

Schedule of Modifications

Long Wittenham Parish Council submitted a proposal to review their neighbourhood plan to South Oxfordshire District Council in October 2018. South Oxfordshire District Council carried out a consultation in November 2018 and submitted the Neighbourhood Plan Review for an independent examination.

The examination of the Plan considered the documents as initially submitted together with the responses to the consultation process. The independent examiner, Andrew Ashcroft, issued his [Update and Preliminary Findings](#) in September 2019.

In response to the examiner's update and preliminary findings, Long Wittenham Parish Council has undertaken further work on the Plan. Table 1 of this schedule of modifications highlights substantive changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan Review originally submitted in October 2018 and updated in November 2021. The purpose of this document is to help those involved in the consultation identify where substantive changes have been made.

In Table 1, changes are shown as follows:

- Deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~
- Additions to the text are shown in **bold underline**

Please note that page numbers refer to the page numbers in the revised Neighbourhood Plan Review document (November 2021).

The revised Neighbourhood Review is accompanied by a Further Environmental Report Update (November 2021) and other supporting documents. Table 2 identifies the nature of the changes made to these documents.

Table 1 - Changes to Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Plan:

Section	Modification
Front cover and throughout	References to plan period amended to align with the Local Plan: 2018-2035 <u>2018-2035</u>
Page 5, Paragraph 4	Addition of new paragraph: <u>4.The RLWNDP was subject to Regulation 14 in autumn 2018 and was submitted to SODC in October 2018. During the examination, significant objections were raised by Historic England regarding the archaeological significance of the site allocation for the community hub, and following advice from the Examiner, the Parish Council withdrew the NDP. Since that time, the Parish Council has worked with its preferred developer for the hub scheme who have commissioned archaeological reports regarding the site. The scheme has been modified to take account of these findings, and the RLWNDP has been modified accordingly.</u>
Page 23, Paragraph 87	Addition of new paragraph: <u>87. The NDP was subject to Regulation 14 consultation in Autumn 2018 and submitted to SODC in October 2018. At the latter stages of the NDP preparation after Regulation 16 consultation on the 2018 submission draft, Historic England scheduled part of the</u>

	<p><u>allocation site. The 2018 draft NDP was withdrawn upon the advice of the Examiner, and Archaeological work was undertaken to understand the historic context of the portion of the allocation site that was not subject to scheduling. The full background is set out in the Evidence Paper: Archaeology, the SEA Environmental Report and the evaluation prepared by Cotswold Archaeology (2021). All documents accompany the LWNDP and should be consulted in the preparation of any scheme or proposal. The scheme and the RLWNDP has been amended accordingly. The principles outlined above have not been changed.</u></p>
<p>Page 24, Paragraph 88</p>	<p>Amendment of paragraph:</p> <p>88. Emerging Local Plan Policy H8 states that in villages such as Long Wittenham where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place, there should be at least a 5% increase in dwelling numbers above those recorded in the 2011 census. <u>Neighbourhood Development Plans will need to demonstrate that the level of growth they are planning for is commensurate to the scale and character of their village, and this is expected to be around a 5% to 10% increase in dwellings above the number of dwellings in the village in the 2011 census (minus any completions since 1 April 2011).</u> This amounts to at least 16 new houses over the local plan period up to 2033 2035. A recent planning appeal allowed 36 houses which exceeds the requirement by some way—this site has been allocated under NDP policy LW3. In addition, there has been another 4 houses built since 2011 as infill development. There is therefore no additional requirement for Long Wittenham to allocate sites according to the emerging Local Plan and its supporting evidence base. The supporting text for H8 states that smaller villages will look to larger villages for higher level services and facilities. The Emerging Local Plan considers Long Wittenham to be relatively less sustainable in terms of its services and facilities than other villages and towns. <u>Since 2011, 43 dwellings have been approved in Long Wittenham.</u></p>
<p>Page 25, Paragraph 102</p>	<p>Addition to paragraph:</p> <p>102. The development must also respect the area’s archaeological and natural features and complement the village character in its design. <u>During the Regulation 16 consultation and Examination in 2018, Historic England raised significant concerns about the preferred hub site. Subsequent archaeological investigations were undertaken in accordance with HE guidance, which is explained in detail in Evidence Papers: Archaeology and Site Allocations.</u></p>
<p>Pages 25 -27, Paragraphs 104-8</p>	<p>Deletion of paragraph and addition of five new paragraphs:</p> <p>93. NPPG para. 33 requires local plans to be reviewed every 5 years. It took Long Wittenham Parish Council 8 years to agree the scheme with all the landowners and partners. It can be concluded that should the hub scheme fail, it would take longer to redesign the scheme than it would to review the NDP. Therefore, should the hub scheme fail, the allocated Didcot Road site would not be developed, and the</p>

