recovery  |
| Social                                      | Community involvement                 | 7) To support community involvement in decisions affecting them and enable the community to provide local services and solutions.  |
|   | Community safety                      | 8) To help 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.   |
|   | Housing need                          | 9) To help to provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home and in a decent environment supported by appropriate levels of infrastructure.   |
|   | Transport                             | 10)To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need to travel by car and shorten the length of journeys.  |
|   | Traffic and road safety               | 11)To ensure development proposals do not exacerbate existing traffic and road safety and where possible, improves it.   |
|   | Health and well-being                 | 12)To maintain and improve people's health, well-being, and community cohesion and support voluntary, community and faith groups.  |
|   | Access to services                    | 13)To improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural and community facilities and services.   |
|   | Heritage assets and village character | 14) a) To conserve and enhance the historic environment, including archaeological resources<br>b) to ensure that new development is of high-quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.                               |
| Economic                                    | Thriving local economy                | 15)To assist in the development of small firms that maintain and enhance the rural economy.  |
|   | Tourism                               | 16)To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector   |

The SEA process considered the contribution of the NDP towards each of the appraisal objectives, drawing on the baseline information to predict the likely significant effects in line with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Practical Guide to the SEA Directive<sup>1</sup>. Specifically, the following key components of the NDP were appraised against the SEA objectives:

- Vision and Plan Objectives;
- Policies in the NDP and reasonable alternatives to those, including the do-nothing option where appropriate;
- Site allocations (including reasonable alternatives).

The appraisal identified the likely changes to the baseline conditions as a result of the NDP's implementation. These effects were described (where possible) in terms of their extent, the timescale over which they could occur, whether the effects would be temporary or permanent, positive or negative, short, medium and/or long-term. The potential for secondary, synergistic and cumulative effects were also considered and reported where relevant.

---

<sup>1</sup> ODPM (2005) *A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive*. Published September 2005.

### 3 HOW THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT HAS BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

#### 3.1 Overview

The development of the NDP has been iterative. SEA has played an integral role in this iterative process with each of the following NDP stages having been accompanied by an Environmental Report in order to help inform the Plan and fully integrate environmental and sustainability considerations into decision making. **Table 3.1** below lists the iterations of the NDP, corresponding Environmental Reports and key conclusions from the Environmental Report.

**Table 3.1 Summary of SEA Iterations**

| Report   | Summary of the Accompanying SEA Environmental Report (what was appraised)   | Key Conclusions from the SEA Environmental Report   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Draft Sustainability Appraisal</b><br/><b>June 2017</b></p>            | <p>The report provides an assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan objectives and policies, and alternatives for the preferred growth strategy for the Parish and recommends the most suitable means of achieving it. The report was consulted on at the pre-submission stage</p> | <p>The assessment indicated that the preferred policies of the draft Plan avoided leading to any significant, negative environment effects and would contribute, in overall terms, to achieving a sustainable pattern of growth and consolidation in the village.</p> <p>The SA Report concluded that the Six Acre site (together with infill) was the most suitable means of achieving the preferred growth strategy. It provides a range of significant positive effects in relation to the provision of housing and the resolution of local issues, without impacting detrimentally on infrastructure and services. The most significant effect identified was in relation to cultural heritage. Mitigation strategies were documented and other policies in the NDP were judged to help reduce this effect.</p> |
| <p><b>Final Sustainability Appraisal Report,</b><br/><b>January 2018</b></p> | <p>The report provides an assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan objectives and policies and alternatives for the preferred growth strategy for the Parish and recommends the most suitable means of achieving it. It was reviewed and updated based on responses to</p>        | <p>The assessment indicated that the preferred policies of the Plan avoided leading to any significant, negative environment effects and would contribute, in overall terms, to achieving a sustainable pattern of growth and consolidation in the village.</p> <p>The SA Report concluded that the Six Acre site (together with infill) was the most suitable means of achieving the preferred growth strategy. It provides a range of significant positive effects in relation to the provision of housing and the resolution of local issues,</p>  |



the pre-submission consultation.

without impacting detrimentally on infrastructure and services.

In response to pre-submission consultation, policies were strengthened to avoid potential negative impacts to biodiversity as well as re-organisation and further strengthening of policies designed to protect village character and cultural heritage.

### **3.2 How the Findings of the SEA Have Been Taken into Account**

The SEA has helped to shape the direction of the NDP. In particular, the findings of the SEA of the emerging NDP and reasonable alternatives have informed decisions in respect of:

- the policies that the NDP should contain and their content;
- the amount of growth to be accommodated in the plan area;
- the sites to be allocated in the NDP and options for delivering the overall amount of growth required.

## 4 HOW OPINIONS EXPRESSED DURING CONSULTATION HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

### 4.1 Overview

As set out in Section 1, the development of the NDP has been informed by extensive, ongoing engagement and public consultation, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637).

A Consultation Statement was prepared for the NDP in accordance with Paragraph 15 (2)1 of the Regulations which defines a “consultation statement” as a document which:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;*
- (b) explains how they were consulted;*
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and*
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.*

The Consultation Statement sets out the consultation undertaken during the preparation of the NDP, a summary of main issues raised and details of how the comments received have been taken into account.

### 4.2 SA Consultation Summary

Following consultation on the scope of the SEA in January 2017, Environmental Reports have been prepared and published for consultation at each key NDP stage as set out **Table 3.1** above.

A five week consultation was undertaken on the Scoping Report which concluded on 22 February 2017; a total of 15 responses were received.

The changes made to the Scoping Report as a result of the consultation were as follows:

- Additional information relating to biodiversity inserted and incorporated into sustainability issues together with revision of objectives 1 and 2 based on the response of Natural England
- Additional information relating to heritage assets inserted based on the response of Historic England and a number of Parishioners
- Revision of objective 5 to include light pollution based on a number of responses from Parishioners
- Separation of objective 14 into two distinct objectives 14a and 14b to reflect the importance of heritage assets to the local community.

