

# SITE SELECTION

(INCORPORATING SEQUENTIAL FLOOD RISK AND  
EXCEPTION TEST)

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse  
**Joint Local Plan 2041**  
EXAMINATION LIBRARY DOCUMENT

**TOP07.1**

**Joint Local Plan**

Submission Version

(Regulation 22)



This topic paper supports the Joint Local Plan 2041.

We have prepared topic papers to present a coordinated view of the evidence that has been considered in drafting the Joint Local Plan 2041. We hope this will make it easier to understand how we have reached our position.

### **Publication history**

This topic paper was first published in October 2024 and released with the Regulation 19 publication version of the Joint Local Plan.

This December 2024 version contains the following updates since the October 2024 version:

- Change to the status of the North-East of East Hanney site as this has now completed.
- Added context in relation to the approach to density on allocated sites and clarified wording regarding the carrying forward of sites with planning permission.
- Added reference to a site that now has approval to grant planning permission, subject to completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation.
- Clarification of the approach to identifying reasonable alternatives where there are overlapping HELAA sites.
- Removal of reference to the 'proposed submission plan', instead referring to 'the plan'.
- Updated housing supply figures on sites of less than 1ha in size.

# Contents

Contents .....	2
Section 1: Introduction .....	3
Section 2: Our methodology .....	4
Stage 1a: Reviewing the existing residential focused allocations .....	4
Stage 1b: Reviewing the existing employment-led allocations and other sites likely to contribute to employment land supply .....	9
Stage 2: Identifying alternative residential and employment sites:.....	13
Section 3: Conclusions .....	18
Appendices.....	20
Appendix 1: Status of the existing residential focused site allocations in the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse existing Local Plans .....	20
Appendix 2: Existing residential focused site allocations without planning permission review .....	25
Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review.....	71
Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites .....	78
Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests .....	93

# Section 1: Introduction

- 1.1 This topic paper shows how we have identified the residential and employment sites to allocate through the Joint Local Plan (known as the site selection process). It also includes our sequential flood risk test, and exception test for allocating sites that contain areas of medium to high flood risk.
- 1.2 The topic paper explains our site selection methodology for the residential and employment site allocations in the Joint Local Plan. Firstly, it sets out how we have reviewed the allocations in the existing, adopted Local Plans to determine whether they are still appropriate to allocate. Then, it sets out how we identified alternative sites to test against these, and the process we went through to assess them. It then explains how we undertook a sequential flood risk and exception tests for those proposed allocations that contain areas at higher risk of flooding.
- 1.3 The report contains several appendices that show the results of our assessments.
- 1.4 The report concludes that most of our allocations in existing local plans should be carried forward, except a small number that have either finished construction completely, or are no longer suitable for allocation. As set out in the Joint Local Plan, the sites we have selected for allocation meet our housing and employment needs in full, and provide a surplus supply for both in each district.

## Section 2: Our methodology

### Stage 1a: Reviewing the existing residential focused allocations

#### Starting point

- 2.1 In our preferred options consultation (January to February 2024), we set out a review of the allocations in the existing local plans in our “residential focused site allocations” topic paper (January 2024). We supported this assessment with a sustainability appraisal of the existing allocations. We have reviewed the outcomes of that assessment and updated it to take account of the latest evidence and circumstances in this topic paper.
- 2.2 Our review of the allocations resulted in the existing allocated sites falling into 1 of 3 categories. These are sites that:
  - a. have finished construction,
  - b. have planning permission and may or may not be under construction,
  - c. do not have planning permission
- 2.3 Appendix 1 shows every residential focused site allocation in our current local plans, and whether they fall into category a, b, or c as set out above.
- 2.4 The Joint Local Plan will have less influence on those sites in categories a and b, and as a planning permission is in place, the plan cannot influence the “principle” of building homes on those sites. Sites within category c are sites where the Joint Local Plan will have greatest influence, including on whether development should take place on that site at all. The site promoters for those sites will still need to secure planning permission, and the councils will use the policies in the Joint Local Plan, when it is adopted<sup>1</sup>, to determine those.
- 2.5 Consequently, the councils undertook a review of those sites that fell within category c as part of our preferred options consultation to determine whether they should still be part of the Local Plan. The summary of this review is in paragraphs 2.15 to 2.18 below, but the detailed assessments of each of these sites is in Appendix 2 (updated as appropriate since our preferred options consultation in January and February 2024).

---

<sup>1</sup> Emerging policies in plans under preparation (i.e. before they are adopted) can also have weight in the determination of planning permissions, the details of this can be found in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 48: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

## **Category a: sites that have finished construction**

- 2.6 When a residential focused development site has been fully built, there will be no need for the Joint Local Plan to continue allocating it for development. The review showed that 6 sites in our current local plans have finished construction and do not need to be allocated in the plan anymore.

## **Category b: sites that have planning permission**

- 2.7 23 of the sites that our current local plans allocated have some sort of planning permission. While most of these sites are still under construction, and some are yet to start construction, we will need to carry forward the original policy and present these in Appendix 5 to the Joint Local Plan. For the sites with all the relevant planning permissions, this is in case the applicant submits new or varied plans. For the other sites, we will need to retain the policy to determine reserved matters applications (the detailed applications that follow outline consent). This will mean that the councils can still use the previous allocation policy, upon which the developer secured their outline permission, to determine these reserved matters applications.
- 2.8 The principle of development on these sites has been advanced through planning permission, but in most instances the previous policy is still needed to help guide the determination of reserved matters / discharge of condition applications. Furthermore, changes to these policies could have had a disruptive effect on developers securing these detailed consents / discharging conditions. The councils therefore decided to carry forward these existing policies into Appendix 5 of the plan.
- 2.9 In addition to those sites with some sort of permission, there is one small parcel of land on the site Land North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames that does not currently benefit from planning permission. Most of this site has planning permission, with the largest parcel to the north of the B4017, which runs through the allocation site, now a largely complete residential site<sup>2</sup>. On the land to the south of the B4017 Aldi has secured permission for, and built a store here<sup>3</sup>. On the remaining part of this allocation, there is a live hybrid planning application seeking full permission for a C2 care home and outline permission for C3 residential development<sup>4</sup>. We consider that given such a small parcel of the site doesn't have consent, and a planning application for this parcel is now at an advance stage, the existing policy is still appropriate and will be carried forward into the Joint Local Plan's Appendix 5. The site falls within the settlement boundary for Abingdon-on-Thames, and so the principle of development is also supported by Policy SP1.

---

<sup>2</sup> Planning application reference: P17/V1336/O

<sup>3</sup> Planning application reference: P21/V0024/FUL

<sup>4</sup> Planning application reference: P23/V2861/O

## Category c: sites without planning permission

- 2.10 14 of the sites in our current local plans do not currently benefit from planning permission<sup>5</sup>. We subjected these sites to a detailed assessment as part of our preferred options consultation, to determine whether the allocation needs to remain as is, be amended, or whether the allocation is unsuitable to carry forward into this plan.
- 2.11 We have drawn from planning practice guidance to inform our assessment, notably guidance on how to assess the suitability of potential and existing allocated sites contained under the “Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment”<sup>6</sup> (HELAA) and “Plan Making”<sup>7</sup> sections respectively. While we draw on the HELAA guidance in this section, this process is distinct and separate from our HELAA, which can be viewed online<sup>8</sup>. Our HELAA sets general density figures to establish an initial capacity figure. The specific capacity of allocated sites has been refined by a more detailed consideration of constraints, opportunities and the range of land uses to be accommodated onsite, as shown on the illustrative concept plans and/or within the detailed wording of the site allocation policies. This is consistent with Joint Local Plan Policy DES4 – Optimising densities.
- 2.12 We have provided the detailed appraisals in Appendix 2, which have followed these steps derived from planning practice guidance:

Step	Description
1	<p><b>Have circumstances changed which have altered the availability of the site as allocated in the adopted local plan?</b></p> <p>We have assessed whether the site promoter is still promoting the land to the council, examining our recent call for land and buildings available for change<sup>9</sup>, our housing land supply statements<sup>10 11</sup>, and progress towards planning applications.</p>
2	<p><b>Have circumstances changed which alter the achievability of the site as allocated in the adopted local plan?</b></p> <p>We considered any issues affecting viability and developability of the site.</p>

<sup>5</sup> One of these 14 sites, ‘Land North of Bayswater Brook’ (the main parcel of the allocation), has approval to grant planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation, following consideration of the application (P22/S4618/O) at 9 October 2024 South Oxfordshire Planning Committee.

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 3-018-20190722

<sup>7</sup> Paragraph 065 Reference ID: 61-065-20190723

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.southandvale.gov.uk/JLPEvidence>

<sup>9</sup> <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/83c42d77f9104794a8cb49a815ff2352>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/south-oxfordshire-district-council/planning-and-development/local-plan-and-planning-policies/our-development-plan/five-year-land-supply/>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/vale-of-white-horse-district-council/planning-and-development/local-plan-and-planning-policies/supporting-documents/>

3	<p><b>Have circumstances changed that alter the suitability of the site as allocated in the adopted local plan?</b></p> <p>We have tested if allocated sites are proposing new homes within National Landscapes (formally Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or Green Belt. We have proposed not to retain allocated sites that would result in new homes being developed in these locations as national policies give significant protection to these areas. We have also tested the sites against three key principles in the emerging spatial strategy (Policy SP1). These are whether the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. closely located, and well related, to an existing major employment site in Science Vale?</li> <li>B. in a Garden Village or Garden Town?</li> <li>C. is the site identified in the adopted local plan as addressing the previously agreed unmet housing need from Oxford (i.e. a site located close to Oxford City): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Land North of Bayswater Brook</li> <li>ii. Land South of Grenoble Road</li> <li>iii. Land at Northfield</li> <li>iv. North of Abingdon-on-Thames</li> <li>v. North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames</li> <li>vi. North-West Radley</li> <li>vii. South of Kennington</li> <li>viii. Dalton Barracks</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Does the policy need any minor presentation changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b></p> <p>For example, where the policy cross references to other policies that would be superseded by the Joint Local Plan or where the policy can be more clearly worded.</p>

2.13 If the answer to all of the questions in steps 1 to 4<sup>12</sup> in bold above was **no**, then the existing site allocation policy is considered sound to carry over and we have proposed to present that policy in Appendix 5 of the Joint Local Plan.

2.14 If the answer to any of the steps 1 to 4 questions in bold above was **yes**, then we considered whether we could tweak the policy to pass the availability, achievability and suitability tests in steps 1 to 3, or if it requires presentational changes under step 4. This included, for example, changes to text details / criteria, as well as considering whether we need to change the site concept plan, boundary or total homes on the site. In these circumstances where a change can rectify these challenges, we have

<sup>12</sup> Previously presented as 2a-d in our residential focused site allocations topic paper supporting our preferred options consultation January 2024



proposed an update to the policy accordingly and the continued allocation in the Joint Local Plan.

- 2.15 If we could not amend the existing policy to ensure suitability, achievability (deliverability), and availability, then we have proposed that the site allocation is not retained (i.e. the allocated status is proposed to be removed from the site in the emerging Joint Local Plan).
- 2.16 The result of this assessment shows that 3 of these 14 sites would not be suitable to continue for allocation, as well as a separate, distinct parcel of land on one other (Land at Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford).
- 2.17 This means the Joint Local Plan has continued 11 of the existing allocations that do not currently have planning permission in the current local plans. The assessment did show that these 11 site allocation policies would need some amendments to ensure they are consistent with priorities and other policies in the Joint Local Plan and to reflect any change in circumstances. In some cases, we have included updated or new concept plans (for sites of 500 or more homes), this is to reflect the updated policies and to ensure consistency of approach across South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse allocations. Previously only South Oxfordshire District Council used concept plans. The councils' current allocation policies are structured and presented differently, so the new policies are shown in a consistent way. Where relevant, we have also updated the allocation boundary and shown the updated boundary on the proposed policies map. The proposed updated policies for these sites are set out in Chapter 8 of the plan, in Policies AS1-A10 and AS16.
- 2.18 We have also subjected the 14 current allocated sites without planning permission to sustainability appraisal.
- 2.19 Through the preferred options we also considered if there were additional well located brownfield sites that needed allocation (i.e. would not be policy compliant if brought forward as a windfall application). This led to us extending the Dalton Barracks allocation from 1,200 to 2,750 homes. We have set our reasons for this in the proforma for the site in Appendix 2.

# Stage 1b: Reviewing the existing employment-led allocations and other sites likely to contribute to employment land supply

## Starting point

- 2.20 The councils' starting point for site assessment work for the Joint Local Plan was to consider all the sites already allocated by the Local Plans for each district. These allocated employment sites or mixed-use sites with employment fell into three categories depending on the progress towards development since they were allocated:
- a. have finished construction and have no more capacity remaining
  - b. have some capacity remaining from their allocation
  - c. have full capacity remaining from their allocation
- 2.21 Appendix 3 shows every allocation in our current local plans, and whether they fall into category a, b or c as set out above.
- 2.22 The Joint Local Plan will have influence on sites in categories b and c, including on whether development should take place at all for sites which do not yet have planning permission and are not already existing employment sites. The site promoters for those sites will still need to secure planning permission, and the councils will use the policies in the Joint Local Plan, when it is adopted to determine those.
- 2.23 A description of the three categories, alongside the sites included in each category, is set out below.

## Category a: sites that have finished construction and have no more capacity remaining

- 2.24 On sites where construction has been completed, there is no need for a Joint Local Plan policy to allocate the site. It does not need 'allocation status' anymore. The review showed that four sites in our current local plans have finished construction and do not need to be allocated in the Joint Local Plan:
- Southmead Industrial Estate West, Didcot
  - Abingdon Business Park
  - Land adjacent to A420
  - Land North of Park Road, Faringdon

## **Category b: sites with some capacity remaining from their allocation**

- 2.25 Sites with some but not all of their allocation remaining, either due to planning permission being granted or construction being completed for part of the site, are carried forward with a reduced allocation to reflect this change in capacity. This applies to the following two sites, listed alongside the remaining capacity:
- Culham Science Centre (now Culham Campus), 2.3ha
  - Harwell Campus, 93ha
- 2.26 Milton Park is an allocation with 5.36ha capacity remaining. There is a Local Development Order covering the entire site. This enables development to come forward at Milton Park through the Local Development Order process, so it is not necessary to allocate development through the Joint Local Plan at this site. Although it is not being carried forward as an allocated site, the remaining employment capacity at Milton Park has nonetheless been accounted for in the employment land supply set out in policy JT1.

## **Category c: sites with all of the capacity remaining from their allocation**

- 2.27 Allocated sites which continue to have capacity in accordance with their current allocation have been reviewed to assess whether they are still fit for purpose for continued employment use. This applies to the following sites:
- Monument Business Park, Chalgrove
  - Hithercroft Road and Lupton Road, Wallingford
  - Junction of Whitley Road and Lester Way, Wallingford
  - Southmead Industrial Estate
  - Abingdon Science Park
  - Didcot A
  - Grove Technology Park
  - South of Park Road, Faringdon
- 2.28 Core Policy 16: Didcot A Power Station from the Vale of White Horse Local Plan has been 'carried forward' for this site in Appendix 5 to the Joint Local Plan. This is to ensure that the overarching policy framework for this allocation remains in place, to inform subsequent planning applications on this site (such as reserved matters applications for the outline planning consents already granted). The other sites with capacity remaining do not

have detailed policy text in the adopted plans, instead they are simply named as employment sites in overarching policies, and so there is no specific policy text to be carried forward.