preparation of a revised Community Hub scheme would be dealt with in the next review of the NDP.

104. The Parish Council responded to the growth scenarios assessment in the updated SEA (2021) as follows: Option 1 (Didcot Road) is the Parish Council's preferred option, in light of the SEA Environment Report, which shows this option to perform well relative to Option 2.

It is recognised that there are a range of issues and likely impacts associated with Option 1;

however, there will be the potential to avoid and mitigate impacts through the development

management process, guided by policy within the RLWNP. There may nonetheless be residual

negative impacts, perhaps most notably in respect of the historic environment, but the Parish

Council believes that these are likely to be outweighed by the community benefits that will result from delivering a new

community hub, and enabling the relocation of the school and village hall away from their current locations on the High Street.

There is no other 'do something' option for the RLWNP, as there is little or nothing that the plan can do to enable a successful

redevelopment of the existing school site. The only other option for the Parish Council would be to not progress with a RLWNP

focused on the allocation of land for

community infrastructure, but this option is not favoured because of a well understood need to

proactively take steps to address the current issues with the school and village hall

105. Figure 7 shows how the new Scheduled Monument (Anglo-Saxon great hall complex and Roman settlement) sits within a wider historic landscape protected by a significant number of other scheduled sites.

106. The scheduled monument has been defined to preserve a sample of the 'sunken featured building' features in the southern part of the monument. However a number of these features lie outside the monument in the eastern part of the development site proposed in LW1. In defining the site to be scheduled, a decision was made by Historic England to afford the protection as a scheduled monument to a sample of these features, but those outside that protected area still receive a level of protection and need for consideration through the requirements of the NPPF and local plan policies. It is likely that these features relating to the allocation in LW1 will be harmed to an extent by construction works as part of the development. This would be considered to be, at least, a moderate harm to the wider site of archaeological interest requiring some form of mitigation to the heritage asset where possible, in addition to the justification of the public benefits to be delivered.

107. A way forward that would allow the development at Didcot Road to proceed with an acceptable level of harm through mitigation was agreed between the Steering Group and Historic

	<p><u>England and this has been set out in the Environment Report and codified in LW1. Applications and proposals for land at Didcot Road should consult the Environment Report (2021), the Archaeological Evaluation prepared by Cotswold Archaeology (2021) and the Evidence Paper: Archaeology (2021).</u></p> <p><u>108. The housing portion of the proposal is contingent upon delivery of the other elements of the scheme, as set out in A above. Housing development that does not make provision for A a-f will not be allowed on this site.</u></p>
<p>Pages 28-29, Policy LW1: Community Hub</p>	<p>Amendments and additions to policy text:</p> <p>Policy LW1: Community Hub</p> <p>A. The site referred to as the “Community Hub” shown on Figure 6 is allocated for development of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A primary school (c. 100 pupils and on land at least 1.34 ha in line with current standards) and pre-school with outdoor space to allow for potential expansion; b. A Village Hall with ancillary activities such as café, shop, meeting spaces, performance space, and other community based recreational activities c. Playing fields with ancillary development and infrastructure; d. Car parking sufficient for meeting the needs of the land uses set out above; e. Cycle and footpath linkages to the surrounding adopted, permitted and proposed network, maximising the potential of Footpath 287/5 to provide links between the site and the village centre and the countryside; f. 40-45 houses (to include affordable housing as required by the local planning authority <u>in Local Plan policy H9)</u>. <p>B. Development on the community hub site shall be subject to a masterplan and design brief to be agreed with the local planning authority. The masterplan will address the following points as a minimum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Innovative and attractive design will be required that takes full account of changing educational and social expectations whilst complementing the unique character of Long Wittenham as described in Evidence Papers: Character Assessment and Countryside; b. The proposal will complement the adjacent Fieldside development (LW3), and if possible, will propose how the two developments will jointly address issues such as access, the protection of views into and out of the countryside (particularly with regard to Wittenham Clumps as set out in LW8). If it is not possible to consider these matters jointly, the masterplan should consider them for the community hub site alone; c. Open space provision, including the playing fields and the open space associated with the housing portion of the site, should relate to and compliment provision made at Fieldside, and to provision in the wider village with the