Details of the results of consultation at this stage are provided in the section 5.81 of the consultation statement available on the SODC website:

[http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/WSNPConsultationStatement\\_Redacted.pdf](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/WSNPConsultationStatement_Redacted.pdf)

The draft Environmental Report accompanying the Regulation 14 (Pre-submission version of the NDP) was consulted on for eight weeks which concluded on 23 August 2017; a total

of 201 responses were received to the Pre-submission consultation: 6 from statutory consultees, 5 from landowners/agents, 2 from organisations and 188 from parishioners.

Comments and responses to the statutory consultees are provided below. (A summary of comments and responses to other consultees can be found in section 5.8.2 of the consultation statement.)

| Pre - Submission NP documents referenced | Statutory Consultee  | WSNP Response  |
|--|--|--|
| Policy C1                                | Comments were received from SODC and Thames Water, especially related to current infrastructure.                               | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion. Now comprises C1 and C2. C1 states: Proposals for new residential development should not worsen any infrastructure deficiency and where it does this should be mitigated for.   |
| C2                                       | SODC suggested considering classes of use, study of current floor space and potential change of use and cited Chinnor examples | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion, however it was not deemed beneficial to conduct a study into floor space. number of units or promoting change of use.   |
| C3                                       | SODC suggested formatting justification and evidence changes for clarity   | Supporting evidence added as suggested (Appendix H).   |
| C4                                       | SODC CIL comments: generally supportive  | Noted.   |
| Character Assessment and Policies        | SODC and Heritage England made comments about the Character Assessment.  | Additions were made to the existing Character Assessment (development pattern, views & green spaces) and differences with historic views were added. 'Most Positive features' added. This was referred to in updated policy wording in the NP, as suggested. |
| E1                                       | SODC suggested separating local employment and community assets into 2 distinct policies                                       | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion  |

| Pre - Submission NP documents referenced | Statutory Consultee   | WSNP Response   |
|--|---|---|
| H1                                       | Historic England (HE) and SODC made specific reference to this policy.  | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion (and incorporated into VC1). Reference to protection of heritage assets clarified as per HE suggestions and reference made to their protection under NPPF.      |
| H2                                       | SODC Policy and Housing departments commented on H2 highlighting potential conflict and requesting the need to reflect district policies and the Local plan                               | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion (note now policy H1)  |
| H3                                       | SODC Policy and Housing requested this policy be amended to reflect SODC Housing policy to meet basic condition   | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion (note now in policy H1)   |
| H4                                       | HE, OCC, SODC and SODC Conservation and Thames Water all commented on this Site Allocation policy.  | Together with a planning consultant, the SC carefully considered all suggestions. Policy amendments made (note now policy H2), in particular making it a criteria-based policy as recommended by SODC |
| H4                                       | OCC & Natural England (NE) suggest the need for development to provide a net gain in biodiversity. NE also suggest 40% [later updated to 50%] of development site be given to greenspace. | Policy H2 (site allocation) amended as suggested. The objective relating to biodiversity is tested against all policies in the SAR.   |
| H5                                       | HE suggestions to resist cumulative   | Policy amended as per HE & NE suggestions and amendments made to accommodate SODC   |

| <b>Pre - Submission NP documents referenced</b> | <b>Statutory Consultee</b>   | <b>WSNP Response</b>   |
|---|--|--|
|   | effects of infill is welcomed.<br>SODC comments<br>NE suggests prioritising brownfield sites for infill.                     | recommendations (note now policy H3)   |
| H6  | SODC suggest adding local detail into policy wording, or delete;<br>OCC suggested review of wording.                         | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion to incorporate local detail. (Note now policy H4.)   |
| H7  | SODC suggest wording the policy positively;<br>OCC suggested review of wording   | Policy amended as per SODC suggestion. (Note now policy H5.)   |
| H8  | SODC suggest this flooding policy is not a policy, it is a statement and does not add local detail                           | No other reports exist to provide additional local detail. Further detail added in NP sustainability challenges. Policy deleted.   |
| NP  | OCC request renaming of footpaths to footways  | Wording has been amended in the NP to make the differentiation clear   |
| VC  | HE, OCC and SODC all commented on these policies, which multiple recommendations for rewording, restructuring and combining. | Together with a planning consultant, the SC carefully considered all suggestions. Policy amendments made by combining all three VC policies into one, and restructuring as a criteria-based policy as suggested by SODC. |
| NP App G  | OCC request clarification regarding Hammer Lane descriptions   | Wording has been amended to clarify  |
| NP  | OCC support rubbish receptacle storage areas   | Noted (Now in policy VC1).   |
| NP Intro  | SODC suggest timeframe changes and   | Content amended accordingly  |

| Pre - Submission NP documents referenced | Statutory Consultee   | WSNP Response   |
|--|---|---|
|  | clarification on consultation   |   |
| NP Vision and Objectives                 | SODC suggest expanding vision and objectives.   | The NP feel that the vision and which underpinned objectives and all NP development were well tested in the community and integral to the process of the development of the NP. Whilst we agree with the sentiments, we do not feel that now would be the appropriate time to make fundamental changes to the underlying vision and objectives. |
| NP                                       | OCC detail Wallingford School expansion plans   | Noted.  |
| NP                                       | OCC request that scheduled monuments are excluded from development and non-scheduled sites preserved.   | Noted. (Now in policy VC1).   |
| NP                                       | NE suggest: biodiversity protection references be included in the policy wording.   | Wording added in VC1, H4, H3, and H2 as suggested.  |
| NP                                       | NE suggest: an additional biodiversity project and commend Benson NP policy wording.  | Biodiversity wording added to existing footpath policy, which is well-evidenced from the consultation process, and to the footpath, parking and playground projects.  |
| Sustainability Appraisal Report (SAR)    | HE requests that clarification is made to note the potential harm to the Warborough conservation area and listed buildings and to demonstrate that special regard has been given to the | Content amended accordingly.  |