- 2.29 Two of our existing strategic site allocations which are being carried forward also include a requirement to deliver employment land, which has not yet been constructed:
- Berinsfield Garden Village, 5ha of employment land
  - Land South of Grenoble Road, 10ha of employment land

## **Reviewing other sites that are likely to contribute to employment land supply**

- 2.30 In addition to the capacity afforded by the sites in categories b and c, there are two other sites that are likely to contribute to employment land supply, these are the former Esso Research Centre and the strategic allocation at Dalton Barracks.
- 2.31 The former Esso Research Centre site was allocated as ‘Milton Hill Business and Technology Centre’ in the former Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. It was recognised as a saved allocation in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1. It was not carried forward in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2, as it was considered that development could proceed according to *Core Policy 28: New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites*. As a former employment site on brownfield land it is capable of coming forward as employment development once more, this has been confirmed by the landowner. Its reuse is consistent with the requirements of policy JT1 for unallocated employment sites, and therefore in order to acknowledge its likely contribution to employment land supply it is considered appropriate to allocate it once again.
- 2.32 The Dalton Barracks strategic site allocation was reviewed to determine whether it was appropriate to quantify the employment provision to be required on the site, as the current policy does not state a specific quantity. Given its Garden Village status, its increased residential allocation, and to ensure consistency with the approach to some other strategic-scale allocations, employment provision is appropriate on this site. This has been quantified as employment opportunities amounting to 7.4 hectares via the Dalton Barracks Employment Assessment, part of the Joint Local Plan evidence base<sup>13</sup>. Of the three scenarios presented in the Dalton Barracks Employment Assessment, we consider the second scenario, which proposes allocating employment land to accommodate working age adults arising from the proposed 2,750 allocated new homes, to be the most appropriate. This is due to the relationship scale of needs arising from the residential development proposed at the Garden Village, and the proximity of other employment opportunities.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.southandvale.gov.uk/JLPEvidence>

## **Assessing the availability, achievability and suitability of the allocated employment sites**

2.33 The allocated sites with some capacity for employment development remaining (category b), the allocated sites with all capacity for employment development remaining (category c) and the other sites that are likely to contribute to employment land supply (the former Esso Research Centre and Dalton Barracks) were all further assessed to determine if they remain available, achievable and suitable for development as set out below:

- **Availability:** We reviewed the latest information from our HELAA and other sources to assess whether the site would still be available for its allocated development by 31 March 2041 (the end of the Joint Local Plan period).
- **Achievability:** We assessed whether the site's current allocation could be delivered on site – i.e. whether the site has capacity to accommodate the current policy requirements.
- **Suitability:** We have developed a new employment policy (Policy JT1: Meeting employment needs), which itself has been subject to SA alongside alternatives. Sites with capacity remaining were tested against this new employment policy to determine whether they were still suitable to allocate for development.

2.34 The results of this achievable, available, sustainable assessment are included in the table in Appendix 3. In summary, the sites in categories b and c, plus the other sites likely to contribute to employment land supply are all available, achievable and suitable. They have therefore been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal, alongside the alternative sites identified in Stage 2 outlined below.

## Stage 2: Identifying alternative residential and employment sites:

### The HELAA

- 2.35 The councils' Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) assessed all potential development sites across the districts. The HELAA identified these potential sites from the following sources:
- a. Sites already allocated in adopted and emerging development plan documents and supplementary planning documents;
  - b. Information from land owners and developers;
  - c. Information from residents and parish councils on land they believe has development potential in their area;
  - d. Planning application records;
  - e. The brownfield land registers;
  - f. The empty property registers;
  - g. Sites in the ownership of local authorities and other public sector bodies; and
  - h. Desktop surveys undertaken by council officers.
- 2.36 This identified a total of 1466 sites for the HELAA to assess; 755 in South Oxfordshire and 711 in the Vale of White Horse. The HELAA then filtered this range of sites through a two-step process, providing the councils with a list of sites that had development potential once we had applied some key constraints. The first step applied "absolute constraints". This removed all sites that fell entirely within one or more of the following constraints, or where partially covered by such constraints, where the remainder of the site was less than 0.25ha<sup>14</sup>:
- a. Land within Flood Zone 3b
  - b. Sites of Special Scientific Interest
  - c. Special Areas of Conservation
  - d. Special Protection Areas
  - e. Town Greens

---

<sup>14</sup> (or 5 homes/500sqm of economic floorspace)

- f. Ancient woodland
  - g. Scheduled monuments
  - h. Registered parks and gardens
- 2.37 Following step 1 the HELAA identified 1,375 sites; 717 in South Oxfordshire and 658 in the Vale of White Horse. The HELAA then applied a second step that considered whether sites were affected by further constraints such as greenfield Green Belt land, greenfield sites in the National Landscape, and sites within Flood Zone 3a.
- 2.38 To identify alternative sites to test through sustainability appraisal, and as a pool of sites to compare against our existing allocations, we decided to take the outcomes of step 1 of the HELAA and not step 2. This was to ensure we had as wide a choice of sites as possible to assess.
- 2.39 Some sites within the HELAA overlap, with some areas represented by multiple promoters in multiple HELAA entries. Where this is the case, we have assessed the larger site area in this assessment to ensure all potentially suitable land was assessed.

### **Moving from the HELAA to a list of reasonable alternatives**

- 2.40 It would be unmanageable to undertake detailed assessments and sustainability appraisal on all 1,375 sites following step 1 of the HELAA. We therefore applied an additional set of criteria to identify sites for further testing that aligned with the spatial strategy in Policy SP1:
- a. Locational criteria:
    - i. Within, or immediately adjacent to the existing built-up area of a Tier 1, 2 or 3 settlement; or
    - ii. Within Tiers 1 to 4 if a brownfield site.
  - b. Spatial constraints:
    - i. Fall outside the North Wessex Downs and Chilterns National Landscapes
    - ii. Fall outside the Oxford Green Belt
  - c. Development capacity / size threshold:
    - i. Greenfield sites with a capacity for 500 or more homes
    - ii. Brownfield sites with a capacity for 100 or more homes
    - iii. 1ha+ for employment land

- 2.41 Applying this broad spatial strategy compliance criteria resulted in 43 “reasonable alternatives” for us to subject to sustainability appraisal, against the allocations that remained suitable to carry over into the Joint Local Plan.

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

- 2.42 The Sustainability Appraisal showed that all sites performed differently against different sustainability objectives. The appraisal does show some broad similarities across all sites though:
- a. almost all sites perform negatively against the objectives of reducing pollution of all kinds, and meeting environmental targets for air and water (SA objective 1).
  - b. all sites performed negatively or neutral against the objectives to:
    - i. protect, restore, and enhance biodiversity in our districts (SA objective 4).
    - ii. enhance all heritage assets in the districts (SA Objective 6).
    - iii. protect and manage the character and appearance of the landscape, and important gaps between settlements (SA Objective 7).
    - iv. achieve sustainable water resource management (SA Objective 11).
  - c. almost all sites performed as having mixed or minor effects against the objectives to conserve and manage natural resources (SA Objective 8).
  - d. almost all sites performed positively against the objectives to:
    - i. safeguard the health and wellbeing of the population (SA objective 2).
    - ii. reduce the need to travel and increasing access to sustainable and active travel (SA objective 3).
    - iii. contribute to achieving net zero carbon emissions in both districts and to promote adaptation and resilience to climate change (SA objective 5).
    - iv. plan for housing needs and affordable housing (SA objective 9).
    - v. provide a resilient economy in the districts (SA objective 10).
- 2.43 The Sustainability Appraisal does not show a clear distinction between the reasonable alternative sites and those existing appropriate allocations from



the current local plans and the 2 other appropriate employment sites. There are a handful of sites that perform marginally better against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives collectively, but these are located in the western end of the Vale of White Horse, so do not align well with the spatial strategy. Additionally, a collective approach of assessing Sustainability Appraisal performance overall must be considered with caution, as a negative performance against one objective is not necessarily off-set by a positive performance against a different objective.

## **Following Sustainability Appraisal**

- 2.44 Following feedback from the Sustainability Appraisal on these sites and acknowledging the capacity of the sites exceed our needs, we then applied a further final filtering process to determine whether a site would closely align with Policy SP1. This would only carry forward alternative sites that meet these strategic, spatial criteria:
- a. within Science Vale, or
  - b. within or adjacent to a Garden Community (Berinsfield, Dalton Barracks, or Didcot), or
  - c. adjacent to Oxford, or
  - d. brownfield.
- 2.45 After applying this final filter, the councils had 17 alternative sites to consider in detail along with the existing 11 allocated sites that passed step 1a above. Appendix 4 of this paper provides an assessment of these alternative sites and provides site specific reasons why the councils decided not to progress any alternative sites for allocation. These included:
- a. the sites are for significant number of homes at settlements that already have planning permission for thousands of homes (for example, Didcot, Wantage and Grove).
  - b. there are existing uses on site that would need to have their tenancies ended, and have site remediation work take place - meaning homes on these sites are unlikely to come forward sooner than current allocations.
  - c. the sites are of too small a scale to replace existing allocations.
  - d. impacts on national landscapes.
  - e. physical barriers between sites and the settlement, making integration and active travel challenging / non- deliverable.
- 2.46 Policies HOU1 and HOU2 identify that the councils have more homes allocated in the plan than the housing requirement. This means that there is

an oversupply of housing and we do not need to allocate additional housing sites to meet our needs. Therefore, any alternative sites would be replacements for, not additions to, the existing allocations.

- 2.47 Similarly, policy JT1 identifies that our employment land supply from sites allocated in the plan exceeds the need identified in the Employment Land Needs Assessment. Therefore, any alternative sites would be replacements for, not additions to, the existing allocations.
- 2.48 Many unallocated housing or employment sites are likely to be much further behind the planning process than those in an existing development plan. This would mean any replacement site would likely deliver housing or employment later than those existing allocations that have secured land deals, begun pre-application discussions or submitted planning applications, and may already have developers on board. Choosing alternative sites to our existing allocations would therefore generally result in slower housing delivery and availability of employment land.
- 2.49 Furthermore, transport infrastructure is at capacity on the Didcot-Culham-Berinsfield corridor. The County Council has historically raised objections to any development creating a new dwelling in this area due to the pressure on the transport network. As a result, new development in this area is dependent on the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF1) to deliver a new Thames River Crossing between Didcot and Culham. HIF funding is from central government and unlocks the existing housing allocations in this area (principally those at Didcot, Culham, and Berinsfield), including those sites that have planning permission and are currently building out. Replacing these allocations with alternatives could undermine the delivery of HIF funded infrastructure, and result in the reinstatement of restrictions on development in the Didcot-Culham-Berinsfield corridor.

## **The Sequential Flood Risk Test**

- 2.50 We have undertaken a sequential flood risk test, and exception test, in accordance with Paragraph 167 of the NPPF, and guidance contained in the Planning Practice Guidance. This is because some of the existing allocations, and reasonable alternatives contain land at a higher risk of flooding.
- 2.51 We have presented this sequential flood risk test, and the subsequent exception tests in Appendix 5 of this report.
- 2.52 This process demonstrated that it is not possible for development to be located in areas with a lower risk of flooding, while taking into account wider sustainable development objectives of the Joint Local Plan. Appendix 4 of this report identifies all the alternative sites, and explains why these sites do not meet the wider objectives of the plan.
- 2.53 Appendix 5 further demonstrates that all the sites subject to the exception test have passed it.

## Section 3: Conclusions

- 3.1 The councils each have housing and employments need that we need to address through making land use allocations in the Joint Local Plan. Our starting point for considering how we would meet that need was examining the existing allocations in our current local plans. Many of these sites have already secured planning permission, and so the Joint Local Plan cannot affect whether the principle of development on those sites is acceptable (see Appendix 1 for the residential focused site allocations' statuses, and Appendix 3 for the employment site allocations' statuses). We have carried over the existing allocations for sites that have planning permission, but have not built out entirely. This is so that we can still use those existing allocation policies to determine reserved matters applications as they come forward.
- 3.2 14 of our existing residential allocations had not secured planning permission, and so we looked to these first to address our needs. This is because these sites formed a sound strategy in our adopted plans, and in most instances, site promoters have made good progress toward securing planning permission. We therefore assessed these 14 allocations to determine whether they remained appropriate to carry over as allocations into the Joint Local Plan. To do so, we tested the sites against three tests derived from the Planning Practice Guidance to determine whether they remained available, achievable, and suitable for development (see Appendix 2 for these assessments). This showed that 3 of these 14 sites would not be suitable to continue for allocation, as well as a separate, distinct parcel of land on one other (Land at Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford).
- 3.3 After reviewing the existing employment allocations we found that 12 of them have remaining capacity. We identified an additional 2 sites that are likely to contribute to employment land supply. All these 14 sites are available, achievable and suitable for employment development.
- 3.4 Next, we identified alternative sites to test against these existing appropriate allocations and the 2 other appropriate employment sites. We started with our HELAA, and then applied some broad locational, size, and constraints-based criteria to find sites that broadly aligned with the spatial strategy. This resulted in 43 alternative sites, which we subjected to Sustainability Appraisal, alongside the existing allocations that remained suitable for allocation.
- 3.5 The Sustainability Appraisal did not provide any clear distinction between the reasonable alternatives and the proposed allocations, with sites scoring broadly similarly against all objectives.
- 3.6 Following the Sustainability Appraisal we assessed each of the reasonable alternatives against a stricter alignment with the spatial strategy, namely only including sites that are; within Science Vale, within or adjacent to a Garden Community (Berinsfield, Dalton Barracks, or Didcot), adjacent to Oxford, or on brownfield land. We then assessed in more detail those sites which met these spatial strategy criteria and considered that those existing allocations

that remained suitable for allocation, were still the most appropriate sites to carry forward into the Joint Local Plan to meet our needs.