	<p>aim of providing a variety of open spaces that can serve different recreational and amenity purposes;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Innovative and attractive design in compliance with educational standards will be required whilst complementing the unique character of Long Wittenham as described in Evidence Papers: Character Assessment and Countryside; b. Parking and circulation in the scheme will lead to an overall increase in sustainable transport choices and a reduction in congestion in the village; c. Use of Sustainable Urban Drainage will manage surface water <u>and fluvial flooding.</u> <p>C. Heritage Appraisal and Impact Assessment proportionate to the significance of the designated and non-designated assets and archaeological remains should inform proposals in accordance with national policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>A programme of pre-application archaeological investigation will be undertaken by the applicant to inform the layout of development, preserving archaeological remains of interest in-situ where possible, and to inform a strategy of enhancement of the monument and the wider heritage asset.</u> b. <u>A written scheme of investigation will be agreed in writing with Oxford shire County Council's archaeological advisors.</u> c. <u>The layout and design of development will be demonstrated to preserve remains of archaeological interest that have been identified within the site in-situ, giving the highest priority to remains that contribute to the significance of the adjacent scheduled monument. This should include the siting of areas of open space within the development to preserve such remains from disturbance where possible.</u> d. <u>A construction management plan will be required to ensure these areas are not disturbed during the construction process.</u> e. <u>A management plan for open space following construction will be required to ensure it is appropriately maintained.</u> f. <u>Where the loss of remains of archaeological interest is unavoidable and justified based on the public benefits that would arise an appropriate record should be made prior to their loss to a level of detail agreed with the Council's archaeological advisor.</u> g. <u>The findings of any investigation and recording, along with those from previous investigations should be made available to the public through an interpretation strategy, including on-site measures that should be agreed as a condition of consent.</u> h. <u>The layout, landscaping and scale, materials and form of buildings will be designed to minimise harm to the setting of the scheduled monument as well as exploring opportunities to emphasise the</u>
--	---

	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>importance of the monument as a site of national archaeological interest.</u></p> <p>D. Development proposals should clearly set out development phasing including off-site contingencies. <u>The community hub element of the project should be legally transferred to the Parish Council before completion of the 20th dwelling, and the primary school and pre-school should be transferred to the education authority/academy before the start of the final 10% of the residential component.</u></p> <p>E. The housing portion of the proposal is contingent upon delivery of the other elements of the scheme, as set out in A above. Housing development that does not make provision for A a-f will not be allowed on this site.</p>
<p>Page 30, Paragraph 109</p>	<p>Deletion of paragraph and addition of new paragraph:</p> <p>98. Since the housing land allocations in this NDP are sufficient to ensure that Long Wittenham's housing requirement has been met, it is not necessary during this review of the NDP to allocate further housing sites. Therefore, it is not necessary to preclude the development of the Village Hall or school sites for housing unless this makes a contribution to the hub scheme. If the Village Hall and school sites are not required to make such a contribution, then it is possible that a non-housing land use would be preferable. In this case, the optimal future land use would need to be proven in individual planning applications.</p> <p><u>109. It is not necessary for the RLW NDP to allocate further housing sites since the need identified in Local Plan Policy H8 has been met. However, the development of the Village Hall and school sites are safeguarded as housing sites in order to cross-subsidise the delivery of the hub scheme. However, should the cross-subsidy not be required, the policy must anticipate that proposals for other land uses may come forward and may be supportable.</u></p>
<p>Page 30, Paragraph 110</p>	<p>Amendment of paragraph:</p> <p>110. The safeguarding approach is being used in LW2 for the Village Hall and school sites since it will be more flexible if the community hub scheme fails than would a straightforward housing land allocation which is proven to be unnecessary. <u>The safeguarding approach, rather than a housing allocation, anticipates that other land uses may come forward on these sites, for instance Class E or Class F development.</u></p>
<p>Page 31, Policy LW2: Safeguarded sites</p>	<p>Amendments to policy text:</p> <p>Policy LW2: Safeguarded sites</p> <p>A. The sites referred to as the "school" and "Village Hall" shown on Figure 6 are safeguarded as part of the community hub proposal.</p>