| Pre - Submission NP documents referenced | Statutory Consultee   | WSNP Response  |
|--|---|--|
|  | desirability of their conservation.   |  |
| SAR Appendix - Technical Site Assessment | HE requests that amendments are made to the site assessments to note the potential harm to the Warborough conservation area and listed buildings and to demonstrate that special regard has been given to the desirability of their conservation. | <p>Content amended accordingly.</p> <p>The SC note that there are a number of heritage assets throughout the Parish. Some potential sites have evidence of heritage assets on the site itself and the TSA assessments focussed on a comparison of potential harm across all sites, rather than focussing on one site in isolation (as might be the case, for example, in response to a planning application).</p> <p>A list of changes made to the TSA assessments can be found in Section 5.8.2. Key elements include: 1- making the equity of the assessment approach to heritage across all sites clearer; 2- including additional heritage information and; 3- clarifying methodology used, in particular, in relation to how mitigation was incorporated, and how harm vs benefit was considered.</p> |
| SAR                                      | OCC suggest referring to Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study, and Historic Landscape characterisation data.  | The OWLS bio map was included in the biodiversity section of the SASR, the key findings of which were summarised in the SAR. No action taken.  |
| SAR                                      | SODC request that additional information is included in support of infill growth figures of 2% and clarify throughout that option 2 in report is allocation plus infill.  | Content amended accordingly (also see response to theme 9 in section 5.8.2)  |
| SAR                                      | NE agree no significant impact on Little  | Noted.<br>SAR mitigation updated to reflect.   |

| Pre -<br>Submission<br>NP<br>documents<br>referenced | Statutory Consultee  | WSNP Response  |
|--|--|--|
|  | Wittenham SAC;<br>Development<br>biodiversity impact can<br>be mitigated | NP Projects updated to include<br>'green infrastructure' |

Details of the results of consultation at this stage are provided in section 4.6.2 and 4.6.3. of the consultation statement available on the SODC website:

[http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/WSNPConsultationStatement\\_Redacted.pdf](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/WSNPConsultationStatement_Redacted.pdf)



## 5. THE REASONS FOR CHOOSING THE NDP, AS ADOPTED, IN THE LIGHT OF THE OTHER REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES DEALT WITH

### 5.1 Overview

Article 5 (1) of the SEA Directive and SEA Regulation 12(2) require that “*an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated*”. Information to be provided includes “*an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with*” (SEA Directive Annex I (h) and SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (8)).

The European Commission guidance on the SEA Directive<sup>2</sup> discusses possible interpretations of handling ‘reasonable alternatives’ as required by Article 5(1). It states that “*The alternatives chosen should be realistic. Part of the reason for studying alternatives is to find ways of reducing or avoiding the significant adverse effects of the proposed plan or programme*”.

As set out in **Section 3**, the SEA has been an iterative process undertaken alongside and integrated with the development of the NDP itself. The reasonable alternatives considered in preparing the NDP and appraised through the SA have related to:

- development scenarios (the amount of growth to be accommodated in the plan area);
- policy options (including the do-nothing option where relevant);
- site allocations; and
- site configurations (site boundaries and site capacity).

The findings of the appraisal of the preferred approach and reasonable alternatives were reported in the Environmental Reports at each stage of NDP preparation and subject to consultation with the wider community and relevant consultation bodies.

### 5.2 The Reasons for Choosing the Preferred Approach and for Rejecting Reasonable Alternatives

The Final Environmental Report sets out the reasons for choosing the preferred approach and for rejecting reasonable alternatives, this is summarised below.

#### Development Scenarios

The WSNP Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in the context of the South Oxfordshire District Council planning strategy for the Parish of Warborough. The village is classified as a smaller village where large- scale development is not normally considered appropriate. This does not preclude limited growth being encouraged through positive policies for infill and small scale development within the built-up area. Policies VC1 and particularly H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan achieve this.

---

<sup>2</sup> EC (2001) *Implementation of Directive 2001/42 on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment*. Available from [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/eia/pdf/030923\\_sea\\_guidance.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/archives/eia/pdf/030923_sea_guidance.pdf) [Accessed June 2017].

Despite the fact that the village is a thriving and active community, it struggles to support the local shop, post office and public houses (two have shut in recent times, leaving one remaining). It suffers from traffic congestion due to high flow and little off- road parking, especially around the school. There has been no substantial development in the Parish for 35+ years and there is a shortage of affordable, smaller and housing for the elderly.

The emerging Local Plan identifies that smaller villages should be capable of 5-10% growth across the district depending on local circumstances to be determined within a Neighbourhood Plan. Despite Warborough and Shillingford being identified as unsuitable for an allocation of development, the emerging local plan does allow the Neighbourhood Plan to explore the potential for further development including a site allocation. This Neighbourhood Plan has approached this task carefully and always within the overall planning strategy.

### **Policies Included in the NDP**

Neighbourhood plans are not obliged to contain policies addressing all types of development. The range and scope of policies to be included in the NDP was considered through production of draft versions of the NDP. Where relevant the do-nothing option was also considered. Relevant policy areas and reasonable alternatives are summarised below.

Policy H8 of the South Oxfordshire District Council Emerging Local Plan 2033 states: “A minimum of 500 new homes will be delivered in the ‘smaller villages’. This will be achieved through Neighbourhood Development Plans which allocate sites for at least a 5% increase in dwelling numbers above those recorded in the 2011 census. In ‘smaller villages’ where there is no Neighbourhood Development Plan a 5-10% increase in dwelling numbers, above those recorded in the 2011 census, will be achieved through the development of suitable sites and through infill development.”

As Warborough and Shillingford is classed as a smaller village, the WSNP therefore considers two options for growth:

1. **Do not allocate a site – limited growth.** The limited growth option relies on positive policies (Policy H3, together with VC1) that enable some growth within the built-up area or on its edge through infill. This would achieve around 2% growth.
2. **Infill development + site allocation.** This option would deliver balanced growth of at least 5% over the plan period, together with local benefits.

### **Option 1 – Limited Growth (do not allocate a housing development site)**

This option relies on positive policies that enable some growth within the built-up area or on its edge. The Steering Committee identified the level of growth that would likely be the result of a “do not allocate a housing development site” policy.

The call for infill sites yielded fewer than 15 dwellings on 8 plots initially. Subsequently, 9 more infill sites emerged with a total potential yield of up to 30 dwellings.