- 3.7 Alongside this process, we subjected the existing allocations and the alternative sites to a sequential flood risk test and where relevant an exception test. This was because some of the existing allocations and reasonable alternative sites contained areas of high or medium flood risk. We have presented this in appendix 5. This shows that although a number of the proposed allocations have areas of flood risk, they remain appropriate to allocate because the sites would deliver wider sustainability benefits and the development can be made safe for the intended lifespan including under climate change conditions.
- 3.8 By following the process set out in this paper we have identified a housing supply that exceeds need from within existing allocated residential sites or within existing mixed-use strategic allocations. These are considered the most appropriate sites to meet housing needs, and so alternative residential sites have not been allocated for development. We have however expanded the Dalton Barracks allocation to ensure the future of this non-Green Belt brownfield site, which is located in a Garden Village, is appropriately planned for through this Joint Local Plan.
- 3.9 In accordance with Paragraph 70 of the NPPF, we have tested how much of our housing supply is made up of sites of less than 1ha. As of 1 April 2024, in South Oxfordshire, we have a specific supply of 667 homes on known small sites with planning permission and a windfall allowance on minor sites (10 or fewer homes) of 1,330. This totals 1,977 homes, which is in excess of 10% of South Oxfordshire's housing requirement of 16,530. In Vale of White Horse, we have a specific supply of 956 homes on known small sites with planning permission and a windfall allowance on minor sites (10 or fewer homes) of 1,638. This totals 2,594, which is in excess of Vale of White Horse's housing requirement of 14,490.
- 3.10 By following the process set out in this paper we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations. These are considered the most appropriate sites to meet employment needs, and so alternative employment sites have not been allocated for development.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Status of the existing residential focused site allocations in the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse existing Local Plans

District	Existing development plan document	Existing site allocation reference	Existing site allocation name	Category	Status in the Joint Local Plan
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT7	Land at Chalgrove Airfield	c	Allocation not carried forward
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT9	Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre	c	Allocation carried forward with some amendments (Policy AS2)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT10i	Land at Berinsfield Garden Village	c	Allocation carried forward with some amendments (Policy AS1)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT11	Land south of Grenoble Road	c	Allocation carried forward with some amendments (Policy AS3)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT12	Land at Northfield	c	Allocation carried forward with some amendments (Policy AS4)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT13	Land North of Bayswater Brook	c	Allocation carried forward with some amendments (Policy AS5)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	STRAT14	Land at Wheatley Campus	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2d with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2a	Ladygrove East	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2a with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2b	Didcot North East	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2b with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2c	Great Western Park, Didcot	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed

**Appendix 1: Status of the existing allocations in the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Local Plans**

District	Existing development plan document	Existing site allocation reference	Existing site allocation name	Category	Status in the Joint Local Plan
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2d	Vauxhall Barracks	c	Allocation carried forward with additional design information (Policy AS16)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2e	Orchard Centre Phase 2	c	Allocation carried forward with additional design information (Policy AS6)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2f	Didcot Gateway	c	Allocation carried forward with additional design information (Policy AS7)
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2g	Hadden Hill, Didcot	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H2h	Land South of the A4130, Didcot	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H3	Land West of Wallingford	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2c with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H5	Land to the West of Priests Close, Nettlebed	c	Allocation not carried forward
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H6	Joyce Grove, Nettlebed	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2e with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
South Oxfordshire	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035	H7	Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station	c	Allocation not carried forward
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	North of Abingdon-on-Thames	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2n with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2v with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP

**Appendix 1: Status of the existing allocations in the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Local Plans**

District	Existing development plan document	Existing site allocation reference	Existing site allocation name	Category	Status in the Joint Local Plan
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	North-West of Radley	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2i with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	South of Kennington	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2j with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	Crab Hill (North East Wantage and South East Grove)	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2u with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	Grove Airfield	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2q with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	Monks Farm (North Grove)	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2p with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	Valley Park	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2r with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	North-West of Valley Park	c	Allocation carried forward with some amendments (Policy AS9)
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	West of Harwell	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	Milton Heights (Smaller Village)	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2h with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP

**Appendix 1: Status of the existing allocations in the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Local Plans**

District	Existing development plan document	Existing site allocation reference	Existing site allocation name	Category	Status in the Joint Local Plan
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	East of Sutton Courtenay	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2x with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	Land South of Park Road, Faringdon	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2m with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	South-West of Faringdon	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2g with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	East of Coxwell Road, Faringdon	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	South of Faringdon	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2o with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	North of Shrivenham	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2k with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1	Core Policy 4	West of Stanford-in-the-Vale	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2l with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Core Policy 4a	North of East Hanney	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2w with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Core Policy 4a	North-East of East Hanney	a	Site complete, allocation no longer needed with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Core Policy 4a	East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2s with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP




**Appendix 1:** Status of the existing allocations in the South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Local Plans

<b>District</b>	<b>Existing development plan document</b>	<b>Existing site allocation reference</b>	<b>Existing site allocation name</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Status in the Joint Local Plan</b>
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Core Policy 4a	South-East of Marcham	b	Allocation carried forward in Policy HOU2t with detailed policy wording presented in Appendix 5 of the JLP
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Core Policy 4a	Dalton Barracks	c	Allocation carried forward with additional design information (Policy AS10) and an extension of the allocation to cover the brownfield area of the site that is inset from the Green Belt. The allocated amount of development and uses reflect the larger allocated area.
Vale of White Horse	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2	Core Policy 4a	North-West of Grove	c	Allocation carried forward with additional design information (Policy AS8)

## Appendix 2: Existing residential focused site allocations without planning permission review

### Site Name: Land at Berinsfield Garden Village



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	STRAT10i
<b>Site Size</b>	132 hectares
<b>Description of the <u>existing</u> site allocation</b>	Land within the strategic allocation at Berinsfield Garden Village will be developed to provide around 1,700 new homes within the Local Plan 2035 period, at least 5 hectares of additional employment land and supporting services and facilities. The number of new homes should demonstrably support the regeneration of Berinsfield and the delivery of the necessary social infrastructure.
<b>Available</b>	Yes

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land at Berinsfield Garden Village


<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site promoter Ptarmigan is working towards producing a masterplan for this site. The site is actively being promoted, demonstrated by on-going engagement between the site promoter, the Council and other relevant stakeholders.		
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes		
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>D</b>
	No	Yes	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land to the east of the village of Berinsfield. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscape.</p> <p>In June 2019, Berinsfield was awarded Garden Village status by the Government. The Garden Village includes undeveloped land to the east of the existing settlement which makes up this site (STRAT10i). The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy includes focusing new housing at Garden communities which includes Berinsfield.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	We would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required</p>		
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.		

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land at Berinsfield Garden Village

	Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
**Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre**

**Site Name: Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	STRAT9
<b>Site Size</b>	217 hectares
<b>Description of the <u>existing</u> site allocation</b>	Land within the strategic allocation adjacent to Culham Science Centre will be developed to deliver approximately 3,500 new homes, with approximately 2,100 homes within the Local Plan 2035 period, a net increase of at least 7.3 hectares of employment land in combination with the adjacent Science Centre, 3 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and supporting services and facilities.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site promoter is Commercial Estates Group (CEG). The Council has agreed a planning performance agreement with the site promoter. The site is actively being promoted demonstrated by on-

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre

	going engagement between the site promoter, the Council and other relevant stakeholders.		
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes		
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	<p>Since the adoption of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035, we have realised that it has been challenging to apply the requirement for 7.3ha of employment land on both this site, and the neighbouring land at Culham Campus. This is because the sites are in different ownership. To make this policy achievable, we will need to remove reference to joint delivery of 7.3ha of employment land.</p> <p>We are not aware of any other change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development</p>		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	Yes	No	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land adjacent to Culham Science Centre, which is a major employment site in the Science Vale area. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the Green Belt and National Landscapes.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy identifies Science Vale as a focus for new development. The strategy supports sites that are closely located, and well related to existing major employment centres where they are not within the Green Belt or a National Landscape.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	We would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p>		


**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre

	Suitability – No change required
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.  Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.



**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
**Land at Chalgrove Airfield**

**Site Name: Land at Chalgrove Airfield**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	STRAT7
<b>Site Size</b>	255 hectares
<b>Description of the <u>existing</u> site allocation</b>	Land within the strategic allocation at Chalgrove Airfield will be developed to deliver approximately 3,000 new homes with at least 2,105 to be delivered within the Local Plan 2035 period, 5 hectares of employment land, 3 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers, education facilities, public open spaces, retail and supporting services and other community facilities.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site promoter is Homes England. They are actively promoting the site for development and submitted information to us. The site is actively being promoted demonstrated by on-going engagement between the site promoter, the Council and other relevant stakeholders.



**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Land at Chalgrove Airfield


<b>Achievable</b>	No										
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	<p>The site promoter (Homes England) has identified issues with complying with the existing policy for the currently allocated site. An objection from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) regarding the proposed layout of the runway led to Homes England withdrawing its outline planning application for this site in May 2021.</p> <p>The current allocation of 3,000 homes is not achievable within the existing allocated site boundary. The site is leased by Killinchy Aerospace Holdings Limited (until 2063). Killinchy's operating subsidiary Martin Baker Aircraft Company Ltd develops and tests ejector seats for armed forces around the globe. The current site boundary does not allow enough space for 3,000 new homes and a realigned runway delivered to Civil Aviation Authority standards. Homes England has advised that the site boundary would need to be extended (predominantly to the north into currently unallocated, greenfield land) to address the CAA's concerns about the runway.</p>										
<b>Suitable</b>	No										
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>A</b></td> <td><b>B</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>C</b></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	No	No	<b>C</b>	No
Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No										
Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)											
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>										
No	No										
<b>C</b>	No										
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is not located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape. The site is not a good fit with the emerging spatial strategy for the Joint Local Plan (see Policy SP1), which involves delivering planned development within Science Vale, focussing new housing at the garden communities of Didcot, Berinsfield and Dalton Barracks, on well-located brownfield sites, and maintaining existing sites that contribute to addressing Oxford's unmet housing need.</p> <p>An extension to the site boundary to include additional land in the control of the site promoter to facilitate a relocation of the runway, to address the CAA concerns, would result in the site's greenfield</p>										

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
 Land at Chalgrove Airfield

	<p>footprint extending even further. It would further diminish the extent to which this is a brownfield site since it would involve building on greenfield land. The Joint Local Plan’s strategy is to support development on well-located brownfield land. Therefore, whilst Homes England do control the land to facilitate an extension, expanding the allocation would result in the site further conflicting with the emerging spatial strategy of the Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>The Councils consider that the significant change in social and environmental priorities of the Joint Local Plan now render the site unsuitable for development.</p>
<p><b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b></p>	<p>Notwithstanding the councils’ conclusions regarding suitability, if the Joint Local Plan continued to allocate this site, we would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.</p>
<p><b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b></p>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – The Joint Local Plan could extend the site boundary to include additional land in the control of the site promoter to facilitate a relocation of the runway. However, this would result in the site’s greenfield footprint extending even further. It would further diminish the extent to which this is a brownfield site since it would involve a relocation of an existing use onto greenfield land. Therefore, while Homes England do control the land to facilitate an extension, expanding the allocation would result in the site further conflicting with the emerging spatial strategy of the Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>Suitability – The Councils don’t think changes to this policy will be able to make it suitable. The emerging spatial strategy does not support development in this location.</p>
<p><b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b></p>	<p>Preferred option: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p> <p>There are no alternative options as the site is not suitable for residential development in principle.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>The allocation <b>is not recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p>

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
**Land South of Grenoble Road, Edge of Oxford**

**Site Name: Land South of Grenoble Road, Edge of Oxford**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668


<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	STRAT11
<b>Site Size</b>	153 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	Land within the strategic allocation at Grenoble Road will be developed to deliver approximately 3000 new homes, 2,480 expected within the Local Plan 2035 period, provide at least 10 hectares of employment land incorporating an extension to the Oxford Science Park, a Park and Ride site adjacent to the A4074 and supporting el services and facilities.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site is being promoted by three landowners: Magdalen College, Oxford City Council, and Thames Water known as South Oxford Science Village Partners. The site is actively being promoted demonstrated by on-going engagement between the site promoter, the Council and other relevant stakeholders.
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land South of Grenoble Road, Edge of Oxford

	site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	No	Yes
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land adjacent to the south of Oxford. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</p> <p>The South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 identified the site as helping to provide for Oxford City's unmet housing need, including affordable housing need, close to where that need arises.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	We would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required</p>		
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	<p>Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.</p> <p>Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.		

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
**Land at Northfield, Edge of Oxford**

**Site Name: Land at Northfield, Edge of Oxford**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	STRAT12
<b>Site Size</b>	68 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	Land within the strategic allocation at Northfield will be developed to deliver approximately 1,800 new homes and supporting services and facilities within the Local Plan 2035 period.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site is being promoted by L&Q Estates. The site is actively being promoted demonstrated by on-going engagement between the site promoter, the Council and other relevant stakeholders.
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this




**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Land at Northfield, Edge of Oxford

	site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	No	Yes
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land adjacent to the south of Oxford. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</p> <p>The South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 identified the site as helping to provide for Oxford City's unmet housing need, including affordable housing need, close to where that need arises.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	We would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required</p>		
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	<p>Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.</p> <p>Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.		

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
**Land north of Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford**

**Site Name: Land North of Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	STRAT13
<b>Site Size</b>	110 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	Land within the strategic allocation at Land North of Bayswater Brook will be developed to deliver approximately 1,100 new homes and supporting services and facilities within the Local Plan 2035 period.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	<p>The largest part of the site known as Land North of Bayswater Brook (LNBB) is being promoted by Christ Church and Dorchester Residential Management. The site is actively being promoted demonstrated by the live planning application for this site (Ref: P22/S4618/O).</p> <p>The allocation in Local Plan 2035 also includes a parcel of land to the southeast known as Sandhills, which is also being promoted. This is separate from the wider allocation and therefore would not prevent the wider site coming forward.</p>
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes (in part)
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of most of the site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years)

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Land north of Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford

	<p>and the viability of the Land North of Bayswater Brook part of the development.</p> <p>We have identified significant issues affecting the developability (the likelihood of part of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the Sandhills element of the development.</p> <p>Access to this part of the site has to cross a bridleway over unregistered land. Oxfordshire County Council has advised that this is not possible, and therefore the site is not achievable. South Oxfordshire District Council refused a planning application for outline planning permission on this site partly for this reason (P24/S0133/O) in April 2024. Alternative access arrangements may result in the development being unviable.</p>		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes (in part)		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	No	Yes
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located directly adjoining the eastern boundary of Oxford City. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</p> <p>The Local Plan 2035 identified the site as helping to provide for Oxford City’s unmet housing need, including affordable housing need, close to where that need arises.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan’s emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the conclusion regarding the suitability of the site in accordance with the emerging Joint Local Plan strategy, there are specific issues identified affecting the suitability of</p>		



**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Land north of Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford


	<p>the Sandhills element of the allocation. Access to the Sandhills site must cross a bridleway, over unregistered land. Oxfordshire County Council has advised that this crossing is not possible, and therefore the site is not achievable. South Oxfordshire District Council refused a planning application for outline planning permission on this site partly for this reason (P24/S0133/O) in April 2024. Therefore, this part of the site is not suitable based on highways objections.</p>
<p><b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b></p>	<p>We would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.</p>
<p><b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b></p>	<p><b>Land North of Bayswater Brook</b></p> <p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required</p> <p><b>Sandhills</b></p> <p>Availability – The Council are not aware of any availability issues with this parcel of land.</p> <p>Achievability – The Joint Local Plan could extend the site boundary to include additional land in order to enable alternative access arrangements. This would require development to take place in land currently designated as Green Belt. The provision of a link road could make the development unviable.</p> <p>Suitability – The prospective developers have indicated that they would like vehicles to access the Sandhills site across a bridleway from Burdell Avenue and Delbush Avenue. Oxfordshire County Council has advised that this is not possible given the unregistered land upon which the bridleway sits, and therefore the site is not achievable. Additionally, Oxfordshire County Council has advised that any other potential means of access via Waynflote Road would be unlikely to be able to accommodate many further trips given geometric constraints and gradients. Therefore, this part of the site is not suitable based on highways objections. South Oxfordshire District Council refused a planning application for outline planning permission on this site partly for this reason (P24/S0133/O) in April 2024.</p>

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land north of Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford

<p><b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b></p>	<p>Preferred option: De-allocate the Sandhills element of the site, but retain the rest of the allocation subject to presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.</p> <p>Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>The allocation of the land north of Bayswater Brook <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>The parcel of land north of Sandhills is <b>not recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p>

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
 Land to the West of Priest Close, Nettlebed

**Site Name: Land to the West of Priest Close, Nettlebed**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	H5
<b>Site Size</b>	0.76 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	A residential development of approximately 11 dwellings.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The councils are not aware of any change in circumstances that affect availability of this site for development.
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development
<b>Suitable</b>	No

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Land to the West of Priest Close, Nettlebed


<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	Yes	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	No	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on greenfield land on the edge of the village of Nettlebed. The village of Nettlebed and the site itself are washed over by the Chilterns National Landscape. When allocating this site through the Local Plan 2035 our landscape evidence (South Oxfordshire District Council - Landscape Assessment Update (Hankinson Duckett Associates, 2018)), found that whilst the site lies within the Chilterns National Landscape (at the time these were called AONB), the site is well contained and relates well to the existing village edge. It was therefore considered to have some potential for sensitively designed small-scale residential development on the site.</p> <p>Our emerging spatial strategy takes a more restrictive view than our current plan to development in National Landscapes, and in doing so places a great emphasis on conserving and enhancing the special qualities of our nationally protected landscapes; the Chilterns and North Wessex Downs.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is outside the built-up area of Nettlebed (a proposed Tier 3 settlement). Our previous strategy sought to identify opportunities for villages to grow, especially where this will support local services. Our emerging strategy is to allow housing within Tier 3 settlement, but not on greenfield land outside it.</p> <p>The councils consider that the significant change in our spatial strategy now renders this site unsuitable for development because it no longer meets the plan's social and environmental priorities.</p> <p>Additionally, there are issues with access to the site, with access likely to be required across Registered Common Land, an additional constraint not in favour of development at this location.</p>		

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land to the West of Priest Close, Nettlebed

<p><b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b></p>	<p>Notwithstanding the councils' conclusions regarding suitability, if the Joint Local Plan continued to allocate this site, we would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.</p>
<p><b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b></p>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – The Councils don't think changes to this policy will be able to make it suitable. The emerging spatial strategy does not support development in this location.</p>
<p><b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b></p>	<p>Preferred option: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p> <p>There are no alternative options as the site is not suitable for residential development in principle.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>The allocation <b>is not recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p>

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station

**Site Name: Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station, Nettlebed**



Site © Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	H7
<b>Site Size</b>	1.3 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	A residential development of approximately 15 dwellings.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The councils are not aware of any change in circumstances that affect availability of this site for development.
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development.