	<p>B. In the event that the community hub scheme progresses, and a new school or village hall will be made available, neither site should be developed for any other purpose than: <u>and/or Village Hall is provided, it may be argued that either of the safeguarded sites will be required to be redeveloped to cross-subsidise the proposal in LW1. Under these circumstances, the following development will be supported:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. School site: up to 5 houses and village green and improved setting for the War Memorial; b. Village Hall site: 1-2 residential units <p>C. Development for other purposes will only be allowed where the site concerned is no longer required for housing related to the overall community hub scheme. <u>Where is can be demonstrated that either safeguarded site is not required to cross-subsidise the proposal in LW1, alternative development will be supported.</u></p>
<p>Page 33, Policy LW3: Housing Mix</p>	<p>Deletion of Policy LW3: Housing Allocation as submitted in 2018. Replacement of Policy LW5: Housing Mix, as submitted in 2018, with Policy LW3: Housing Mix.</p> <p>Policy LW3: Housing Allocation</p> <p>A. The site referred to as the “Fieldside”, shown on Figure 7, is allocated for up to 36 housing units.</p> <p>B. Development on the site shall be subject to a masterplan and design brief to be agreed with the local planning authority. The masterplan will address the following points as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Innovative and attractive design will be required, complementing the unique character of Long Wittenham as described in Evidence Papers: Character Assessment and Countryside; b. The proposal will complement the adjacent Community Hub development, and if possible, will propose how the two developments will jointly address issues such as access, the protection of views into and out of the countryside, particularly with regard to Wittenham Clumps as set out in LW8. If it is not possible to consider these matters jointly, the masterplan should consider them for the Fieldside site alone; c. Open space provision should relate to and compliment provision made at the community hub and to provision in the wider village with the aim of providing a variety of open spaces that can serve different recreational and amenity purposes; d. Parking and circulation in the scheme will lead to an overall increase in sustainable transport choices and not add to congestion in the village; e. Use of Sustainable Urban Drainage will manage surface water.

	<p>C. A Heritage Appraisal and Impact Assessment proportionate to the significance of the designated and non-designated assets and archaeological remains should inform proposals in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>Policy LW5 LW3: Housing Mix</p> <p>A. Development proposals for schemes of more than ten dwellings, will be required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. deliver the affordable housing requirements set out in the Development Plan, and; b. deliver an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes, having regard to the local community's needs as identified in the housing needs survey, and other local evidence. There is a preference towards smaller houses as starter properties and homes for those who wish to downsize.
<p>Page 37, Policy LW4: Countryside</p>	<p>Amendments to policy text:</p> <p>LW4: Countryside</p> <p>Green Gap</p> <p>A. Development will be permitted in the land identified on Figure 8 as the Green Gap that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is for transport purposes relating to the proposed Green Line and to improve cycle and pedestrian access between Didcot Garden Town and Wittenham Clumps; b. Provides a woodland buffer between the built-up edge of Didcot Garden Town and the countryside. <p>Countryside Including The Green Gap</p> <p>B. Development will be permitted in the Countryside (defined as outside the built-up area of Long Wittenham Village from the date that the NDP is made) that:</p> <p><u>Development in the Countryside (defined as outside the built-up area of Long Wittenham Village from the date that the NDP is made) and within the Green Gap will generally be resisted except where it:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Is not for housing other than <u>Is for housing on</u> rural exception sites or is infill development as defined in the Development Plan; B. Provides opportunities for rural business and enterprise to grow and expand whilst avoiding unnecessary intrusion into open farmland and countryside; C. Conserves and enhances the North Wessex Downs Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; D. Can demonstrate that it avoids harm to the tranquillity of the countryside; E. Complies with policy LW8 LW5;