SODC emphasise the importance of deliverability on any housing provision identified within NPs. Under these criteria and based on past performance within the Parish, 5% growth was not thought to be deliverable. The Parish has a strong tradition of inhibiting any development: 6 new dwellings have been provided in the last 20 years (i.e. 1.5%); all of those have required significant effort, some with multiple applications; others have failed altogether – some repeatedly – or been withdrawn.

However, with positive policies in place, the Steering Committee estimate that this could be enhanced to deliver an increase in successful infill applications over the plan period, resulting in a housing contribution c. 10 dwellings, or 2%.

### **Option 2- Site Allocation + infill**

This option has required an evaluation of potential sites to determine if a site allocation could deliver balanced growth and is based on delivering at least 5% growth, in line with Policy H8 of the Emerging Local Plan

The precise figure was not a hard and fast target as much depended on the village and a suitable site. However, growth in excess of this was thought likely to lead to an imbalance between growth and service capacity and/or could change the nature and character of Warborough and Shillingford as a place. The site assessment was therefore undertaken in the context of seeking to explore if this level of growth is achievable without placing a burden on local services.

Given that the NPPF is underpinned by a presumption in favour of development and that SODC did not have a 5-year land supply at the time the NP was drafted, the presumption in favour of development places a developer in a strong position. To challenge an unsuitable planning application on a site on the edge of the villages a comparative site assessment is invaluable and enables the community to lead rather than respond to the site appraisal debate. That a suitable site can be identified and subject to detailed evaluation, shows that this strategy is an important one to evaluate.

### **Site Options**

The site assessment process took into account the District Council's planning strategy, the NPPF, our WSNP objectives and village priorities. The selection of a potential site is difficult. The Neighbourhood Plan must complement the existing planning strategy that recognises the villages' role as a smaller village but also the emerging strategy that could endorse a site agreed within the Neighbourhood Plan. The approach adopted here is very much a 'bottom up' approach of identifying a site that meets our local objectives, complements the village as a place and does not create an imbalance between growth and service capacity. The analysis is at a high level looking at strategic matters. It does not provide a detailed evaluation of each site such as a planning application would do but rather identifies the potential of a site for development to a reasonable degree of confidence to enable its allocation.

Development of the site inventory and details of the assessment process are provided in the Technical Site Assessment in Appendix 2 of the Environmental Report.

The community were also given the opportunity to put development sites forward as part of the April 2016 NP survey. No sites were forthcoming. Not all fields around the village have been assessed, but key findings with regard to assessed sites, as part of the NP, will be helpful in future assessments of new sites that may become available

The steering committee met on 3 and 17 March 2017 to test the sustainability effects of sites (i.e. the different options for growth). There were 6 possible sites and to give a complete picture of the sustainability implications of each site, all of these were assessed against the sustainability criteria despite the fact that some were technically more feasible than others. The option to not allocate (2% growth) was also tested at the Steering Committee meeting on 5 May 2017.

The steering committee also considered ways in which positive aspects of the sites might be strengthened or opportunities for negative aspects to be mitigated existed, noting that some aspects such as location (for example, in greenbelt or in flood plain) are not able to be mitigated.

### **Comparison of the Two Options for Growth**

Both Option 1 and Option 2 deliver growth. Therefore, a comparison between the two is useful.

Option 1 'Do not allocate a housing development site - limited growth' is an enabling strategy backed up by positive policies that provide for continued natural growth from infill or very small site development. These types of site cannot be foreseen, are within the built-up area of the village and have historically come forward at low levels (1.5% over the past 20 years). With positive policies, it is estimated that this could be increased to achieve around 2% growth within the Plan period.

The sustainability testing of Option 1 is problematic, given that it is impossible to know, for example, the location and number of homes that may emerge in this way. Therefore, it is felt that a neutral analysis offers a fair summation of the impact on the sustainability objectives of this type of unplanned growth. It is clear from the assessment contained within the Environmental Report that Option 1 performs on-the-whole better in the sustainability analysis against all sites in Option 2. In particular, its environmental impact is less, but it does not offer any of the possible positive benefits that allocating a site could bring.

It is considered unlikely that, taking deliverability into account, Option 1 will contribute more than 2% growth over the plan period. Option 2, on the other hand, achieves at least 5% growth.

### **Preferred Growth Strategy and Site Allocation**

This section focuses on the potential of a site allocation to deliver a level of growth that does not compromise village character, as expressed in the objectives arising from consultation.

The site selection priorities expressed by the village were to:

- keep development inside the village envelope
- minimise impact on flooding
- low landscape impact
- use of brownfield
- avoidance of greenfield sites.

These are all consistent with identifying a potential site.

Clearly the need to address existing school parking issues and significant traffic concerns were key priorities. This suggested that a central location adjacent to existing facilities and capable of delivering most benefits to the village community should be a meaningful consideration in the site selection process. Whilst this was a community desire, locating any new development centrally to reduce journeys and village parking burdens and to improve access to facilities is also a sound planning objective.

The steering committee had to balance this with a similarly clear message to keep housing numbers low whilst ensuring quality of design, minimising impact on open views and prioritising the desired accommodation mix (that is, starter & elderly).

### **Site Allocation**

Notwithstanding the better 'sustainability performance' of Option 1 in comparison to Option 2, the WSNP supports the delivery of a single site (6 Acres) as the sole allocated development site.

Although the Six Acres site is not as large as some sites put forward, it is acknowledged that it has the potential to deliver more dwellings than the village wanted (30 or 7% of current housing stock). However, these figures are entirely consistent with SODC's aspiration to achieve at least 5% more dwelling in smaller villages. In Warborough and Shillingford this would be circa 22 homes.

Consultation feedback shows that the potential developer is prepared to provide the school parking contribution, modest density and high design and landscaping specifications within this scale of scheme which indicates that a potential allocation can deliver what we both want and need as a community and that appropriate policies can be developed to manage these aspirations. However, much will depend on the detailed site requirements including community infrastructure, design and access. The consultation feedback gives confidence that the site can be delivered with many of the prerequisite studies, demonstrating no 'show stoppers'.

