

**DRAFT Site Assessment Criteria & Green Sites - FOR COMMENT**

Each site identified by you in the previous consultation exercise is known as a **RED site** and will be scored (max 100 points) using the criteria set out below, **with higher scores** indicating a more favoured site.

This assessment will cover each sites **suitability** and **acceptability**. Their **availability** will be subject to discussions with owners/land owners/developers.

Each **GREEN site** (identified by you as **not** for development) will be classified as:

- Green 1:** Established infrastructure—like AR Village Green
- Green 2:** Local Community Amenities—like KB Hillwerke Trust Field etc
- Green 3:** Established open spaces, sometimes with historical significance

Sites which are listed as Green 1 and 2 **WILL NOT** be assessed as there is no development potential according to SODC guidelines.

However all RED sites also listed as GREEN 3 will be processed using the proposed criteria below.

<b>Landscape</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites which may be developed without impact upon the landscape, nor upon strategic or sensitive views</li> <li>• Sites which maintain and do not infringe upon existing green and open spaces</li> </ul>
<b>Character</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites where development would preserve or enhance the special rural character of the area, including the existing conservation areas and Chilterns AONB.</li> <li>• Sites which may be developed without material detriment to the vista enjoyed by residents of existing dwellings, including visual impact</li> <li>• Sites which preserve the integrity and special character of the distinctive village community’s</li> <li>• Sites which do not detract from the setting, character or enjoyment of protected spaces, conservation areas or any listed buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Settlement Boundaries*</b> <small>* Defined boundaries within the current village envelopes which preserve the integrity of the distinctive village communities</small>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites within the defined settlement boundary having an established hedge/tree frontage to any roads, on the presumption that development may only take place behind that retained vegetation</li> <li>• Sites within the defined settlement boundary which do not impinge upon the setting of the principal villages of AR and KB, nor upon the strategic gap between those villages, as so defined in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Sites which avoid ribbon development and/or isolated development on existing protected spaces and farm land , so NOT extending any building into open countryside</li> </ul>
<b>Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites where levels of protection from traffic noise(from B4009 and M40) are commensurate with those enjoyed by existing residents</li> <li>• Sites where development would not detract from established ecological or biodiversity features, including protected species or where appropriate mitigation may be introduced</li> <li>• Sites where all ancient trees, hedges and Tree Preservation Orders(TPOs) would be maintained</li> </ul>
<b>Infill</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is an infill site, being undeveloped land between two built-up properties and that reaffirms the established frontage;</li> <li>• Site with minimal visual impact to any neighbours of infill site</li> </ul>
<b>Brownfield</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites - previously developed land occupied by a permanent structure and land associated with it - but excluding gardens to the front or rear of existing residential properties</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites capable of development with direct access to existing roads and services (utilities, drainage, waste disposal) while requiring minimal additional infrastructure</li> <li>• Site locations that avoid known stress points in existing infrastructure</li> <li>• Sites which will not result in a significant increase in traffic on minor roads or lanes</li> </ul>

# ARPC Neighbourhood Plan Public Consultation



<b>Ground</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites which may be developed without remodelling or re-contouring of the existing ground levels and that maintain historical ground and land characteristics</li> <li>• Sites shown to benefit from well-drained soil and where there is no risk of flooding or interference with natural water courses.</li> </ul>
<b>Density</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that realise a development potential for no more than 5 new dwellings, in accordance with the building density as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• Sites of less than 0.5 Hectares</li> <li>• Sites able to accommodate parking for residents and visitors within any development to avoid traffic overspill</li> </ul>
<b>Amenities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites within convenient walking distance of the school, village hall, playground and Church</li> <li>• Sites with safe pedestrian access to existing public transport</li> </ul>

## We need your views NOW !!

1. Are these appropriate criteria to assess potential housing sites?
2. Should anything be added or omitted?
3. Should there be a weighting system whereby some criteria should be afforded greater or lesser weight than others, and, if so, which criteria should be so weighted?

The table below lists the nominated Green sites in the 3 categories (the ‘S’ references in brackets relate to the maps on the NP website):

<b>Green 1: “Established infrastructure”</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AR Village Green</li> <li>• KB Village Green</li> </ul>	<b>Green 2: “Local Community Amenities”</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB Hillwerke Trust Playing Field</li> <li>• KB Allotments incl. Field(North)</li> <li>• KB ARCC original Cricket Field</li> <li>• KB ARCC “New” Cricket Field</li> <li>• AR Church grounds</li> </ul>
<b>Green 3: “Established open spaces, sometimes with historical significance”</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AR Triangle entrance to AR (B4009)</li> <li>• AR Open space/Horse paddock</li> <li>• AR Open Fields North East</li> <li>• AR Field adjacent to original London Road (West)</li> <li>• AR Field adjacent to original London Road (East)</li> <li>• AR/KB Field(Stud) adjacent to B4009 (North side)</li> <li>• KB ARCC Potential 3<sup>rd</sup> Cricket field (East/ adjacent B4009)</li> <li>• KB Strip farming field adjacent original “Shoulder of Mutton”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB Strip farming field front of original “Shoulder of Mutton”</li> <li>• KB Donkey Paddock behind original “Shoulder of Mutton”</li> <li>• KB Field to North of Allotments</li> <li>• KB Fields surrounding Kingston Manor House</li> <li>• KB Field to the north of “new” Cricket Field</li> <li>• KB Field to the north of Farm buildings</li> </ul>

4. Should anything be added or omitted?
5. Should any Green site be moved to another Green category, if so which and where to?

## Don’t miss this chance to give your input!

Please give feedback before January 31<sup>st</sup> via the NP email address – [np@astonrowant.org.uk](mailto:np@astonrowant.org.uk)

or hand deliver/post to ARNP, c/o Brook House, The Green, Kingston Blount, OX39 4SE