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station**

<b>Suitable</b>	No		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	Yes	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	No	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on greenfield land on the edge of the village of Nettlebed. The Village of Nettlebed and the site itself are washed over by the Chilterns National Landscape. When allocating this site through the Local Plan 2035 our landscape evidence (South Oxfordshire District Council – Landscape Assessment Update (Hankinson Duckett Associates, 2018)), found that whilst the site lies within the Chilterns National Landscape, the site was not visually prominent and could accommodate some development. It was therefore considered to have some potential for sensitively designed small-scale residential development on the site.</p> <p>Our emerging spatial strategy takes a more restrictive view than our current plan to development in National Landscapes, and in doing so places a great emphasis on conserving and enhancing the special qualities of our nationally protected landscapes; the Chilterns and North Wessex Downs.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is outside the built-up area of Nettlebed (a proposed Tier 3 settlement). Our previous strategy sought to identify opportunities for villages to grow, especially where this will support local services. Our emerging strategy is to allow housing within Tier 3 settlement, but not on greenfield land outside it.</p> <p>The councils consider that the significant change in our spatial strategy now renders this site unsuitable for development because it no longer meets the plan’s social and environmental priorities. in</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	Notwithstanding the councils’ conclusions regarding suitability, if the Joint Local Plan continued to allocate this site, we would need to update the policy to ensure references to old policies or standards are replaced.		


**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station

<p><b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b></p>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – The Councils don't think changes to this policy will be able to make its suitable. The emerging spatial strategy does not support development in this location.</p>
<p><b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b></p>	<p>Preferred option: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p> <p>There are no alternative options as the site is not suitable for residential development in principle.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>The allocation <b>is not recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p>



**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
**Vauxhall Barracks**

**Site Name: Vauxhall Barracks**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	H2d (saved from the Core Strategy)
<b>Site Size</b>	9.9 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	The site is allocated for 300 dwellings by Policy H2d of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site is under the control of the Ministry of Defence. It was originally allocated for development in the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy in 2012, when the MoD were planning to close the base in the 2020s. However, a more recent statement by the Secretary of State for Defence (November 2021) confirmed that the site will remain operational until 2034. The site is actively being promoted for development and will be available in the Joint Local Plan period which run to 2041.

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Vauxhall Barracks

<b>Achievable</b>	Yes		
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	Yes	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land within the built-up limits of Didcot. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</p> <p>In December 2015, the Government announced that Didcot would become a Garden Town. The Didcot Garden Town Master Plan boundary is set out in Appendix 6 of the Local Plan 2035. This site is located completely within the master plan boundary. The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy includes focusing new housing at Garden communities which includes Didcot.</p> <p>The site is currently occupied by the Ministry of Defence and used as a barracks. Redevelopment of this site provides an opportunity to prioritise development of brownfield land in one of the most sustainable settlements in the plan area which is a key part of the Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	The current allocation does not benefit from a strategic site allocation policy detailing the requirements for a planning application. Following feedback from the preferred options consultation, we have decided that it would be appropriate to contain more detail for the site's development.		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p>		


**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Vauxhall Barracks

	<p>Suitability – No change required</p> <p>Presentation changes – Changes required to ensure we are consistent with policies for sites and to update references to new standards or policies.</p>
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	<p>Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to changes to demonstrate design requirements for the site.</p> <p>Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p>

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Orchard Centre Phase II**

**Site Name: Orchard Centre Phase II (remaining site)**

Existing Allocation:




© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

Proposed Updated Allocation:



**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Orchard Centre Phase II**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	H2e (saved from the Core Strategy)
<b>Site Size</b>	11.2 hectares (existing)
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	The site is allocated for 300 dwellings by Policy H2e of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The councils are not aware of any change in circumstances that affect availability of this site for development.
<b>Achievable</b>	No
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	<p>The site was carried forward in Local Plan 2035 from previous development plan documents. The original extension east of Didcot town centre was set out in the Local Plan 2011. The Core Strategy 2012 carried the proposals forward and envisaged a masterplan for the whole Orchard Centre (including Orchard Centre and Orchard Centre phase II) for a mixed-use retail-led development to include approximately 300 dwellings to be delivered across the whole site. The part of the site known as Orchard Centre has now been delivered however no residential units were delivered as part of that scheme.</p> <p>As a result of the reduced site area now available (2.8 hectares) the site's capacity has reduced to 100 dwellings.</p>

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Orchard Centre Phase II


<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscapes?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>D</b>
	No	Yes	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land within the built-up limits of Didcot. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes</p> <p>In December 2015, the Government announced that Didcot would become a Garden Town. The Didcot Garden Town Master Plan boundary is set out in Appendix 6 of the Local Plan 2035. This site is located completely within the master plan boundary. The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy includes focusing new housing at Garden communities which includes Didcot.</p> <p>The site is currently under multiple ownership, with businesses still operating from many units in the site area. Redevelopment of this site provides an opportunity to prioritise development of brownfield land in one of the most sustainable settlements in the plan area which is a key part of the Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	<p>The current allocation does not benefit from a strategic site allocation policy detailing the requirements for a planning application. Following feedback from the preferred options consultation, we have decided that it would be appropriate to contain more detail for the site's development. We also need to make minor amendments to the policy to reflect its updated capacity.</p>		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required.</p> <p>Achievability – The Joint Local Plan should recognise the reduced capacity of the site, and reduce the site area to 2.8 hectares.</p> <p>Suitability – No change required.</p>		
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	<p>Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to changes to demonstrate design requirements for the site, and to amend the current</p>		

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Orchard Centre Phase II

	allocation's boundary and capacity, from 300 to 100. Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan, with an amended boundary.

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
 Didcot Gateway

**Site Name: Didcot Gateway**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100018668

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	H2f
<b>Site Size</b>	4.3 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	The site is allocated for 300 dwellings by Policy H2(f) of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site is being promoted by multiple landowners, including Homes England (HE), who have submitted an outline application for a large part of the site. Alongside the application HE are working with the Council and Soha (registered social housing provider) to prepare a masterplan for the wider Didcot Gateway area.
<b>Achievable</b>	No
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	Since the site was allocated in Local Plan 2035 progress has been made in bringing the site forward for development, including the various landowners working collaboratively towards developing a masterplan for the whole site.



**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Didcot Gateway


	Following this work, and HE's outline planning application for part of the site, we no longer consider the site to have sufficient capacity to deliver 300 homes, and other uses on site (which are likely to include a new office for South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse District Councils). The revised capacity of this site is likely to be around 200 units.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	Yes	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on land within the built-up limits of Didcot. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or a National Landscape.</p> <p>In December 2015, the Government announced that Didcot would become a Garden Town. The Didcot Garden Town Master Plan boundary is set out in Appendix 6 of the Local Plan 2035. This site is located completely within the master plan boundary. The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy includes focusing new housing at Garden communities which includes Didcot.</p> <p>Redevelopment of this site provides an opportunity to prioritise development of brownfield land in one of the most sustainable settlements in the plan area which is a key part of the Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	The current allocation does not benefit from a strategic site allocation policy detailing the requirements for a planning application. Following feedback from the preferred options consultation, we have decided that it would be appropriate to contain more detail for the site's development. We also need to make minor amendments to the policy to reflect its updated capacity.		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required.</p> <p>Achievability – The Joint Local Plan should recognise the reduced capacity of the site.</p>		

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Didcot Gateway

	Suitability – No change required.
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	Preferred option: Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to changes to demonstrate design requirements for the site, and to amend the current allocation’s boundary and capacity, from 300 to 200.  Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
North West of Abingdon on Thames**

**Site Name: North West of Abingdon on Thames**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 10009525

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	Core Policy 4
<b>Site Size</b>	12.6 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	Around 200 homes, subject to detailed masterplanning.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	<p>The part of the site to the east of Wootton Road has detailed permission for 200 homes, which the developer is now building.</p> <p>The site to the west of Wootton Road now has an Aldi supermarket on its northern part.</p> <p>The site promoter for the remaining part of the land (on the southern part of the land to the west of Dunmore Road) is promoting this for residential development.</p>
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
North West of Abingdon on Thames**


<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	Part of the site has permission and is built out, but the remaining part remains achievable. We are not aware of any change in circumstances affecting the developability (the likelihood of this site coming forward in the next 6 to 15 years) and the viability of the development.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	No	Yes
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is located on greenfield land on the edge of the settlement of Abingdon on Thames. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</p> <p>The site is located within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Core Policy 4a: Meeting our Housing Needs states the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford City to be addressed within the Vale of White Horse of 2,200 dwellings will be provided for through either strategic or additional sites within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan’s emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	<p>No.</p> <p>The Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 allocates this site and identifies key requirements in a development template. The Site Development Template identifies key objectives for the site and set out requirements relating to issues such as infrastructure provision, urban</p>		

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
North West of Abingdon on Thames

	<p>design, landscaping, ecology, flood risk and drainage.</p> <p>We will carry forward this development template in an appendix to the Joint Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b></p>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required</p>
<p><b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b></p>	<p>Preferred option: retain the current allocation and the development template carried forward in an appendix to the Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.</p>

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
North West of Grove

**Site Name: North West of Grove**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 10009525

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	Core Policy 4a / 15a
<b>Site Size</b>	28 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	The site is allocated for 400 homes (to 2031), alongside any necessary onsite infrastructure and supporting facilities.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site promoter, Persimmon Homes, has submitted a planning application for this site (Ref: P20/V3113/O) and continues to promote the site for residential development.
<b>Achievable</b>	Changes needed
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	The Councils are not aware of any issues that affect the achievability of this site. However, the current site allocation in the Local Plan Part 2 is for 400 homes. However, this was only the expected capacity of the site to 2031, based on the Council's trajectory for this site when we adopted the plan. The current allocation

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
North West of Grove

	acknowledges that the site has capacity to deliver more housing, expected after 2031. The site area can accommodate 600 homes, and therefore the capacity of the site will need to be updated to reflect this.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	Yes	No	No
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is not located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape.</p> <p>The site is in Science Vale on the north western edge of Grove. It is close to the Williams F1 site in Grove. The spatial strategy therefore supports development on this site.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	<p>As the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 allocates this site, it does not benefit from a strategic site allocation policy detailing the requirements for a planning application. Instead, the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 identified key requirements in a development template. The Site Development Templates identify key objectives for each site and set out requirements relating to issues such as infrastructure provision, urban design, landscaping, ecology, flood risk and drainage.</p> <p>To ensure consistency between the allocated sites of 500 or more homes in the Joint Local Plan, we believe the plan needs to set out the Development Template requirements in a policy. Through transferring these requirements to a new policy, we will also need to update any references to old policies or standards that are to be superseded.</p>		
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – Change required to reflect capacity of the site</p> <p>Suitability – No change required.</p> <p>Presentation changes – Changes required to ensure we are consistent with policies for sites</p>		




**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
 North West of Grove

	and to update references to new standards or policies.
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to a new policy incorporating the site's updated capacity (600 homes) based on delivery to 2041, with presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.  Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.



**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
North West of Valley Park, Didcot

**Site Name: North West of Valley Park, Didcot**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 10009525

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	Core Policy 4
<b>Site Size</b>	33 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	The site is allocated for 800 homes, alongside any necessary onsite infrastructure and supporting facilities.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site promoter has responded to our request for information for the Housing Land Supply Statement for the Vale of White Horse (December 2023) <sup>15</sup> , confirming they are still actively promoting the site for residential development.

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/vale-of-white-horse-district-council/planning-and-development/local-plan-and-planning-policies/supporting-documents/>

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
North West of Valley Park, Didcot


<b>Achievable</b>	Yes						
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	The Councils are not aware of any issues that affect the achievability of this site.						
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes						
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape? No						
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>A</th> <th>B</th> <th>C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	A	B	C	Yes	Yes	No
	A	B	C				
Yes	Yes	No					
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is not located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape.</p> <p>The site is located west of Valley Park, a large urban extension of Didcot. This site will therefore become part of Didcot (the largest urban centre in Science Vale and a Garden Town) and adjacent to Milton Park (accessible via the pedestrian and cycle underpass under the A4130).</p>						
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	<p>As the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 allocates this site, it does not benefit from a strategic site allocation policy detailing the requirements for a planning application. Instead, the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 identified key requirements in a development template. The Site Development Templates identify key objectives for each site and set out requirements relating to issues such as infrastructure provision, urban design, landscaping, ecology, flood risk and drainage.</p> <p>To ensure consistency between the allocated sites of 500 or more homes in the Joint Local Plan, we believe the plan needs to set out the Development Template requirements in a policy. Through transferring these requirements to a new policy, we will also need to update any references to old policies or standards that are to be superseded.</p>						
<b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required.</p> <p>Presentation changes – Changes required to ensure we are consistent with policies for sites</p>						

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
North West of Valley Park, Didcot

	and to update references to new standards or policies.
<b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b>	Preferred option: retain the current allocation subject to a new policy with presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.  Alternative 1: De-allocate the site for residential development.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained in the Joint Local Plan.