	<p>F. Closely associates with existing built form and is well-integrated within the landscape;</p> <p>G. Limits urbanising influences with Provides tree and plant screening at the edge of settlements and other major features such as transport infrastructure.</p>
<p>Page 37-38, Paragraphs 130-132</p>	<p>Deletion of previous paragraphs under 'Protected Views' heading and replacement with new paragraphs:</p> <p>Protected Views</p> <p>135. There are still places in the parish of Long where it is quiet, and no man-made structures can be seen. Views towards Appleford have been compromised by Didcot Power Station but these will eventually become more rural in character once the remaining large buildings of the power station are demolished. The landscape of the area is still relatively unspoilt.</p> <p>136. There is easy access to a good network of public rights of way from the village making it safe and convenient to walk off road to Little Wittenham, Appleford and towards Sires Hill areas. The Thames Path National Trail runs along the parish bank of the Thames from Clifton Hampden towards Days Lock in Little Wittenham. There is a well-used cycle route (Sustrans 5) from the village towards Didcot taking cyclists and pedestrians on a hard surfaced off-road route into Ladygrove. The Harwell to Culham Science Vale cycle route is also accessible.</p> <p>137. The NDP community survey⁴ showed relatively high regard to the countryside.</p> <p>138. The planning policy and evidence review in Evidence Paper: Countryside indicates that there are additional views of importance over and above what was included in the made LWNDP. The following views have been identified as needing special protection and are shown in Figure 11:</p> <p>139. Protected views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The view from Fieldside over the countryside towards Wittenham Clumps; ● The view from Wittenham Clumps over the countryside towards Long Wittenham village; ● The view from Sire's Hill over the countryside towards Long Wittenham and Appleford villages; <p>140. The views' value derives from the sense of openness that they provide. This is illustrated in the photo record presented in the evidence paper. To retain this sense of openness, new development should not "obstruct" the views from important public vantage points such as public rights of way (as illustrated in the photos).</p> <p>141. For the purpose of development management decisions, an "obstructed" view is where a view corridor was originally "wide", showing a broad vista over the area in question and this is unacceptably reduced. The view would be "obstructed" where the</p>

	<p>width of the viewable corridor becomes restricted either at the edges or within the vista to the extent that the difference is perceptible and noticeable to the viewer. There will inevitably be a range of how much “obstruction” takes place regarding individual developments, and this will be a matter for individual proposals to address. Therefore, there may be some instances where the obstruction is imperceptible, or perceptible but acceptable, to the viewer. However, as the level of obstruction increases, there will be a commensurate increase in the perception of harm to the view and the viewer’s enjoyment of the landscape.</p> <p>142. Development proposals should pay due regard to the issue of obstruction of protected views and should seek to avoid harm wherever possible. Where it is likely that a development will cause obstruction to a protected view, it would be prudent to prepare a full Landscape and Visual Assessment to determine the level of harm and options for mitigation.</p> <p><u>130. The views in Figure 9 have value derived from the sense of openness that they provide. This is illustrated in the photo record presented in the Evidence Paper: Countryside. To retain this sense of openness, new development should not “obstruct” the views from important public vantage points such as public rights of way (as illustrated in the photos).</u></p> <p><u>131. For the purpose of development management decisions, an “obstructed” view is where a view corridor was originally “wide”, showing a broad vista over the area in question and this is unacceptably reduced. The view would be “obstructed” where the width of the viewable corridor becomes restricted either at the edges or within the vista to the extent that the difference is perceptible and noticeable to the viewer. There will inevitably be a range of how much “obstruction” takes place regarding individual developments, and this will be a matter for individual proposals to address. Therefore, there may be some instances where the obstruction is imperceptible, or perceptible but acceptable, to the viewer. However, as the level of obstruction increases, there will be a commensurate increase in the perception of harm to the view and the viewer’s enjoyment of the landscape.</u></p> <p><u>132. Development proposals should pay due regard to the issue of obstruction of protected views and should seek to avoid harm wherever possible. Where it is likely that a development will cause obstruction to a protected view, it would be prudent to prepare a full Landscape and Visual Assessment to determine the level of harm and options for mitigation.</u></p>
<p>Page 39, Policy LW5: Protected Key Views</p>	<p>Deletion of Policy LW8: Protected Views as submitted in 2018. Addition of Policy LW5: Protected Key Views:</p> <p>Policy LW8: Protected Views</p> <p>A. Development will be allowed where it does not lead to the obstruction or detriment of the following protected views from publicly accessible vantage points:</p>