Therefore, by proactively planning for a site that delivers clear benefits now, together with a more organic infill approach which will grow more slowly, the community can achieve SODC's minimum 5% increase in dwellings and better support and improve local infrastructure whilst continuing to protect Warborough and Shillingford's essential character.

In summary, the Six Acre site is the most suitable site for the following reasons:

- 1- The site performs better than all others, comparatively, in sustainability testing (see Environmental Report)

- 2- The site performed better than all others, comparatively, in the Technical Site Assessment (see Environmental Report)
- 3 - The site is the only site that meets the high level spatial strategy preference (i.e. it sits close to village amenities) and, helped by the flanking buildings and strong perimeter landscaping, is modestly visible and does not impact open vistas;
- 4- It is not in the flood plain, there are no flooding concerns;
- 5 - It is not in the Green Belt;
- 6 - Existing pedestrian links will allow residents to easily access community facilities on foot;
- 7 - There is willingness to mitigate traffic concerns;
- 8 - It will alleviate the current school parking problem;
- 9 - Consultation feedback gives confidence that the potential developer will commit to deliver the housing mix as well as affordable units in a style that reflects the best of village character.

The steering committee has engaged positively and consistently with all land owners who have potential sites to enable it to have a better understanding of site deliverability. In the case of Six Acres, the potential developer has shared a clear development plan to complete development within a 2-year period and also has a history of successfully delivering similar local projects. Disruption is inevitable but they have shared plans to minimize potential disruption including prioritising of on-site parking for work vehicles and scheduling construction traffic to avoid school rush hours and minimise village impact.

Anticipated development will take up the spare capacity of the local infrastructure (roads and school).

To allocate an additional site is not appropriate for the following reasons:

- 1- Points 1-9 above
- 2- Given that Six Acres, alongside projected levels of infill development, will deliver the homes required to achieve at least 5% growth there is no need to allocate another site.
- 3- The next best site performed well below the preferred site in both sustainability testing and with regard to 'non-SEA' site assessment presented at Appendix 2 in the Environmental Report.
- 4- All sites apart from Six Acres perform poorly in terms of their location and impact on the Plan's key objectives (particularly setting and place) to the extent that these should be excluded as potential sites.

## **6. THE MEASURES THAT ARE TO BE TAKEN TO MONITOR THE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY EFFECTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NDP**

### **6.1 Overview**

The SEA Regulations (17 (1)) set out that “*The responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme with the purpose of identifying any unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action*”.

The District Council is the responsible authority for the purposes of monitoring the NDP. Planning Practice Guidance states:

*“Monitoring the significant effects of the implementation of a neighbourhood plan that was subject to a strategic environmental assessment should be undertaken (see regulation 17 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004). This will enable unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage and to enable appropriate remedial actions. The local planning authority should consider arrangements to monitor the significant effects of implementing the neighbourhood plan and reporting this issue in its Monitoring Report.”*

The District Council is developing a suite of monitoring indicators that cover the topics identified in the SEA Directive. These will be used to monitor the effects of the Development Plan, including the Warborough & Shillingford NDP. Appendix A sets out the proposed monitoring indicators for the Local Plan and how they relate to the SEA topics that will be used prior to adoption of the Local Plan. These will be finalised once the Local Plan is adopted. The Council’s Authority Monitoring Plan will be produced annually with information updated as it becomes available.

Warborough Parish Council is not obliged to produce additional indicators for monitoring at the local level but may do so if it wishes. The Qualifying Body would be responsible for monitoring any additional indicators. In this instance Warborough Parish Council] has elected to do so. Proposed indicators at the local level are set out in Appendix B.

**APPENDIX A: MONITORING INDICATORS FOR THE LOCAL PLAN AND RELATIONSHIP THE SEA DIRECTIVE (Appendix R Monitoring - Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Version of the Local Plan 2019 – Appendices - March 2019)**

**Review of Proposed Monitoring Indicators against the Topics in the SEA Directive**

| Local Plan Policy  | Indicators from the Local Plan   | Sustainability Objective(s)  | SEA Topic  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>STRAT1: The Overall Strategy</b>                                  | Covered by all other indicators in framework -see below  | See below  | See below  |
| <b>STRAT2: South Oxfordshire Housing and Employment Requirements</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Number of dwellings permitted and completed in the district to meet the overall need</li> <li>□ Progress towards meeting South Oxfordshire’s apportionment of unmet need in the housing market area</li> <li>□ Number of dwellings permitted and completed in the district to meet the overall need</li> <li>□ Quantum of land permitted and completed for employment by strategic site and allocation</li> <li>□ Number of Homes delivered at the Grenoble Road, Northfield, and North of Bayswater Brook strategic allocations</li> </ul> | 1. ‘Housing’.<br>13. ‘Employment’<br>14. ‘Science Vale.’   | Population   |
| <b>Strat3: Didcot Garden Town</b>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Principles</li> </ul>  | The design principles cover design, local character, density and tenure, transport and movement, heritage, landscape and green infrastructure and social and community benefits. As such this indicator is relevant to a number of SA Objectives, including:<br>1 ‘Housing’<br>2 ‘Community safety’<br>3 ‘Access to facilities’<br>4 ‘Health and wellbeing’<br>5 ‘Environmental protection’<br>6 ‘Travel choice’ | Population, Human health, Material assets, Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna, Cultural heritage, Landscape |



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | 7 Biodiversity<br>9 Historic environments<br>17 Community involvement |  |
|--|--|---|--|