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Dalton Barracks

**Site Name: Dalton Barracks**



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 10009525

<b>Current Site Allocation Document</b>	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2
<b>Existing Policy Reference</b>	Core Policies 8a and 8b
<b>Site Size</b>	77 hectares
<b>Description of the existing site allocation</b>	1,200 new homes allocated at Dalton Barracks will be provided to an exemplar standard and following Garden Village principles to ensure the potential for highly sustainable and accessible development is fully realised. The development will form a mixed-use community incorporating on-site services and facilities, including education provision, a local centre, providing local opportunities for employment and ensuring excellent public transport, cycle way and footpath connections to Oxford and Abingdon-on-Thames.
<b>Available</b>	Yes
<b>Commentary on Availability</b>	The site is actively being promoted, demonstrated by on-going engagement between the site

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Dalton Barracks

	promoter, the Council and other relevant stakeholders.		
<b>Achievable</b>	Yes		
<b>Commentary on Achievability</b>	The Councils are not aware of any issues that affect the achievability of this site.		
<b>Suitable</b>	Yes		
<b>Suitability Assessment Criteria</b>	Is the site located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape?	No	
	Suitability assessment criteria checklist (see Step 3 of the methodology)		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Commentary on Suitability</b>	<p>The site is not located within the Green Belt or a National Landscape.</p> <p>The site forms part of the Dalton Barracks Garden Village. The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy includes focusing new housing at Garden communities which includes Dalton Barracks.</p> <p>The site is located within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Core Policy 4a: Meeting our Housing Needs states the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford City to be addressed within the Vale of White Horse of 2,200 dwellings will be provided for through either strategic or additional sites within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</p>		
<b>Does the policy need any presentational changes to ensure it remains an effective policy?</b>	Dalton Barracks is the only site within the Vale of White Horse Local Plans that benefits from a strategic policy setting out specific requirements for the site. The plan also has a development template for the site in an appendix.		

**Appendix 2: Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review**  
Dalton Barracks

	<p>To ensure consistency between the allocated sites of 500 or more homes in the Joint Local Plan, we believe the plan needs to set out a single allocation policy for Dalton Barracks. Through combining the existing allocation policy and development template requirements into one allocation policy, we will also need to update the any references to old policies or standards that are to be superseded.</p>
<p><b>Can the policy be amended to address issues of suitability, availability or achievability?</b></p>	<p>Availability – No change required</p> <p>Achievability – No change required</p> <p>Suitability – No change required</p> <p>Presentation changes – Changes required to ensure we are consistent with policies for allocated sites and to update references to new standards or policies.</p>
<p><b>Preferred option and alternative(s) to subject to sustainability appraisal</b></p>	<p>Preferred option: To increase the site area of the allocation at Dalton Barracks to include the brownfield part of the barracks to the east of the existing site. This will increase the number of homes from 1,200 to 2,750.</p> <p>The site is currently a Ministry of Defence site located adjacent to the village of Shippon to the north of Abingdon-on-Thames.</p> <p>As part of Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2, the main area of Barracks buildings on the site was removed from the Green Belt, but this area was not allocated for development at that time. We consider that as the site is due to be vacant from 2029 it is important to positively plan for the redevelopment of this brownfield (previously developed) area now. It is located immediately adjacent to the existing allocation. This offers huge potential to deliver a comprehensively planned exemplar development of a scale that provides the opportunity to bring forward associated facilities and infrastructure for the benefit of the local community. The extended area of the allocation is located within the Garden Village area and includes further land in the Green Belt to provide for a larger parkland, amounting to 52 hectares rather than the current policy requirement of 30 hectares.</p> <p>Alternative 1: retain the current allocation subject to presentational changes of the existing criteria / requirements for this site.</p> <p>Alternative 2: De-allocate the site for residential development.</p>

**Appendix 2:** Existing residential site allocations without planning permission review  
Dalton Barracks

<b>Recommendation</b>	The allocation <b>is recommended</b> to be retained and extended in the Joint Local Plan.
-----------------------	---



## Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
<b>South Oxfordshire</b>					
Culham Science Centre (now called: Culham Campus)	STRAT8	7.3	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Construction completed on 5ha of land, leaving 2.3ha remaining to come forward.</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with some capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	B
Monument Business Park, Chalgrove	EMP9i	2.25	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C
Southmead Industrial Estate East, Didcot	EMP4i	2.66	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C

**Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review**

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
			Suitable: This is an existing employment site.		
Southmead Industrial Estate West, Didcot	EMP4ii	0.26	All construction complete, no capacity remaining on site.	Allocation not carried forward.	A
Hithercroft Road and Lupton Road, Wallingford	EMP7i	0.84	Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.  Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining  Suitable: This is an existing employment site.	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP. This allocation should be combined with the Junction of Whitley Road and Lester Way allocation to create a single combined allocation.	C
Junction of Whitley Road and Lester Way, Wallingford site	EMP7ii	0.25	Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.  Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining  Suitable: This is an existing employment site.	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP. This allocation should be combined with the Hithercroft Road and Lupton Road allocation to create a single combined allocation.	C
Milton Park	EMP1	6.5	This employment allocation is provided in VoWH as part of larger allocation at Milton Park. Please see the Milton Park assessment within the Vale of White Horse section of this table.	This employment allocation is provided in VoWH as part of larger allocation at Milton Park. Please see the Milton Park assessment within the Vale of White Horse section of this table.	Not applicable

**Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review**

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
Land South of Grenoble Road	STRAT11	10	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This forms part of an existing strategic site allocation which is being carried forward (see Appendix 2). The employment land complements the residential development.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C
Berinsfield Garden Village	STRAT10i	5	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This forms part of an existing strategic site allocation which is being carried forward (see Appendix 2). The employment land complements the residential development.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C
Land at Chalgrove Airfield	STRAT7	5	This allocation was justified as part of the strategic allocation to support a residential development. This allocation is not being taken forward in the	Allocation not carried forward.	Not applicable

**Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review**

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
			Joint Local Plan (see the site assessment in Appendix 2) and therefore the justification for the employment aspect of the allocation no longer exists.		
<b><i>Vale of White Horse</i></b>					
Milton Park	CP6	28	<p>Available: This site is available for development. However, there is an LDO for the site, so development would come forward through this process.</p> <p>Achievable: Some construction completed, 5.36ha remaining to come forward.</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	It is not necessary to consider this site for allocation in the JLP because development will come forward through the LDO process. The remaining capacity of 5.36ha will be factored into the employment land supply.	B
Harwell Campus	CP6	128	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Construction completed on 35ha of land, leaving 93ha remaining to come forward.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with some capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	B

**Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review**

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
			Suitable: This is an existing employment site.		
Monks Farm, North Grove	CP6	6	<p>Available: The planning application history indicates that this 6ha part of this larger mixed-use allocation might be developed for housing, in part or completely.</p> <p>Achievable: Residential construction underway on this mixed-use allocated site.</p> <p>Suitable: This is a mixed-use allocation within the development boundary of Grove, adjacent to an existing employment site and the newly constructed residential extension of Grove.</p>	This site may not be available for employment development and due to this uncertainty has not been accounted for in the sources of supply in Policy JT1. The carried forward allocation under policy HOU2, does however continue to contain reference to 6ha of employment which could in part still come forward.	Not applicable
Didcot A	CP6 and CP16	29	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C

**Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review**

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
South of Park Road, Faringdon	CP6	3	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C
Abingdon Business Park	CP6	0.7	All construction complete, no capacity remaining on site	Allocation not carried forward.	A
Abingdon Science Park	CP6	0.7	<p>Available: This site would be available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C
Grove Technology Park	CP6	5.4	<p>Available: This site is available for development by the end of the JLP period.</p> <p>Achievable: Full allocation capacity remaining</p> <p>Suitable: This is an existing employment site.</p>	This site is available, achievable and suitable for development, with full capacity remaining. It is therefore appropriate to consider for allocation in the JLP.	C

**Appendix 3: Existing employment site allocations review**

Existing Allocations	Existing policy	Amount allocated (hectares)	Available, Achievable and Suitable tests	Conclusion	Category
Land adjacent to A420	CP6	4.2	All construction complete, no capacity remaining on site	Allocation not carried forward.	A
Land North of Park Road, Faringdon	CP6	0.2	All construction complete, no capacity remaining on site	Allocation not carried forward.	A



## Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
SH574	Former South Oxfordshire District Council offices, Crowmarsh Gifford	Yes – the site is brownfield land	113 homes	The landowner is not certain which use they want to progress on this site at this time. One of the landowner's promoted uses would see a continuation of the established employment use of the site and therefore does not require an allocation to be made at this time. A future allocation could be considered through a future Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan
SH602	Land North of Wallingford	No	21.46ha	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH605	Land off Wantage Road, Wallingford	No	55.00ha	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH609	Land at Cholsey Fields, Cholsey	No	554 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH628	Richmead Park, Didcot	Science Vale & Didcot	1,175 homes	<p>The site immediately abuts the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, and would place urban fringe pressures and impact on the setting of the national landscape.</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Didcot to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in Didcot at Didcot Northeast (circa 2,030 homes), Ladygrove</p>

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				East (750 homes), Valley Park (4,254 homes). While Didcot is an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.
SH649	Blackditch Farm, Thame	No	25.79ha	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH668	Chalgrove Airfield	No	See reasons for discounting why this wasn't taken forward	<p>This site is an expansion of the existing Chalgrove allocation. This expanded site is partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.</p> <p>The site promoter (Homes England) has identified issues with complying with the existing policy for the currently allocated site. An objection from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) regarding the proposed layout of the runway led to Homes England withdrawing its outline planning application for this site in May 2021.</p> <p>The current allocation of 3,000 homes is not achievable within the existing allocated site boundary. The site is leased by Killinchy Aerospace Holdings Limited (until 2063). Killinchy's operating subsidiary Martin Baker Aircraft Company Ltd develops and tests ejector seats for armed forces around the globe. The current site boundary does not allow enough space for 3,000 new homes and a realigned runway delivered to Civil Aviation Authority standards. Homes England has advised that the site boundary would</p>

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				<p>need to be extended (predominantly to the north into currently unallocated, greenfield land) to address the CAA's concerns about the runway.</p> <p>The Chalgrove Airfield site is not a good fit with the spatial strategy for the Joint Local Plan (see Policy SP1), which involves delivering planned development within Science Vale, focussing new housing at the garden communities of Didcot, Berinsfield and Dalton Barracks, on well-located brownfield sites, and maintaining existing sites that contribute to addressing Oxford's unmet housing need.</p> <p>An extension to the site boundary to include additional land in the control of the site promoter to facilitate a relocation of the runway, to address the CAA concerns, would result in the site's greenfield footprint extending even further. It would further diminish the extent to which this is a brownfield site since it would involve building on greenfield land.</p>
SH685	Land Southwest of Chinnor	No	999 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH692	South Fleet, Didcot	Science Vale and Didcot	653 homes	The site is about 400m from the edge of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, and would place urban fringe pressures and impact on the setting of the national landscape.

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Didcot to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in Didcot at Didcot Northeast (circa 2,030 homes), Ladygrove East (750 homes), Valley Park (4,254 homes). While Didcot is an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.
SH787	Land Off Wantage Road, Wallingford	No	77.90ha	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH811	Land South West of Thame	No	787 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH816	Land southeast of Moorend Lane, Thame	No	603 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
SH830	Land to the north of the A329, Cholsey	No	648 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH128	Kingston Bagpuize House	Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.	183 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria and site is only partially brownfield land.
VH139	Land at Crown Packaging, Wantage	Brownfield, just outside Science Vale	168 homes	The site falls just outside the Science Vale Area. However, it does immediately abut the area so we have considered this site further.

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				<p>The site is still in active use by Crown as a “corporate innovation centre”. There is therefore no certainty that this site would come forward quicker than existing allocations as the employment use would need to vacate, and remediation works for an industrial brownfield site would need to take place.</p> <p>The site would not be sufficient to replace an existing allocation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils’ strategy, we don’t want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>
VH235	Land at the Potting Shed Nursery, Longworth	Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.	123 homes	Doesn’t meet strategic spatial criteria
VH267	Croft and little Croft Milton Heights	<p>Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.</p> <p>Located in Science Vale, but adjacent or within a Tier 1-3</p>	132 homes	Doesn’t meet strategic spatial criteria

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
		settlement, and not within a Tier 4 settlement.		
VH288	Land to the south of East Hanney	No	288 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH290	Grove Road, Wantage	Brownfield Science Vale	147 homes	<p>The site is still in active use as employment by MacDermid. There is no indication in the HELAA submission when the lease for the employment uses would terminate. Therefore, there is no certainty this site would come forward quicker than existing allocations as the employment use would need to vacate.</p> <p>The site would not be sufficient to replace an existing allocation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>
VH310	Land North of Reading Road and Grove Road, Harwell	Science Vale	581 homes	The site is immediately adjacent the North Wessex Downs National Landscape. Development is likely to have an impact on this asset.

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				Development of the site would erode the gap between Rowstock and Harwell, creating urbanising pressure on the National Landscape
VH314	Haynes of Challow, Roadside Farm, East Challow	Brownfield, just outside Science Vale	143 homes	<p>The site falls just outside the Science Vale Area. However, it does immediately abut the area so we have considered this further.</p> <p>The site is still in active use by Haynes of Challow with some bulky goods retail uses and as a recycling site. Previous / existing waste handling use would require remediation work – which would delay likely start on site for housing.</p> <p>There is no certainty this site would come forward quicker than existing allocations as the employment use would need to vacate.</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
VH376	Land at Old Mill Nurseries, Upper Green, Stanford-in-the-Vale	Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.	126 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH381	Land adjacent to Peewit Farm, 95 Drayton Road, Drayton	Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.	152 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH386	Land to the south of Marcham	No	701 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH399	Tulwick Park, Grove	Science Vale	934 homes	<p>Site is a greenfield site</p> <p>Appeal decision on this site:</p> <p>“The scheme would lie outside the settlement boundary of Grove and would appear as an awkward eastern extension of the village, causing significant harm to the countryside and the character of the landscape” (Paragraph 19 of the Inspector’s conclusion ref:P22/V0550/O)</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils’ strategy,</p>



Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.
VH400	Land south of Shrivenham	No	616 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH403	Land east of Hendred	Science Vale	2,397 homes	<p>The site is immediately adjacent the North Wessex Downs National Landscape so likely to have an impact on this asset.</p> <p>Development on the site would erode the gap between East and West Hendred, creating urbanising pressure on the National Landscape.</p> <p>Furthermore, parcels of possible priority Grassland Habitat, Traditional Orchards, Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland are present on site.</p>
VH404	Land north of Grove	No, just outside Science Vale	7,975 homes	<p>The site falls just outside the Science Vale Area. However, it does immediately abut a settlement in Science Vale, Grove, so we have considered this site further.</p> <p>Site is physically separated from Grove by the Great Western Railway – which provides a firm settlement edge in this location. It was also create severance issues for new development, with residents having to traverse this steep road bridge on a busy A road. Active travel connections across the railway (including clearance for gantries and sufficient</p>

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				<p>landing room to the south on third party land) would be needed.</p> <p>There are two local wildlife sites within the site, and 8 priority habitats impact by the site: lowland meadows, lowland mixed deciduous woodland, wet woodland, eutrophic standing waters and traditional orchards.</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>
VH541	Land at Drayton East Way and Land South of Drayton Road, Drayton	No just outside Science Vale	1,060 homes	The site falls just outside the Science Vale Area. Unlike other examples at Wantage, the site is not directly adjoining a settlement in Science Vale so we have excluded this form further assessment.
VH544	Land north of the A420, Sandhill Farm, Shrivenham	No	4,306 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH560	South of Majors Road, Watchfield	No	647 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
VH572	Rogers Concrete Faringdon	Brownfield	150 homes	This site has outline planning permission for residential use, and is an existing allocation (Land South of Park Faringdon, HOU2m). There is no need to consider this site for allocation, as development can already take place here.
VH590	Land at south Abingdon, Drayton Road	No	1,501 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH606	North of Crab Hill, Wantage	Yes	3,724 homes	<p>There is ancient woodland present within the site</p> <p>The development of this site could impact on the national landscape – and likely lead to further coalescence between Wantage and Grove – causing further pressure on the setting of the national landscape in this location</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>
VH611	Land to the north of Grove and to the east and west of the A338	No, just outside Science Vale	6,096 homes	The site falls just outside the Science Vale Area. However, it does immediately abut a settlement in