	<p>a. The view from Fieldside over the countryside towards Wittenham Clumps;</p> <p>b. The view from Wittenham Clumps over the countryside towards Long Wittenham village;</p> <p>c. The view from Sire's Hill over the countryside towards Long Wittenham and Appleford villages;</p> <p>B. Where development has the potential to cause harm to a protected view, the proposal should seek to retain its visual integrity and will be required to undertake a full Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment for this purpose.</p> <p><u>Policy LW5: Protected Key Views</u></p> <p><u>Development will be allowed where it does not lead to the obstruction or detriment of the following protected views shown in Figure 8 from publicly accessible vantage points:</u></p> <p><u>A. The view from Fieldside over the countryside towards Wittenham Clumps;</u></p> <p><u>B. The view from Wittenham Clumps over the countryside towards Long Wittenham village;</u></p> <p><u>C. The view from Sire's Hill over the countryside towards Long Wittenham and Appleford villages;</u></p>
<p>Page 44, Policy LW6: Heritage and Design</p>	<p>Amendment of policy text:</p> <p>Policy LW7 <u>LW6</u>: Heritage and Design</p> <p>A. All new development should preserve and enhance the overall character and appeal of Long Wittenham parish as described in Evidence Papers: Character Assessment and Countryside.</p> <p>B. Design decisions should reflect the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adjacent and nearby development; b. Streetscape; c. Historic context <u>Conserve and enhance the Conservation Area and its setting;</u> d. <u>Conserve and enhance designated heritage assets including Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments;</u> e. Protected views; f. Local distinctiveness and sense of place; g. Historic built form of the village; h. Permeability by foot and cycle for all villagers. <p>C. The parish's designated historic heritage assets and their settings, both above and below ground including the conservation area, listed buildings, and scheduled ancient monuments, will be conserved and enhanced for their historic significance and their important contribution and enhanced distinctiveness, character and sense of place.</p>

	<p>C. Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss.</p> <p>D. Incidental green spaces within the built-up area of the village should be preserved and enhanced where possible.</p>
Page 46, Policy LW7:	<p>Amendment of policy text:</p> <p>Policy LW9 LW7: Cycle and Footpaths</p> <p>A. Where development leads to increased demand for sustainable transport as set out in Development Plan policies, proposals should consider demonstrate how they could make a proportionate contribution to the proposals set out in Evidence Paper: Cycle and Footpaths.</p> <p>B. Proposals for new cycle and footpaths at the following locations will be supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Between the Community Hub site (LW2 LW1) and the village High Street; Between Didcot Garden Town and Wittenham Clumps; Between Long Wittenham and Clifton Hampden alongside the existing High Street; and The Circular route between the villages of Long Wittenham and Clifton Hampden incorporating the Thames Path.
Page 47, Policy LW8: Off-street Parking	<p>Amendment of policy number:</p> <p>Policy LW40 LW8: Off-street Parking</p>
Page 49, Policy LW9: Ecologically Sensitive Areas	<p>Amendment of policy number:</p> <p>Policy LW44 LW9: Ecologically Sensitive Areas</p>

Table 2 – Updates to the Environmental Report and other supporting documents

The revised Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Review is accompanied by a Further Environmental Report Update (November 2021) and other supporting documents. The table below identifies the submitted revised documents and the nature of the changes made.