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited  
March 2019

| Local Plan Policy                         | Indicators from the Local Plan   | Sustainability Objective(s)                                     | SEA Topic                           |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>STRAT4: Strategic Development</b>      | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of essential strategic infrastructure items<br><input type="checkbox"/> Progress of other Strategic infrastructure items   | 1 'Housing.'<br>3 'Access to facilities'<br>10 Climatic factors | Population, Material assets         |
| <b>STRAT5: Residential Density</b>        | <input type="checkbox"/> Average density for major developments permitted by strategic allocation and location   | 8 Land use  | Material assets                     |
| <b>Strat6: Green Belt</b>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permissions granted within the Green Belt  | 8 Land use  | Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna, Soil |
| <b>Strat7: Land at Chalgrove Airfield</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Masterplan for the strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed at strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of pitches permitted and delivered for Gypsies and Travellers | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'                                  | Population                          |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited  
March 2019

| Local Plan Policy                                     | Indicators from the Local Plan   | Sustainability Objective(s)          | SEA Topic                |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>STRAT8: Culham Science Centre</b>                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed Culham Science Centre  | 13 'Employment'<br>14 'Science Vale' | Population               |
| <b>STRAT9: Land Adjacent to Culham Science Centre</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Masterplan for the strategic allocation:<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of pitches permitted and delivered for Gypsies and Travellers       | 1 'Housing'                          | Population               |
| <b>STRAT10: Land at Berinsfield</b>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Masterplan for the strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed at strategic allocation. | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'       | Population               |
| <b>Strat 10i: Berinsfield Local Green Space</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permissions granted on land identified   | 3 'Access to facilities'             | Population, Human health |

|  |   |                                   |            |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Strat 11: Land South of Grenoble road</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Masterplan for the strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed at strategic allocation | 1. 'Housing'.<br>13. 'Employment' |            |
| <b>Strat 12: Land at Northfield</b>            | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Masterplan for the strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation  | 1 'Housing'                       | Population |
| <b>Strat 13: Land North of Bayswater Brook</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Masterplan for the strategic allocation<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation  | 1 'Housing'                       | Population |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>  | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>  | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b> | <b>SEA Topic</b> |
|---|--|------------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Strat 14: Land at Wheatley Campus, Oxford Brookes University</b>               | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered at strategic allocation   | 1 Housing                          | Population       |
| <b>Policy HEN 1: The Strategy for Henley-on-Thames</b>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered in the Parish of Henley-on-Thames<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed in the parish of Henley-on-Thames<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of retail floorspace permitted and completed in the parish of Henley-on-Thames | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'     | Population       |
| <b>Policy TH1: The strategy for Thame</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered in the Parish of Thame<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed in the parish of Thame<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of retail floorspace permitted and completed in the parish of Thame                                  | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'     | Population       |
| <b>Policy WAL1:</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and delivered in the Parish of Wallingford<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed in the parish of Wallingford<br><input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of retail floorspace permitted and completed in the parish of Wallingford                | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'     | Population       |
| <b>Policy H1: Delivering New Homes</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by all other housing indicators   | See below                          | See below        |
| <b>Policy H2: New Housing in Didcot</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and completed in Didcot by strategic allocation   | 1 'Housing'                        | Population       |
| <b>Policy H3: Housing in the towns of Henley-on-Thames, Thame and Wallingford</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of homes permitted and completed in the towns of Henley-on-Thames, Thame and Wallingford   | 1 'Housing'                        | Population       |

| Local Plan Policy   | Indicators from the Local Plan   | Sustainability Objective(s) | SEA Topic  |
|---|--|-----------------------------|------------|
| <b>Policy H4: Housing in the Larger Villages</b>                          | ☐ Number of homes permitted and completed by Larger Village  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H5: Land to the West of Priest Close, Nettlebed</b>             | ☐ Homes permitted and completed on allocated site  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H6: Joyce Grove, Nettlebed</b>                                  | ☐ Homes permitted and completed on allocated site  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H7: Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station</b> | ☐ Homes permitted and completed on allocated site  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H8: Housing in the Smaller Villages</b>                         | ☐ Number of homes permitted and completed by Smaller Village   | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H9: Affordable Housing</b>                                      | ☐ Percentage of affordable housing provided on major developments or sites with combined gross floorspace of more than 1000m <sup>2</sup>  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H10: Exception Sites</b>  | ☐ Status of permissions granted for rural exception sites  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H11: Housing Mix</b>  | ☐ Average housing mix of planning permissions  | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H12: Self Build and Custom Housing</b>                          | ☐ Number of registered interests on the self and custom build register compared with the potential supply of self and custom build housing<br>☐ Proportion of self and custom build plots on strategic allocations |                             |            |

| Local Plan Policy  | Indicators from the Local Plan   | Sustainability Objective(s) | SEA Topic  |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------------|
| <b>Policy H13: Specialist Housing for Older People</b>                           | ☐ Amount and type of housing designed for older people permitted as part of strategic allocations and within the district. | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H14: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</b>   | ☐ Number of pitches permitted and delivered for Gypsies and Travellers by location   | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |
| <b>Policy H15: Safeguarding Gypsy, traveller and travelling Showpeople sites</b> | ☐ Status and type of permissions granted on Safeguarded Gypsy, Traveller and travelling Showpeople sites                   | 1 'Housing'                 | Population |

|   |   |                             |                         |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Policy H16: Infill Development and Redevelopment</b>               | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of housing permitted not in accordance with policy                     | 1 'Housing'                 | Population              |
| <b>Policy H17: Sub-division and Conversion to Multiple Occupation</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permissions relating to sub-divisions houses of multiple occupation | 1 'Housing'                 | Population              |
| <b>Policy H18: Replacement Dwellings</b>                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of replacement housing permissions in the open countryside             | 1 'Housing'<br>8 'Land use' | Population<br>Landscape |
| <b>Policy H19: Re-use of rural buildings</b>                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of housing permissions in the open countryside                         | 1 'Housing'<br>8 'Land use' | Population<br>Landscape |
| <b>Policy H20: Rural Workers Dwellings</b>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of Rural Worker Dwelling application                                   | 1 'Housing'                 | Population              |
| <b>Policy H21: Extensions to Dwellings</b>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permissions   | 1 'Housing'                 | Population              |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>  | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>   | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b>             | <b>SEA Topic</b>        |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Policy EMP6: New Employment Land at Thame</b>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed at Thame                            | 13 'Employment'                                | Population              |
| <b>Policy EMP7: New Employment Land at Wallingford</b>              | <input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed at Wallingford                      | 13 'Employment'                                | Population              |
| <b>Policy EMP8: New Employment Land at Crowmarsh Gifford</b>        | <input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land allocated, permitted and completed                          | 13 'Employment'                                | Population              |
| <b>Policy EMP9: New Employment Land at Chalgrove</b>                | <input type="checkbox"/> Quantum of employment land permitted and completed at Land at Monument Business Park   | 13 'Employment'                                | Population              |
| <b>Policy EMP10: Community Employment Plans</b>                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of applications for Major developments supported by a community employment plan | 13 'Employment'<br>15 'Education and Skills'   | Population              |
| <b>Policy EMP11: Development in the Countryside and Rural Areas</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of applications for employment uses in the open countryside            | 1 'Housing'<br>8 'Land use'<br>13 'Employment' | Population<br>Landscape |