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				<p>Science Vale (Grove, so we have considered this site further.</p> <p>There is ancient woodland present within the site</p> <p>Site is physically separated from Grove by the Great Western Railway – which provides a firm settlement edge in this location. It was also create severance issues for new development, with residents having to traverse this steep road bridge on a busy A road. Active travel connections across the railway (including clearance for gantries and sufficient landing room to the south on third party land) would be needed</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Wantage and Grove to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in the Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils’ strategy, we don’t want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p> <p>Ancient woodland present within the site</p>
VH627	Land north east of Watchfield	No	1,005 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
VH656	Shrivenham Park Golf Club	No	552 homes	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
VH657	Land West of Wantage	No just outside Science Vale	2,142 homes	<p>Potential impact on a National Landscape (formerly known as AONB) – and likely lead to further coalescence between Wantage and Grove, and East Challow – causing further pressure on setting of a National Landscape in this location</p> <p>Market capacity at Wantage and Grove is unlikely to support early delivery of this site – there are already three large scale allocations building out in Wantage and Grove area (Monks Farm, Grove Airfield, Crab Hill). While Wantage and Grove are an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>
VH685 (EMP)	Abbey Shopping Centre	Brownfield	10,033m <sup>2</sup> employment space	This employment site is brownfield and within an existing settlement. This site complies with Policy JT1, so employment development within it would, in principle, be suitable. However, as we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within other existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations, where they have capacity to accommodate additional employment development, these are considered the most appropriate sites to meet the needs. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.
VH694 (EMP)	Barton Mill	Brownfield	6,112m <sup>2</sup> employment space	This employment site is brownfield and within an existing settlement. This site complies with Policy JT1, so employment development within it would, in

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				principle, be suitable. However, as we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within other existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations, where they have capacity to accommodate additional employment development, these are considered the most appropriate sites to meet the needs. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.
VH703 (EMP)	Shrivenham Hundred	Brownfield	21,334m <sup>2</sup> employment space	This employment site is brownfield and within an existing settlement. This site complies with Policy JT1, so employment development within it would, in principle, be suitable. However, as we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within other existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations, where they have capacity to accommodate additional employment development, these are considered the most appropriate sites to meet the needs. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.
VH708 (EMP)	Abingdon Science Park Barton Lane	Brownfield	52,675m <sup>2</sup> employment space	This employment site is brownfield and within an existing settlement. This site complies with Policy JT1, so employment development within it would, in principle, be suitable. However, as we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within other existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations, where they have capacity to accommodate additional employment development, these are considered the most

Appendix 4: Review of alternative sites

HELAA Ref	Site Name	Does the site meet the strategic, spatial criteria (see paragraph 2.42)	Capacity	Reason for discounting
				appropriate sites to meet the needs. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.
VH715 (EMP)	Drayton Rd Industrial Estate	Brownfield	3,995 m <sup>2</sup> employment space	This employment site is brownfield and within an existing settlement. This site complies with Policy JT1, so employment development within it would, in principle, be suitable. However, as we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within other existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations, where they have capacity to accommodate additional employment development, these are considered the most appropriate sites to meet the needs. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.
VH729	Land West of Grove Business Park	No	29,597 m <sup>2</sup> employment space	This site is a greenfield site and therefore not broadly aligning with the spatial strategy, and whilst located next to an existing business park at a Tier 3 settlement it would not be accessed from the settlement or via the existing business park. A new / improved access road would be required linking to a nearby rural settlement making active travel challenging / non-deliverable. The access is also known to route through a heritage asset which would be impactful. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

### Introduction

- 1.1. This appendix shows how we have assessed the flood risk to the proposed allocations within the Joint Local Plan. As some of these sites contain areas of medium and high flood risk, we have undertaken a sequential flood risk test to assess the extent of the flood risk, and ensure that development is safe and takes place in areas of lower risk of flooding within these sites. As we are proposing to allocate sites that contain areas of medium and high flood risk, we have also undertaken an exception test.
- 1.2. As the main report sets out, we have reviewed all of our existing allocated sites for their continued availability, achievability, and suitability to allocate for development. Alongside those allocations which passed this test, we identified 43 alternative sites to test whether other site allocations would be suitable to make alongside or instead of the current sites. The main report shows how we identified these alternative sites and how we have tested them through the sustainability appraisal. Where relevant this report highlights the relevant sections of those reports or includes specific findings.
- 1.3. We have subjected these alternative sites to the sequential flood risk test alongside the proposed allocations. The sequential test considers all sources of potential flood risk: fluvial, surface water, groundwater, sewer flooding and reservoir flooding as well as the impact from climate change on the risk of flooding.
- 1.4. The sequential test is a multi-staged process that we have carried out in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>16</sup>. This requires Local Planning Authorities to demonstrate whether there is sufficient capacity on suitably located sites with lower risk of flooding before considering allocating sites with higher risk of flooding. The guidance requires us to complete this test regardless of the extent of a site that is in areas of higher risk of flooding. The test requires us to demonstrate that suitable and available alternative sites at low risk of flooding don't have sufficient capacity to meet our needs.
- 1.5. The sequential test identifies sites at lowest risk of flooding from all sources, it forms only part of the overall planning balance when we are considering the suitability of sites for development. It doesn't mean that we are required to only allocate sites that contain only areas of lowest flood risk. We must consider the sustainability of these sites with regard to relevant national and local policies, including those proposed through the Joint Local Plan. We have appraised all the sites we have subjected to

---

<sup>16</sup> Planning Practice Guidance, '[Flood risk and coast change](#)'. Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 7-025-20220825 Diagram 2 Application of the Sequential Test for plan preparation



## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

the sequential test through our Sustainability Appraisal, as well as the site selection criteria in the main report. We have shown our justification for allocating or discounting sites from further consideration in table 2. For more information, please read Appendix 4.

- 1.6. Where our proposed allocations pass this test, we need to apply an “exception test” before allocating sites in medium or high flood risk areas. The exception test requires us to demonstrate that such sites provide sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, and that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall<sup>17</sup>.
- 1.7. In considering the risk of flooding the councils have had regard to all risk of flooding now and in future in accordance with the national policy<sup>18</sup>.

### Sites at lowest risk of flooding

- 1.8. The sequential test is a multi-staged process, the first step is to identify sites at the lowest risk of flooding. We used the following criteria from our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to determine what sites would fall into “low flood risk”:

Table 1: Lowest level / frequency of flood risk

Source of flood risk	Level / frequency of flood risk
Fluvial (flooding from rivers)	Less than a 1 in 1,000 year flood event
Surface water	Between a 1 in 100 year and 1 in 1,000 year flood event
Ground water flooding	Yes or no – Our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes that the potential impact from groundwater flooding could be high
Reservoir flooding	Yes or no – Our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes that the potential impact from reservoir flooding cannot be categorised as high, medium or low risk
Climate change modelling	Sites located in areas of lowest risk are not impacted by this scenario, as it considers an increase of risk based on areas with the highest risk of fluvial and surface water flooding

- 1.9. We applied these criteria to the 21 existing allocations that passed our “available, achievable, suitable” test, and the 43 alternative sites. This showed 5 sites containing

<sup>17</sup> Planning Practice Guidance, ‘[Flood risk and coast change](#)’. Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 7-031-20220825

<sup>18</sup> National planning policy framework paragraph 168

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

only areas of the lowest flood risk. We have listed these sites in table 1, which have passed the sequential test without needing to further pass the exception test.

Table 2: Site located wholly in areas of the lowest flood risk

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed / promoted Use	Area (ha)
VH128	Kingston Bagpuize House	Residential	7.61
VH267	Land at The Croft and Little Croft, Milton Heights	Residential	3.25
JT1b	Grove Technology Park	Employment	13.22
VH703	Shrivenham Hundred Business Park	Employment	5.33
JT1d	Hithercroft Industrial Estate, Wallingford	Employment	1.1

- 1.10. We have appraised all the sites we have subjected to the sequential test through our Sustainability Appraisal, as well as the site selection criteria in this topic paper. We have shown our justification for allocating or discounting sites from further consideration in table 2.

Table 3: Justification for allocating or discounting sites from further consideration

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed for allocation?	Reason for allocating/discounting
VH128	Kingston Bagpuize House	No	Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.  Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria and site is only partially brownfield land.
VH267	Land at The Croft and Little Croft, Milton Heights	No	Partially brownfield, but the site is not capable of delivering all homes on brownfield land.  Located in Science Vale, but adjacent or within a Tier 1-3 settlement, and not within a Tier 4 settlement.  Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
JT1b	Grove Technology Park	Yes	Sequential test passed
VH703	Shrivenham Hundred Business Park	No	This employment site is brownfield and within an existing settlement. This site complies with Policy JT1, so

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed for allocation?	Reason for allocating/discounting
			employment development within it would, in principle, be suitable. However, as we have identified an employment supply that exceeds need from within other existing or former employment sites or within mixed-use strategic allocations, where they have capacity to accommodate additional employment development, these are considered the most appropriate sites to meet the needs. Therefore, this alternative has not been allocated for development.
JT1d	Hithercroft Industrial Estate, Wallingford	Yes	Sequential test passed

- 1.11. The level 1 SFRA identified five sites being entirely within areas of the lowest risk of flooding, including two proposed employment allocations. The potential capacity of these sites would not be sufficient to address the development needs of either council, as identified through the Joint Local Plan. Additionally, as demonstrated by table 2, three of these sites are not suitable locations for development in accordance with the Joint Local Plan strategy.
- 1.12. It is therefore not possible for us to direct development towards areas of lowest flood risk. Consequently, we have considered sites at higher risk flooding following the staged process set out in diagram 2 of the PPG.

### Sites at medium risk of flooding

- 1.13. We used the following criteria from our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to determine what sites would fall into “medium flood risk”. The next step in is for us to consider whether we can allocate development containing only areas of low or medium flood risk. The PPG expects us to rank these with the lowest risk sites first. We have identified sites as being medium risk of flooding where the risk of flooding doesn't exceed the following, from one or more of the following sources:

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

Table 4: medium level / frequency of flood risk

Source of flood risk	Level / frequency of flood risk
Fluvial (flooding from rivers)	Between a 1 in 100 year and 1 in 1,000 year flood event (known as flood zone 2)
Surface water	Between a 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year flood event
Ground water flooding	Yes or no – Our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes that the potential impact from groundwater flooding could be high
Reservoir flooding	Yes or no – Our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes that the potential impact from reservoir flooding cannot be categorised as high, medium or low risk
Climate change modelling	Sites located in areas of medium risk are not impacted by this scenario, as it considers an increase of risk based on areas with the highest risk of fluvial and surface water flooding

- 1.14. Based on the approach outlined above, we have identified 3 sites as having a no higher than medium risk of flooding. One of these three sites is an employment allocation (JT1i). We have ranked the sites' flood risk by identifying the percentage of each site at medium risk of flooding. Each of three sites we have identified at medium risk are all due to the risk from surface water flooding.

Table 5: sites identified as having no greater than medium risk of flooding

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed / promoted Use	Area (ha)	Percentage of site at medium risk of flooding
SH692	South Fleet	Residential	33.49	0.02%
SH816	Land southeast of Moorend Lane, Thame, OX9 3JL	Residential	30.94	0.05%
JT1i	Former Esso Research Centre	Employment	11.02	0.14%

- 1.15. We have appraised all the sites we have subjected to the sequential test through our Sustainability Appraisal, as well as the site selection criteria in the main report. We have shown our justification for allocating or discounting sites from further consideration in table 6. For more information, please read Appendix 4.
- 1.16. If we wish to allocate sites containing any areas of medium flood risk, the sites would need to pass the exception test. However, if the proposed use is less vulnerable to flooding land use it may not be necessary to undertake the exception test.

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

Table 6: Justification for allocating or discounting sites from further consideration

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed for allocation?	Reason for allocating/discounting
SH692	South Fleet	No	<p>The site is about 400m from the edge of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, and would place urban fringe pressures and impact on the setting of the national landscape.</p> <p>Furthermore, the councils are concerned that there may be limited market capacity at Didcot to support early delivery of this site given that there are already three large scale allocations building out in Didcot at Didcot Northeast (circa 2,030 homes), Ladygrove East (750 homes), Valley Park (4,254 homes).</p> <p>While Didcot is an important part of the councils' strategy, we don't want to over rely on housing delivery in this area.</p>
SH816	Land southeast of Moorend Lane, Thame, OX9 3JL	No	Doesn't meet strategic spatial criteria
JT1i	Former Esso Research Centre	Yes	<p>This is a former employment site and as a brownfield employment site it is capable of being development once more - this has been confirmed by the landowner. Its reuse is consistent with how JT1 operates for unallocated employment sites, and therefore it is considered entirely appropriate to allocate it, to acknowledge this site's potential to provide for employment uses.</p> <p>The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses</p>

- 1.17. Only three sites were identified through the SFRA level 1 assessment as being located within areas of no greater than medium risk of flooding. The potential capacity of these sites would not be sufficient to address the development needs of either council, as

## **Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

identified through the Joint Local Plan. Additionally, as demonstrated by table 6, two of these sites are not suitable locations for development in accordance with the Joint Local Plan's strategy. One site is considered suitable by the spatial strategy and is proposed to be an employment allocation within Joint Local Plan (JT1i).

- 1.18. Collectively, only a small number of sites (8) have been identified as being located within areas of the lowest flood risk or areas of no greater than medium flood risk, with only one of these being suitable and available for development. It is therefore not possible to ensure development is directed towards areas of lowest or medium flood risk as there is insufficient development capacity. Following the sequential test the councils are therefore required to consider meeting their development needs at sites which include elements of high flood risk.

## Sites at high risk of flooding

- 1.19. All remaining allocated sites and alternatives considered through the SFRA level 1 have been identified as containing areas of a high risk of flooding. We used the following criteria from our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to determine what sites would fall into “high flood risk”. The PPG expects us to rank these with the lowest risk sites first. We have identified sites as being high risk of flooding where the risk of flooding is within range of the following, from one or more of the following sources:

Table 7: High level / frequency of flood risk

Source of flood risk	Level / frequency of flood risk
Fluvial (flooding from rivers)	Greater than a 1 in 100 year flood event (known as flood zone 3)
Surface water	Greater than a 1 in 30 year flood event
Ground water flooding	Yes or no – Our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes that the potential impact from groundwater flooding could be high
Reservoir flooding	Yes or no – Our Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes that the potential impact from reservoir flooding cannot be categorised as high, medium or low risk
Climate change modelling	Sites with a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability’ (AEP) of flooding plus climate change (additional risk) or flood zone 3b plus climate change (additional risk)

- 1.20. As with sites identified as having no more than a medium risk of flooding the sequential test requires sites with a high flood risk to be ranked, with those with the lowest risk listed first. The proportion of the site within flood zone 3b has been used as this is considered to represent the greater risk of flooding currently and was the basis of undertaking the sequential test prior to changes to the paragraph 168 of the NPPF. Not all sites listed in table 8 have areas located within area at high risk of fluvial flooding, however areas within these sites will have been identified through SFRA as having a high risk of flooding from other sources. The full assessment of potential sources of flooding is set within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Available at: <https://www.southandvale.gov.uk/JLPEvidence>

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

Table 8: site located within areas of high flood risk, ranked by proportion of site located within flood zone 3b.