Where appropriate, changes are shown as follows:

- Deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~
- Additions to the text are shown in **bold underline**

Document	Description of changes
Strategic Environmental Assessment - Further Environmental Report Update	SEA is a mechanism for considering and communicating the likely effects of an emerging plan, and alternatives, with a view to avoiding and mitigating negative effects and maximising positive effects. Central to the SEA process is

	<p>the publication of an Environmental Report alongside the draft plan that presents certain required information. The aim is to inform the consultation and, in turn, plan finalisation.</p> <p>This is the fourth version of the Environmental Report, with earlier versions having been published alongside earlier versions of the RLWNP in 2018 and 2019.</p> <p>Since 2019, a range of work has been undertaken, particularly around historic environment constraints affecting the parish and the RLWNP. This Further Environmental Report Update is published alongside a revised draft version of the RLWNP, with a view to informing the consultation and plan finalisation.</p> <p>This report answers questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What has plan-making/SEA involved up to this point? – including in relation to ‘reasonable alternatives’? 2) What are the SEA findings at this stage? – i.e. in relation to the draft plan? 3) What happens next?
Basic Conditions Statement	Amendments have been made to the document to align with the Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and the NPPF 2021.
Consultation Statement	Amendments have been made to the document with updates to highlight the engagement beyond the submission of the plan.
Evidence Paper: Archaeology and Policy LW1	New document
Evidence Paper: Infrastructure Project List	Updates to list of projects and costing have been made to the table on pages 2-5
Evidence Paper: Countryside	The documents have been updated to reflect the adoption of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.
Evidence Paper: Cycle and Footpaths	<p>Amendments have been made to the document to align with the NPPF 2021.</p> <p>The below changes in particular have also been added to Page 8:</p> <p>b. A link between Fieldside Track to Clifton Hampden (Barley Mow Car Park):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Option a- A discrete, dedicated tarmacked appropriately surfaced cyclepath/footpath, alongside but physically separate from the main road (from the bridge in Clifton Hampden to the Little Wittenham Road junction in Long Wittenham. (blue

	<p>route). <u>Agreements have recently been made between the Parish Council and the two landowners to donate this section of the path, to be built along a dedicated strip at the edge of the two fields.</u> The County Council has indicated that this is their preferred route and are <u>currently exploring funding options.</u></p>
Evidence Paper: Planning Policy Context	Amendments have been made to the document to align with the Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and to take account the findings of the Strategic Environmental Assessment process.
Evidence Paper: Roman Snails	Amendments have been made to the document to align with the Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.
Evidence Paper: Site Allocations	<p>Amendments have been made to the document to align with the Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and the NPPF 2021. Factual information has also been added to incorporate the process and findings of the further work on the archaeological significance of the Community Hub site undertaken by the Parish Council.</p> <p>The below changes in particular have also been added to Site 2 and Site 5 on page 24:</p> <p>Didcot Road (2): This site is the optimal site with the most green” benefits and fewest red” constraints. The site is large enough to accommodate the hub and housing on the same site and the land is currently available at a favourable land value. The north east corner may impact upon the view corridor from the village to Wittenham Clumps and this will require careful design to avoid harm. Historic England has raised concerns that there may be potential for significant effects on archaeological remains from the development. These two negative impacts have been scored as amber as they can be managed with appropriately worded planning conditions. <u>during the 2018 consultations (Regulations 14 and 16) and subsequently scheduled part of the original site. The proposed scheme has been reconfigured to account for the scheduling and a full archaeological assessment has been undertaken and is available in the RLW NDP evidence. On this basis, the proposal can be modified to mitigate against any harm that might be otherwise caused and the historic finds are of lower significance that originally anticipated. Whereas it had been presumed that there had been an Anglo Saxon hall on the site, this has now been reassessed as being an animal stockade.</u></p> <p>West Field/Thames Path <u>Wards Field</u> (5): This site was deemed as unsuitable for housing in the SHELAA and is not ideal for the hub proposal since it is at the edge of the</p>

	<p>village. <u>In addition, there is a covenant preventing development.</u></p> <p>The planning permission table in Part 4 on Pages 30-31 has also been updated.</p>
--	---