|                              |  |  |                         |
|------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
|                              |  | 15 'Education and Skills'                                    |                         |
| <b>Policy EMP12: Tourism</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permissions granted for visitor economic developments. | 8 'Land use'<br>13 'Employment'<br>15 'Education and Skills' | Population<br>Landscape |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>   | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>   | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b>  | <b>SEA Topic</b>   |
|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Policy EMP13: Caravan and Camping Sites</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and Type of permissions granted for Caravan and Camping Sites   | 8 'Land use'  | Landscape  |
| <b>EMP14: Retention of Visitor Accommodation</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Amount of C1 use floorspace lost   | 13 'Employment'<br>16 'Tourism'   |  |
| <b>Policy INF1: Infrastructure Provision</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by all other infrastructure indicators   | See below   | See below  |
| <b>Policy TRANS1a: Supporting Strategic Transport Investment across the Oxford to Cambridge Arc:</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Oxford to Cambridge Arc  | 1 'Housing'<br>6 'Travel Choice'<br>10 'Climatic factors'                                 | Population<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors        |
| <b>Policy TRANS1b: Supporting Strategic Transport Investment</b>                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of transport projects identified in the Local Transport Plan  | 1 'Housing'<br>6 'Travel Choice'<br>10 'Climatic factors'                                 | Population<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors        |
| <b>Policy TRANS2: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility</b>                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring of Travel Plans for developments over 80 dwellings<br><input type="checkbox"/> Progress of transport schemes<br><input type="checkbox"/> To monitor designated Air Quality Management Areas | 1 'Housing'<br>5 'Environmental protection'<br>6 'Travel Choice'<br>10 'Climatic factors' | Population<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors<br>Air |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>                       | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>   | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b> | <b>SEA Topic</b>              |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Policy TRANS3: Safeguarding of Land for</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and use of planning permissions on land safeguarded | 1 'Housing'<br>6 'Travel choice'   | Population<br>Material assets |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Strategic Transport Schemes</b>   |  |  |  |
| <b>Policy TRANS4: Transport Assessments, Transport Statements and Travel Plans</b> | ☐ Monitoring of Travel Plans for developments over 80 dwellings    | 1 'Housing'<br>5 'Environmental protection'<br>6 'Travel choice'         | Population<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors<br>Air |
| <b>Policy TRANS5: Consideration of development Proposals</b>                       | ☐ Number of permissions granted against technical advice           | 1 'Housing'<br>5 'Environmental protection'<br>6 'Travel choice'         | Population<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors<br>Air |
| <b>Policy TRANS6: Rail</b>   | ☐ Status and type of planning permissions related to rail services | 5 'Environmental protection'<br>6 'Travel choice'                        | Population<br>Climatic Factors<br>Air                    |
| <b>Policy TRANS7: Development Generating New Lorry Movements</b>                   | ☐ Number of permissions granted against technical advice           | 5 'Environmental protection'<br>6 'Travel choice'<br>10 'Climate Change' | Population<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors<br>Air |
| <b>Policy INF2: Electronic Communications</b>                                      | ☐ Compliance with Building Regulations                             | 8 'Land-use'   | Landscape  |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>   | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>  | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b>              | <b>SEA Topic</b>                        |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Policy INF3: Telecommunications Technology</b>                                | ☐ Number of planning permissions refused   | 8 'Land-use'                                    | Landscape                               |
| <b>Policy INF4: Water and Waste Water Resources</b>                              | ☐ Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice  | 5 'Environmental protection'<br>11 'Flood Risk' | Biodiversity, fauna, and flora<br>Water |
| <b>Policy ENV1: Landscape and Countryside</b>                                    | ☐ Status and type of permissions permitted in the AONBs  |   |   |
| <b>Policy ENV2: Biodiversity Designated sites, Priority Habitats and Species</b> | ☐ Changes in areas of Priority Habitats and Species<br>☐ Number of permissions granted contrary to consultee advice on impact on Special Areas of Conservation<br>☐ Number of permissions granted contrary to consultee advice on impact on SSSI's | 7 'Biodiversity'                                | Biodiversity, fauna, and flora          |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Policy ENV3: Non Designated Sites, Habitats and Species</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in biodiversity area and/or sites  | 7 'Biodiversity'                                       | Biodiversity, fauna, and flora                                     |
| <b>Policy ENV4: Watercourses</b>                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice   | 10 'Climate Change'<br>11 'Flood Risk'                 | Human health<br>Water<br>Climatic factors                          |
| <b>Policy ENV5: Green Infrastructure in New Developments</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of buildings on the 'Heritage at Risk' Register<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of new Conservation Area Character Appraisals | 7 'Biodiversity'<br>8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built-heritage' | Biodiversity, fauna, and flora<br>Human health<br>Climatic factors |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>   | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>  | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b>                          | <b>SEA Topic</b>   |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Policy ENV6: Historic Environment</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress of Heritage Partnership Agreements                     | 8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built-heritage'                          | Cultural Heritage  |
| <b>Policy ENV7: Listed Buildings</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice | 8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built-heritage'                          | Cultural Heritage  |
| <b>Policy ENV8: Conservation Areas</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice | 8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built-heritage'                          | Cultural Heritage  |
| <b>Policy ENV9: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of planning permissions                         | 8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built-heritage'                          | Cultural Heritage  |
| <b>Policy ENV10: Historic Battlefields, Registered Park and Gardens and Historic Landscapes</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of planning permissions                         | 8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built-heritage'                          | Cultural Heritage  |
| <b>Policy ENV11: Pollution- - Impact from existing and/or Previous Land uses on new Development and the Natural Environment (Potential receptors of Pollution)</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice | 1 'Housing'<br>2 'Environmental Protection'<br>8 'Land-use' | Population<br>Human health<br>Soil<br>Air<br>Material assets<br>Climatic factors |
| <b>Policy ENV12: Pollution Impact of Development on Human Health, the natural environment and/or Local</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice | 1 'Housing'<br>5 'Environmental Protection'<br>8 'Land-use' | Population<br>Human health<br>Soil<br>Air  |