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed / Promoted Use	Area (ha)	Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)	Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)	Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled	Site at reservoir risk?	Site at high groundwater risk?
AS11	Culham Science Centre	Employment	77.3504	0%	0%	0%	No	Yes
AS12	Harwell Campus	Employment	282.2558	0%	0.04%	0%	No	No
AS6	Rich's Sidings and Broadway, Didcot	Mixed	2.9590	0%	1.61%	0%	No	No
AS7	Didcot Gateway, Didcot	Mixed	4.3444	0%	10.19%	0%	No	No
AS8	North West of Grove, Grove	Residential	28.3667	0%	0.72%	0%	No	Yes
AS16	Vauxhall Barracks, Didcot	Mixed	9.8729	0%	0.25%	0%	No	No
JT1e	Monument Business Park, Chalgrove	Employment	2.25	0%	8.82%	0%	No	Yes



**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
JT1k	South of Park Road, Faringdon	Employment	27.87	0%	0.25%	0%	No	Yes
SH574	Former South Oxfordshire District Council offices, Crowmarsh Gifford	Mixed	2.7793	0%	1.56%	0%	No	No
SH602	Land north of Wallingford	Residential	21.4720	0%	0.19%	0%	No	Yes
SH605	Land off Wantage Road, Wallingford	Residential	55.0405	0%	0.19%	0%	No	Yes
SH609	Land at Cholsey Fields, Cholsey	Residential	28.4366	0%	0.45%	0%	No	Yes
SH692	South Fleet	Residential	33.4928	0%	0%	0%	No	No
SH787	Land Off Wantage Road	Mixed	77.9585	0%	0.19%	0%	No	Yes

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
SH816	Land southeast of Moored Lane, Thame, OX9 3JL	Residential	30.9479	0%	0%	0%	No	Yes
SH830	Land to the North of the A329 at Cholsey	Residential	33.2729	0%	0.12%	0%	No	Yes
VH139	Land at Crown Packaging, Wantage	Residential	7.0236	0%	0.19%	0%	No	Yes
VH235	Land at The Potting Shed Nursery, Longworth	Residential	5.1317	0%	1.27%	0%	No	Yes
VH310	Land north of Reading Road and Grove Road, Harwell OX11 0HT	Residential	35.4367	0%	0.48%	0%	No	Yes
VH314	Haynes of Challow, Roadside Farm	Residential	3.5243	0%	1.04%	0%	No	No
VH381	Land adjacent to Peewit Farm, 95 Drayton Road, Drayton	Residential	3.7598	0%	0%	0%	Yes	Yes
VH399	Tulwick Park, Grove	Residential	47.9473	0%	0.08%	0%	No	Yes

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
VH400	Land south of Shrivenham	Residential	31.6287	0%	8.16%	0%	No	No
VH572	Former Rogers Concrete site, Sandshill, Faringdon, SN7 7PQ	Residential	3.6977	0%	0.55%	0%	No	Yes
VH627	Land north east of Watchfield, Majors Road, Watchfield	Residential	51.5724	0%	0.20%	0%	No	Yes
VH685	Abbey Shopping Centre and the Charter	Employment	2.5102	0%	2.05	7.55%	No	Yes
VH715	Drayton Road Industrial Estate	Employment	1.2093	0%	0%	0%	No	Yes
SH628	Richmead Park	Residential	60.3071	0.01%	0.08%	0%	No	No
SH685	Land southwest of Chinnor	Residential	51.2856	0.11%	0%	0%	No	Yes

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
<b>AS10</b>	<b>Land at Dalton Barracks Garden Village, Shippon</b>	Mixed	145.5169	0.36%	0.20%	0.17%	No	Yes
<b>VH288</b>	<b>Land to the south of East Hanney</b>	Residential	43.5290	0.5%	0.53%	0%	No	Yes
<b>VH403</b>	<b>Land east of Hendred</b>	Residential	124.6673	0.81%	0.17%	0.02%	No	Yes
<b>VH694</b>	<b>Barton Mill in Audlett Drive, Abingdon</b>	Employment	1.5290	0.84%	2.95%	1.57%	Yes	Yes
<b>VH606</b>	<b>Land north of Crab Hill, Grove, Wantage</b>	Residential	191.9754	1.21%	1.21%	0%	No	Yes
<b>JT1f</b>	<b>Abingdon Science Park</b>	Employment	16.71	1.56%	0.23%	5.82%	No	Yes
<b>HOU2w</b>	<b>North West of Abingdon-on-Thames</b>	Residential	12.6104	1.81%	0.47%	27.13%	No	Yes
<b>VH708</b>	<b>Abingdon Science Park at Barton Lane</b>	Employment	13.1783	1.99%	0.29%	7.39%	Yes	Yes

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
<b>VH544</b>	<b>Land North of the A420 at Shrivenham, Sandhill Farm, Shrivenham, SN6 8BH</b>	Residential	220.9972	2.82%	1.82%	0.64%	Yes	Yes
<b>SH649</b>	<b>Blackditch Farm</b>	Residential	25.8118	2.96%	2.55%	0.20%	No	Yes
<b>JT1a</b>	<b>Southmead Industrial Estate, Didcot</b>	Employment	2.6388	3.27%	0.59%	0%	No	Yes
<b>AS1</b>	<b>Land at Berinsfield Garden Village</b>	Mixed	132.5199	4.11%	0.09%	0.60%	No	Yes
<b>SH668</b>	<b>Chalgrove Airfield</b>	Residential	444.3167	4.76%	2.82%	0.77%	Yes	Yes
<b>AS3</b>	<b>Land South of Grenoble Road, Edge of Oxford</b>	Mixed	152.6437	4.99%	4.31%	0.19%	No	Yes
<b>VH404</b>	<b>Land north of Grove</b>	Residential	409.2818	5.13%	0.89%	0.04%	No	Yes

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
VH657	Land West of Wantage, North East of East Challow, Wantage/East Challow	Residential	78.7355	6.39%	0.63%	1.92%	No	Yes
VH656	Shrivenham Park Golf Club, Pennyhooks Lane, Shrivenham, SN6 8EX	Residential	28.7193	7.01%	1.16%	3.19%	No	Yes
VH590	Land at South Abingdon, Drayton road, Abingdon	Residential	87.9920	7.54%	3.29%	0.03%	No	Yes
VH290	Grove Road, Wantage OX12 7BZ	Residential	3.6397	7.62%	2.73%	10.21%	No	Yes
VH376	Land at Old Mill Nurseries, Upper Green, Stanford-in-the-Vale	Residential	3.1806	8.4%	0%	0.50%	No	Yes
AS5	Land at Bayswater Book, Edge of Oxford	Residential	105.0799	8.62%	5.13%	3.33%	No	Yes
SH811	Land south west of Thame (Highfields)	Residential	40.2732	8.83%	8.43%	1.90%	Yes	No

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
<b>AS2</b>	<b>Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre</b>	Mixed	217.4304	9.1%	0.27%	1.14%	Yes	Yes
<b>VH611</b>	<b>Land to the North of Grove and to the East and West of the A338 Wider Opportunity, n/a, Grove, n/a</b>	Residential	333.0788	9.88%	3.32%	0.82%	No	Yes
<b>VH541</b>	<b>Land at Drayton East Way and Land South of Drayton Road, Land at Drayton East Way and Land South of Drayton Road, Drayton</b>	Residential	37.5326	10.67%	0%	1.20%	No	Yes
<b>VH386</b>	<b>Land to the South of Marcham</b>	Residential	47.2850	11.99%	0.05%	2.08%	No	Yes
<b>AS4</b>	<b>Land at Northfield, Edge of Oxford</b>	Residential	68.0458	13.78%	7.42%	4.85%	No	Yes
<b>AS9</b>	<b>North West of Valley Park, Didcot</b>	Residential	33.2790	13.79%	2.35%	3.36%	No	No

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / Promoted Use</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b (%) (used to rank sites)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within high risk of surface water flooding (%)</b>	<b>Proportion of the site within FZ3b with climate change impacts modelled</b>	<b>Site at reservoir risk?</b>	<b>Site at high groundwater risk?</b>
VH560	Land South of Majors Road, Watchfield, SN7 7TR, Majors Road, Watchfield, SN7 7TR	Residential	33.1964	21.36%	13.99%	0%	No	Yes



## **Exception test**

- 1.21. The exception test is a two-part process that requires preparation of evidence to demonstrate that development proposals at risk of flooding deliver wider sustainability benefits and that it can be made safe for the intended lifespan (thus it is a requirement to demonstrate that proposed development will be safe under climate change conditions).
- 1.22. Proposed new development placed in locations at high or medium risk from flooding from other sources now and in the future should be accompanied by evidence that the exception test can be satisfied (in a Level 2 SFRA).
- 1.23. The exception test is required if development is:
- Highly vulnerable and in an area of medium flood risk
  - Essential infrastructure in areas of high flood risk or functional floodplain
  - More vulnerable in areas of high flood risk
- 1.24. The exception test in the SFRA provides additional evidence to demonstrate that the principle of development can be supported at a proposed site and shows that the sustainability benefits of the development to the community outweigh the flood risk.

## **Proposed allocations where the exception test is not required:**

- 1.25. The exception test is not required to allocate land for less vulnerable uses (employment) or where the use proposed is more vulnerable (housing) if the site is not located within Flood Zone 3a, and it is expected that vulnerable development will avoid the functional floodplain. Table 9 below identifies 7 employment sites and 7 residential or mixed-use sites, where it is not necessary to pass the exception test as identified in site specific Level 2 SFRA site screening.

Table 9: sites that are not required to pass the exception test.

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Proposed / promoted Use</b>	<b>Reason exception test not required</b>
AS5	Land at Bayswater Brook, Edge of Oxford	Residential	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a and it is expected that vulnerable development will avoid the area of functional floodplain.

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

AS6	Rich's Sidings and Broadway, Didcot	Mixed	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a
AS7	Didcot Gateway, Didcot	Mixed	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a
AS8	North West of Grove, Grove	Residential	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a.
AS9	North West of Valley Park, Didcot	Residential	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a, and it is expected that vulnerable development will avoid the area of functional floodplain.
AS10	Land at Dalton Barracks Garden Village, Shippon	Mixed	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a and it is expected that vulnerable development will avoid the area of functional floodplain.
AS11	Culham Campus	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses
AS12	Harwell Campus	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses.
AS16	Vauxhall Barracks, Didcot	Mixed	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is not located within Flood Zone 3a.

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

JT1a	Southmead Industrial Estate, Didcot	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses and it is expected that development will avoid the area of functional floodplain.
JT1e	Monument Business Park, Chalgrove	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses
JT1f	Abingdon Science Park	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses and it is expected that development will avoid the area of functional floodplain.
JT1i	Former Esso Research Centre	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses
JT1k	South of Park Road, Faringdon	Employment	The site is not required to pass the exception test as it is proposed for less vulnerable uses

**Proposed allocations where the exception test is required:**

1.26. Of the 21 proposed allocations in the Joint Local Plan it is necessary to undertake the exception test for 5 of the allocations. The 5 allocations where the exception test has been undertaken are listed below in table 7 along with the conclusion and whether the proposed allocations pass the test. Site proformas have been prepared for each of these sites setting out the justification for why the proposed allocation pass the test, the proformas are attached at the end of this appendix.

Table 10: sites where the exception test is required.

Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed / promoted use	Exception test passed
AS1	Land at Berinsfield Garden Village	Mixed	Yes
AS3	Land South of Grenoble Road, Edge of Oxford	Mixed	Yes
AS2	Land adjacent to Culham Science Centre	Mixed	Yes
AS4	Land at Northfield, Edge of Oxford	Residential	Yes
HOU2v	North West of Abingdon-on-Thames	Residential	Yes

**Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests Conclusion**

1.27. The requirements of the sequential and exception tests where required have been passed and support the allocation of sites proposed through the Joint Local Plan. There is not sufficient capacity on suitable and available sites outside of the proposed allocations to meet the councils’ development needs in areas of lower flood risk. Additionally, as demonstrated through the review of the proposed allocations in this topic paper these sites have wider sustainability benefits, and the risk of flooding can be mitigated and made safe now and in the future.

Exception test proformas

AS1: Land at Berinsfield Garden Village		
Site area (ha)	132.43ha	
Proposed development impermeable area	112.6 ha (assumed 85% of site area)	
Proposed use	Approximately 1,700 new homes, 60 units of housing with care for older people, between 6 and 10 pitches for gypsies and travellers, 5 hectares of additional employment land, and supporting services and facilities	
Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	More vulnerable	
<b>Medium risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ2)	0.79ha	0.6%
Surface water Medium Risk (1% AEP event outline)	0.63ha	0.6%
<b>High risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ3a)	0ha	0%
Fluvial (FZ3b)	5.5ha	4.1%
Surface water (High Risk (3.3% AEP event outline)	0.13ha	0.1%
<b>Climate change</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1% AEP event + climate change (additional risk)	0.79ha	0.6%
FZ3b + Climate Change (additional risk)	0.79ha	0.6%
<b>Other sources of flood risk</b>		
Site at reservoir risk	No	
Groundwater	Yes	
<b>Description of flood risk</b>		
Around 0.6% of the site is located within areas of medium flood risk, notably flood zone 2 and areas at medium risk of surface water flooding. Around 4.1% of the site is located within flood zone 3b.		
<b>Exception test</b>		
Evidence to demonstrate that development proposals at risk of flooding deliver wider sustainability benefits	<p>There is sufficient capacity on the site to accommodate development outside of this small area at risk of surface water and fluvial flooding. We have illustrated this on the indicative concept plan for this site, which excludes vulnerable development in areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this point, by including areas of flood risk within the site area, the development can include</p>	

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

	<p>a strategy for addressing flood risk across the site, allowing for more effective management of the risk of flooding through sustainable drainage strategies.</p> <p>Furthermore, any development on this site would need to comply with Policy CE6 – Flood Risk, and national planning policies and guidance on flood risk.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan proposes to carry forward this allocation from the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.</p> <p>Delivering growth and regeneration at Berinsfield promotes a sustainable pattern of development that will address key issues currently facing the village. Development at Berinsfield will deliver necessary and specific benefits that cannot be achieved by developing elsewhere in South Oxfordshire</p> <p>Appendix 1 of this paper identifies the reasons why we have proposed to continue this allocation, but in summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site located on land to the east of the village of Berinsfield. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscape.</li> <li>• In June 2019, Berinsfield was awarded Garden Village status by the Government. The Garden Village includes undeveloped land to the east of the existing settlement which makes up this site. The Joint Local Plan’s emerging spatial strategy includes focusing new housing at Garden communities which includes Berinsfield.</li> </ul>
<p>Will the development be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and,</p>	<p>Yes, the development can be made safe for its lifetime. The Level 2 SFRA site screening report concluded:</p> <p>Based on current information and the use of proxies to represent the impacts of climate change, this site should be able to pass the exception test. However, all the recommendations suggested in this Level 2</p>

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

where possible, will reduce flood risk overall?	SFRA should be considered at the site-specific FRA stage or before any site design planning.  See Level 2 SFRA - Appendix A site screening reports, for full details on how development at this location can be made safe now and during the lifespan of the development.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
Is the exception test passed?	Yes – for the reasons listed above the proposed development would deliver wider sustainability benefits and the development can be made safe for the intended lifespan including under climate change conditions.