|   |  |  |                                     |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>amenity (Potential Sources of Pollution)</b> |  |  | Material assets<br>Climatic factors |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>                                | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>   | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b>           | <b>SEA Topic</b>               |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| <b>Policy EP1: Air Quality</b>                          | <input type="checkbox"/> To monitor designated Air Quality Management Areas   | 5 'Environmental Protection'                 | Air                            |
| <b>Policy EP2: Hazardous Substances</b>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice                            | 5 'Environmental Protection'<br>8 'Land-use' | Air<br>Soil<br>Material Assets |
| <b>Policy EP3: Waste collection and Recycling</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling or composting                     | 12 'Waste'                                   | Material Assets                |
| <b>Policy EP4: Flood Risk</b>                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Number and detail of permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding | 11 'Flood Risk'                              | Climatic Factors               |
| <b>Policy EP5: Minerals Safeguarding Areas</b>          | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and use of planning permissions on land safeguarded.                                | 8 'Land-use'                                 | Material Assets<br>Soil        |
| <b>Policy DES1: Delivering High Quality Development</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by all other design indicators   | See Below                                    | See Below                      |
| <b>Policy DES2: Enhancing Local Character</b>           | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted against technical advice                            | 1 'Housing'<br>8 'Land-use'                  | Population<br>Material Assets  |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>  | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>  | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b> | <b>SEA Topic</b> |
|---|--|------------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Policy DES3: Design and Access Statements</b>                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of permissions granted for major development supported by an appropriate masterplan and design and access statement. | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'     | Population       |
| <b>Policy DES4: Masterplans for Allocated Sites and Major Development</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by indicator for DES3   | See DES3.                          | See DES3.        |
| <b>Policy DES5: Outdoor Amenity Space</b>                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by indicator for DES3   | See DES3.                          | See DES3.        |
| <b>Policy DES6: Residential Amenity</b>                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by indicator for DES3   | See DES3.                          | See DES3.        |



|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Policy DES7: Public Art</b>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of permissions granted for major development, or sites larger than 0.5 hectares, that incorporate public art provision | 1 'Housing'<br>13 'Employment'  | Population  |
| <b>Policy DES8: Efficient use of resources</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Covered by indicators for STRAT12, EP1 and EP3  | See STRAT12, EP1 and EP3  | See STRAT12, EP1 and EP3  |
| <b>Policy DES9: Promoting Sustainable Design</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of permissions granted that incorporate climate change adaptation measures.  | 5 Environmental Protection<br>8 'Land-use'<br>9 'Built Heritage'<br>10 'Climatic factors' | Air<br>Soil<br>Climate Factors<br>Material Assets<br>Cultural Heritage<br>Landscape |
| <b>Policy DES10: Renewable Energy</b>            | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permission granted for renewable energy<br><input type="checkbox"/> Renewable energy capacity              | 8 'Land-use'<br>10 'Climatic factors'   | Material Assets<br>Climatic Factors<br>Material Assets                              |

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| <b>Local Plan Policy</b>  | <b>Indicators from the Local Plan</b>   | <b>Sustainability Objective(s)</b>          | <b>SEA Topic</b>              |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>Policy TC1: Retail and Services Growth</b>                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Net change in comparison and convenience retail floorspace   | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>13 'Employment' | Population<br>Material Assets |
| <b>Policy TC2: Retail Hierarchy</b>                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> A use class development permitted by settlement hierarchy<br><input type="checkbox"/> Number of applications approved and refused for 500m2 or greater accompanied with a Retail Impact Assessment | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>13 'Employment' | Population<br>Material Assets |
| <b>Policy TC3: Comparison goods floorspace requirements</b>             | <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison retail floorspace permitted by settlement hierarchy   | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>13 'Employment' | Population<br>Material Assets |
| <b>Policy TC4: Convenience floorspace provision in the Market Towns</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Provision of convenience floorspace (sqm retail floor space) at Henley, Thame and Wallingford  | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>13 'Employment' | Population<br>Material Assets |
| <b>Policy TC5 – Primary Shopping Areas</b>                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of planning permissions granted resulting in loss of retail floorspace in Primary Shopping Areas  | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>13 'Employment' | Population<br>Material Assets |
| <b>Policy CF1: Safeguarding Community Facilities</b>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of community facilities <sup>1</sup> lost   | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>4 'Health'      | Population<br>Human Health    |

1 These include use facilities under A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 and D2 use classes.

© Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Limited

March 2019

| Local Plan Policy   | Indicators from the Local Plan  | Sustainability Objective(s)                                | SEA Topic   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Policy CF2: Provision of Community Facilities and Services</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Status and type of permissions for community facilities                                  | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>4 'Health'<br>7 'Biodiversity' | Biodiversity, fauna and flora<br>Population<br>Human Health |
| <b>Policy CF3: New Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities</b>      | <input type="checkbox"/> Provision of sporting facilities   | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>4 'Health'<br>7 'Biodiversity' | Biodiversity, fauna and flora<br>Population<br>Human Health |
| <b>Policy CF4: Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Number of permissions leading to the loss of open space, sport and recreation facilities | 3 'Access to Facilities'<br>4 'Health'<br>7 'Biodiversity' | Biodiversity, fauna and flora<br>Population<br>Human Health |