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<b>AS2 Land adjacent to Culham Campus</b>		
Site area (ha)	217.27	
Proposed development impermeable area	184.8 ha (assumed 85% of site area)	
Proposed use	This site is allocated to deliver approximately 3,500 new homes, 60 units of housing with care for older people, between 6 and 10 pitches for gypsies and travellers, supporting services and facilities and to optimise the use of existing employment land at the No.1 site by Policy AS2 of the Joint Local Plan.	
Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	More vulnerable	
<b>Medium risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ2)	5.2606	2.4194%
Surface water Medium Risk (1% AEP event outline)	0.8000	0.6327%
<b>High risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ3)	2.4715	1.1367%
Fluvial (FZ3b)	19.7931	9.1032%
Surface water (High Risk (3.3% AEP event outline)	0.5757	0.2648%
<b>Climate change</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1% AEP event + climate change (additional risk)	5.2606	2.4194%
FZ3b + Climate Change (additional risk)	2.4715	1.1367%
<b>Other sources of flood risk</b>		
Site at reservoir risk	Yes	
Groundwater	Yes	
<b>Description of flood risk</b>		
<p>87.34% of the site is located within flood zone 1, the area of lowest fluvial flood risk. Small areas of the site are located within flood zone 2 (2.42%), flood zone 3a (1.14%) and 9.1% is within flood zone 3b. There are areas within the site at either medium (0.63%) or high (0.27%) risk of surface water flooding. There is also a potential for ground water and reservoir flooding. Under the climate change scenarios there is an additional risk of fluvial flooding (1.14%) and surface water flooding (2.42%).</p> <p>In most circumstances, low lying parts of development sites are likely to be affected by multiple sources of flooding, for example both surface water flooding and fluvial flooding.</p>		



**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

Exception test	
<p>Evidence to demonstrate that development proposals at risk of flooding deliver wider sustainability benefits</p>	<p>There is sufficient site capacity to accommodate development outside of the area at risk of fluvial and surface water flooding. We have illustrated this on the indicative concept plan for this site, which excludes vulnerable development in areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this point, by including areas of flood risk within the site area, the development can include a strategy for addressing flood risk across the site, allowing for more effective management of the risk of flooding through sustainable drainage strategies.</p> <p>Furthermore, any development on this site would need to comply with Policy CE6 – Flood Risk, and national planning policies and guidance on flood risk.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan proposes to carry forward this allocation from the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.</p> <p>This allocation provides an opportunity to deliver housing adjacent to one of the major employers in southern Oxfordshire and enable the Culham Campus to realise its full potential as a science campus where publicly funded science research and commercial technology growth can flourish. Development in this location is at the heart of Science Vale and supports the delivery of much needed significant strategic infrastructure.</p> <p>Appendix 1 of this paper identifies the reasons why we have proposed to continue this allocation, but in summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is located on land adjacent to Culham Campus, which is a major employment site in the Science Vale area. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the Green Belt and National Landscapes.</li> <li>• The Joint Local Plan’s spatial strategy identifies Science Vale as a focus for new development. The strategy supports sites that are closely located, and well related to existing major employments where they are not within the Green Belt or a National Landscape.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

<p>Will the development be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall?</p>	<p>Yes, the development can be made safe for its lifetime. The Level 2 SFRA site screening report concluded:</p> <p>Based on current information and the use of proxies to represent the impacts of climate change, this site should be able to pass the exception test. However, all the recommendations suggested in this Level 2 SFRA should be considered at the site-specific FRA stage or before any site design planning.</p> <p>See Appendix A - Level 2 SFRA site screening reports, for full details on how development at this location can be made safe now and during the lifespan of the development.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p>Is the exception test passed?</p>	<p>Yes – for the reason listed above the proposed development would deliver wider sustainability benefits and the development can be made safe for the intended lifespan including under climate change conditions.</p>

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

<b>AS3: Land south of Grenoble Road, Edge of Oxford</b>		
Site area (ha)	152.53	
Proposed development impermeable area	129.7 ha (assumed 85% of site area)	
Proposed use	Approximately 3,000 new homes, 60 units of housing with care for older people, between 6 and 10 pitches for gypsies and travellers, 10 hectares of additional employment land, incorporating an extension to Oxford Science Park, a mobility hub serving the A4074 corridor, and supporting services and facilities.	
Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	More vulnerable	
<b>Medium risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ2)	0.26ha	0.2%
Surface water Medium Risk (1% AEP event outline)	3.39ha	6.5%
<b>High risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ3a)	0.02ha	0.02%
Fluvial (FZ3b)	7.6ha	5%
Surface water (High Risk (3.3% AEP event outline)	6.6ha	4.3%
<b>Climate change</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1% AEP event + climate change (additional risk)	0.26ha	0.2%
FZ3b + Climate Change (additional risk)	0.28ha	0.2%
<b>Other sources of flood risk</b>		
Site at reservoir risk	No	
Groundwater	Yes	
<b>Description of flood risk</b>		
Around 6.5% of the site is located within areas of medium flood risk, notably flood zone 2 and areas at medium risk of surface water flooding. Around 5% of the site is located within flood zone 3b, and 4.3% in areas of high risk of surface water flooding.		
<b>Exception test</b>		
Evidence to demonstrate that development proposals at risk of flooding deliver wider sustainability benefits	There is sufficient capacity on the site to accommodate development outside of this small area at risk of surface water and fluvial flooding. We have illustrated this on the indicative concept plan for this site, which excludes vulnerable development in areas at risk of flooding.	

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

	<p>Notwithstanding this point, by including areas of flood risk within the site area, the development can include a strategy for addressing flood risk across the site, allowing for more effective management of the risk of flooding through sustainable drainage strategies.</p> <p>Furthermore, any development on this site would need to comply with Policy CE6 – Flood Risk, and national planning policies and guidance on flood risk.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan proposes to carry forward this allocation from the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.</p> <p>The allocation is an urban extension to the southern edge of Oxford which will promote a sustainable form of development that will in part help Oxford City by addressing the agreed unmet housing need identified in the Oxford City Local Plan 2036, and first addressed through the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035. Development at Grenoble Road will provide specific benefits that would not be achievable elsewhere in the district; notably the provision of a new mobility hub to the south of Oxford, the provision of affordable housing, an extension to the Oxford Science Park and the ability to contribute to the regeneration of Blackbird Leys. Furthermore, the site would also benefit from the potential re-opening of the Cowley Branch Line at the Oxford Science Park.</p> <p>Appendix 1 of this paper identifies the reasons why we have proposed to continue this allocation, but in summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site is located on land adjacent to the south of Oxford. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</li><li>• The South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 identified the site as helping to provide for Oxford City's unmet housing need, including affordable housing need, close to where that need arises.</li><li>• The Joint Local Plan's emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient</li></ul>
--	--

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

	<p>sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</p>
<p>Will the development be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall?</p>	<p>Yes, the development can be made safe for its lifetime. The Level 2 SFRA site screening report concluded:</p> <p>Based on current information and the use of proxies to represent the impacts of climate change, this site should be able to pass the exception test. However, all the recommendations suggested in this Level 2 SFRA should be considered at the site-specific FRA stage or before any site design planning</p> <p>See Appendix A - Level 2 SFRA site screening reports, for full details on how development at this location can be made safe now and during the lifespan of the development.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p>Is the exception test passed?</p>	<p>Yes – for the reason listed above the proposed development would deliver wider sustainability benefits and the development can be made safe for the intended lifespan including under climate change conditions.</p>

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

<b>AS4 Land at Northfield, Edge of Oxford</b>		
Site area (ha)	68.00	
Proposed development impermeable area	57.9 ha (assumed 85% of site area)	
Proposed use	This site is allocated to deliver approximately 1,800 new homes, 60 units of housing with care for older people, between 6 and 10 pitches for gypsies and travellers, and supporting services and facilities by Policy AS4 of the Joint Local Plan.	
Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	More vulnerable	
Medium risk	Area	Percentage
Fluvial (FZ2)	1.9000	2.7922%
Surface water Medium Risk (1% AEP event outline)	2.4742	11.0531%
High risk	Area	Percentage
Fluvial (FZ3)	1.3978	2.0541%
Fluvial (FZ3b)	9.3811	13.7865%
Surface water (High Risk (3.3% AEP event outline)	5.0470	7.4170%
Climate change	Area	Percentage
1% AEP event + climate change (additional risk)	1.9000	2.7922%
FZ3b + Climate Change (additional risk)	3.2978	4.8464%
Other sources of flood risk		
Site at reservoir risk	No	
Groundwater	Yes	
Description of flood risk		
<p>81.37% of the site is located within flood zone 1, the area of lowest fluvial flood risk. Small areas of the site are located within flood zone 2 (2.79%), flood zone 3a (2.05%) and 13.79% is in flood zone 3b. There are areas within the site at either medium (11.05%) or high (7.42%) risk of surface water flooding. There is also a potential for ground water flooding. Under the climate change scenario there is an additional risk of fluvial flooding (4.85%) and surface water flooding (2.79%).</p> <p>In most circumstances, low lying parts of development sites are likely to be affected by multiple sources of flooding, for example both surface water flooding and fluvial flooding.</p>		
Exception test		

## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

<p>Evidence to demonstrate that development proposals at risk of flooding deliver wider sustainability benefits</p>	<p>There is sufficient capacity on the site to accommodate development outside of the area at risk of fluvial and surface water flooding. We have illustrated this on the indicative concept plan for this site, which excludes vulnerable development in areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this point, by including areas of flood risk within the site area, the development can include a strategy for addressing flood risk across the site, allowing for more effective management of the risk of flooding through sustainable drainage strategies.</p> <p>Furthermore, any development on this site would need to comply with Policy CE6 – Flood Risk, and national planning policies and guidance on flood risk.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan proposes to carry forward this allocation from the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.</p> <p>The allocation is an urban extension to the edge of Oxford which will promote a sustainable form of development that will in part help Oxford City by addressing the agreed unmet housing need identified in the Oxford City Local Plan 2036, and first addressed through the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035. Northfield is well located for access to employment and services within walking and cycling distance, and the B480 is an existing public transport corridor. The site has excellent opportunities to provide improved transport links. Furthermore, the site would also benefit from the potential re-opening of the Cowley Branch Line.</p> <p>Appendix 1 of this paper identifies the reasons why we have proposed to continue this allocation, but in summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site is located on land adjacent to the south of Oxford. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</li></ul>
---	---

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan 2035 identified, and the Joint Local Plan continues to identify the site as helping to provide for Oxford City’s unmet housing need, including affordable housing need, close to where that need arises.</li> <li>• The Joint Local Plan’s spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</li> </ul>
<p>Will the development be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall?</p>	<p>Yes, the development can be made safe for its lifetime. The Level 2 SFRA site screening report concluded:</p> <p>Based on current information and the use of proxies to represent the impacts of climate change, this site should be able to pass the exception test. However, all the recommendations suggested in this Level 2 SFRA should be considered at the site-specific FRA stage or before any site design planning.</p> <p>See Appendix A - Level 2 SFRA site screening reports, for full details on how development at this location can be made safe now and during the lifespan of the development.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p>Is the exception test passed?</p>	<p>Yes – for the reason listed above the proposed development would deliver wider sustainability benefits and the development can be made safe for the intended lifespan including under climate change conditions.</p>



## Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests

<b>HOU2v North west of Abingdon-on-Thames</b>		
Site area (ha)	12.6	
Proposed use	Residential	
Proposed development impermeable area	10.7 ha (assumed 85% of site area)	
Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification	More vulnerable	
<b>Medium risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ2)	2.55ha	20.2%
Surface water Medium Risk (1% AEP event outline)	0.042ha	0.8%
<b>High risk</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Fluvial (FZ3a)	0.87ha	6.9%
Fluvial (FZ3b)	0.23ha	1.8%
Surface water (High Risk (3.3% AEP event outline)	0.06ha	0.47%
<b>Climate change</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1% AEP event + climate change (additional risk)	2.58ha	20.2%
FZ3b + Climate Change (additional risk)	3.42ha	27.1%
<b>Other sources of flood risk</b>		
Site at reservoir risk	No	
Groundwater	Yes	
<b>Description of flood risk</b>		
Around 20% of the site is located with flood zone 2, an area of medium flood risk, with high risk constituting the largest source of flood risk when we consider climate change modelling (raising to around 27%).		
<b>Exception test</b>		
Evidence to demonstrate that development proposals at risk of flooding deliver wider sustainability benefits	<p>There are some significant areas of higher flood risk on this site. However, these are concentrated in the northern corner of the site which already has planning permission and is under construction. The remaining part of the site without permission is not in an area of high flood risk.</p> <p>Furthermore, any development on this site would need to comply with Policy CE6 – Flood Risk, and national planning policies and guidance on flood risk.</p> <p>The Joint Local Plan proposes to carry forward this allocation from the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031. This allocation will deliver a high quality</p>	

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

	<p>and sustainable urban extension to Abingdon-on-Thames which is integrated with Abingdon-on-Thames so residents can access existing facilities in the town.</p> <p>Appendix 1 of this paper identifies the reasons why we have proposed to continue this allocation, but in summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The site is located on greenfield land on the edge of the settlement of Abingdon on Thames. The site is not located within an important protected landscape feature being outside the areas in the districts covered by designations of Green Belt or National Landscapes.</li> <li>▪ The site is located within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Core Policy 4a: Meeting our Housing Needs states the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford City to be addressed within the Vale of White Horse of 2,200 dwellings will be provided for through either strategic or additional sites within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area.</li> <li>▪ The Joint Local Plan’s emerging spatial strategy states that we will allocate sufficient sites to meet the existing agreed unmet housing needs of Oxford. The emerging spatial strategy therefore provides support for the retention of sites previously allocated to address Oxford unmet housing need, i.e. those sites located close to Oxford.</li> </ul>
<p>Will the development be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall?</p>	<p>Yes, the development can be made safe for its lifetime. The Level 2 SFRA site screening report concluded:</p> <p>Based on current information and the use of proxies to represent the impacts of climate change, this site should be able to pass the exception test. However, all the recommendations suggested in this Level 2 SFRA should be considered at the site-specific FRA stage or before any site design planning.</p>

**Appendix 5: Sequential Flood Risk and Exception Tests**

	See Appendix A - Level 2 SFRA site screening reports, for full details on how development at this location can be made safe now and during the lifespan of the development.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
Is the exception test passed?	Yes – for the reason listed above the proposed development would deliver wider sustainability benefits and the development can be made safe for the intended lifespan including under climate change conditions.

**Alternative formats of this publication, a summary of its contents or specific sections, are available on request.**

**These include large print, Braille, audio, email, easy read and alternative languages.**

**Please contact customer services to discuss your requirements on 01235 422422.**

**Planning Policy Team**

Abbey House, Abbey Close

Abingdon, OX14 3JE

Tel: 01235 422422

Email: [planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk)

[www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk)

[www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE