

Delegated authority officer decision notice

Decision made by	Harry Barrington-Mountford Head of Policy & Programmes
Lead officer contact details	Deborah Bryson Senior Planning Policy Officer (Neighbourhood) Deborah.bryson@southandvale.gov.uk 07717 271942
Decision (Keep this succinct)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To accept all modifications recommended by the Examiner; 2. To determine that the Review of the Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Development Plan, as modified, meets the basic conditions, is compatible with the Convention rights, complies with the definition of a neighbourhood development plan (NDP) and the provisions that can be made by a NDP; and 3. To take all appropriate actions to progress the Review of the Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Development Plan to referendum.
Key decision? (see notes below)	No
If key decision, has call-in been waived by the Scrutiny Committee chair(s)?	n/a
Confidential decision, and if so under which exempt category?	No
Delegated authority reference from the constitution	Delegation to Head of Policy & Programmes; reference 3.3. (Page 178)
Risks	<p>The local community will have the opportunity to vote on the neighbourhood plan at referendum; there is a risk that the local community will vote against the plan. This risk is low given the level of support shown for the plan and detailed in the consultation statement.</p> <p>The legislation makes provision for the council's decision at this stage to be challenged via a judicial review. The process undertaken and proposed accords with planning legislation</p>
Reasons for decision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reviewed Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan) as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, has had regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. A requirement to have regard to policies and advice does not require that such policy and advice must necessarily be followed, but it is intended to have and does have to a significant effect. A neighbourhood plan must not constrain the delivery of important national policy

objectives. The principal document in which national planning policy is contained is the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (NPPF) and this conclusion is reached bearing this in mind. The advice within National Planning Practice Guidance (“NPPG”) has also been borne in mind in reaching this conclusion.

2. Paragraph 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans and spatial development strategies. Qualifying bodies should plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside these strategic polices. More specifically paragraph 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.
3. Beyond this, the content of a draft neighbourhood plan will determine which other aspects of national policy are or are not a relevant consideration to take into account. The basic conditions allows qualifying bodies, the independent examiner and local planning authority to reach a view in those cases where different parts of national policy need to be balanced.
4. Having considered all relevant information, including representations submitted in response to the reviewed Plan, the Examiner’s considerations and recommendations, the council has come to the view that the reviewed Plan recognises and respects relevant constraints. The reviewed Plan has developed a positive suite of policies that seek to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. There is a clear focus on delivering a community hub, including a primary school, village hall, playing fields and new housing whilst maintaining the character, views, ecology and heritage assets of the neighbourhood area.
5. The reviewed Plan, as modified by the Examiner’s recommendations, contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. This condition relates to the making of the plan as a whole. It does not require that each policy in it must contribute to sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension the reviewed Plan includes policies for residential development (Policies LW1, LW2 and LW3). In the social role, it includes policies on community facilities (Policies LW1 and LW2) and transport (Policies LW7 and LW8). In the environmental dimension the reviewed Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built and historic environment. It has specific policies on the historic environment, design and key views (Policies LW5 and

LW6) and ecology and the wider countryside (Policies LW4 and LW9).

6. As a whole, the council is satisfied that the policies in the reviewed Plan pursue net gain across each of the different dimensions of sustainability in a mutually supportive way.
7. The reviewed Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the current Development Plan for the area. Although the Plan was submitted within the context of the former South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012 and Saved policies from the Local Plan 2011, the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 was adopted on 10 December 2020 and thus the Plan has been examined and tested against strategic policies in the newly adopted Local Plan.
8. Long Wittenham is identified as a smaller village in the settlement hierarchy. Policy H8 advises that smaller villages have no defined requirement to contribute towards delivering additional housing, however where a Parish Council wishes to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan and make housing allocations within it to support further growth, the Council will support this provided that the levels of growth are commensurate to the size of the village. The amount of housing proposed by Long Wittenham is beyond that anticipated by Policy H8. However, the council agree with the examiner's view that in these circumstances the submitted neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan. The housing element of the community hub proposal is enabling development to allow the community to achieve its wider ambitions for community facilities and the approach has been collaborative, which will result in the development of the minimum number of houses required to deliver the hub. We consider that the delivery of new homes in Long Wittenham is not of such a scale as to affect the overall distribution of new homes in South Oxfordshire as anticipated in Policies STRAT1 and STRAT2 of the Local Plan.
9. The reviewed Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendation, would not breach, and be otherwise incompatible with EU obligations, retained in UK law, including the following Directives: the strategic Environmental Assessment (2001/42/EC); the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (2011/92/EU); the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC); the Wild Birds Directive (2009/147/EC); the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC); the Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC); and the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC). In addition, no issue arises in respect of equality under general principles of EU law or any EU equality directive.
10. In order to comply with the basic condition on the European Union legislation, the Qualifying Body commissioned a Strategic

Environmental Assessment dated October 2018, which was then updated in November 2021. The original Strategic Environmental Assessment sets out the background of how it was developed in section 1 and 2. Section 3 sets out the scope of the SEA. Section 5 identifies the growth scenarios and site options and section 6 assesses these alternative options. Section 7 develops the preferred approach. Section 8 details the methodology. Section 9 assess the submission plan. Section 12 covers monitoring. The updated Strategic Environmental Assessment followed a similar format but assessed the updated Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Plan which worked to address concerns previously raised by Historic England. The Environmental Report is well-considered and detailed. It assesses the environmental conditions in the neighbourhood area and appraises the policies (and reasonable alternatives) against the framework developed through the Scoping Report.

11. The reviewed Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, would not give rise to significant environmental effects on European sites. The Council screened the Plan potential impact on EU Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and this was completed in October 2018 and updated in January 2022. The HRA screening report concluded that the Plan would not have any likely significant effects on the integrity of European sites in or around South Oxfordshire, either alone or in combination with other plans or programmes and that an Appropriate Assessment is therefore not required.
12. The reviewed Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, is in all respects fully compatible with Convention rights contained in the Human Rights Act 1988. There has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the reviewed Plan and to make their comments known.
13. The reviewed Plan, as modified by the Examiner's recommendations, complies with the definition of an NDP and the provisions that can be made by a NDP. The reviewed Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in the whole of the neighbourhood area; it specifies the period for which it is to have effect and it does not include provision about development that is 'excluded development'.
14. The council is satisfied that it is not necessary to extend the referendum area beyond the boundaries of the designated plan area as they are currently defined.
15. The individual modifications proposed by the Examiner are set out in Appendix 1 alongside the council's decision in response to each recommendation and the reason for them. The Examiner's Report is available in Appendix 2.

	<p>16. The Examiner noted in paragraph 7.76 of his report, that it will be appropriate for SODC and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. To ensure that the plan reads as a coherent document the qualifying body and the council have agreed factual and consequential updates. These are set out in Appendix 3.</p> <p>17. The council has taken account of all of the representations received.</p> <p>18. The Counting Officer is responsible for determining the date of the referendum. The Electoral Service team advise that the referendum is planned for Thursday 28th July 2022.</p>
<p>Alternative options rejected</p>	<p>Make a decision that differs from the Examiner’s recommendation</p> <p>If the council deviates from Examiner’s recommendations, the council is required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notify all those identified on the consultation statement of the parish council and invite representations, during a period of six weeks, 2. Refer the issue to a further independent examination if appropriate. <p>Refusing to progress the Plan</p> <p>The council can decide that it is not satisfied with the plan proposal with respect to meeting basic conditions, compatibility with Convention rights, definition and provisions of the NDP even if modified. Without robust grounds, which are not considered to be present in this case, refusing to take the Plan to a referendum could leave the Council vulnerable to a legal challenge</p> <p><u>Reason for rejecting alternative options</u></p> <p>These options were rejected because the district council is minded to agree with all of the Examiner’s modifications and his conclusion that the Plan, as modified, meets the basic conditions and relevant legal requirements</p>
<p>Climate and ecological implications</p>	<p>The reviewed Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.</p> <p>In terms of the ecological implications the Plan contains Policy LW4 (Countryside) and Policy LW9 (Ecologically Sensitive Areas). These policies seek to preserve the rural character of the parish and protect an identified area of ecological sensitivity.</p>
<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>The process undertaken and proposed accords with planning legislation</p>
<p>Financial implications</p>	<p>The Government makes funding available to local authorities to help them meet the cost of their responsibilities around neighbourhood</p>

	<p>planning. A total of £20,000 can be claimed for each neighbourhood planning area. In the case of neighbourhood plan reviews, a local planning authority may make only one claim for substantive modifications to a specific neighbourhood plan in their area within each 5-year window from the date that plan was first made. The council becomes eligible to apply for this additional grant once the council issue a decision statement detailing the intention to send the plan to referendum.</p> <p>The Government grant funds the process of progressing neighbourhood plans through the formal stages, including the referendum. Any costs incurred in the formal stages in excess of Government grants is borne by the council. Staffing costs associated with supporting community groups and progressing neighbourhood plans through the formal stages are funded by the council. It is expected that costs associated with progressing this neighbourhood plan can be met from with existing neighbourhood planning budget.</p>			
Other implications	There are no other implications.			
Background papers considered	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reviewed Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents 2. National Planning Policy Framework (2021) 3. National Planning Policy Guidance (July 2014 and subsequent updates) 4. South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 5. South Oxfordshire HRA Screening Statement 6. AECOM SEA Report 7. Representations submitted in response to the Reviewed Long Wittenham Neighbourhood Plan 8. Relevant Ministerial Statements 			
Declarations/ conflict of interest?	None			
Consultees		Name	Outcome	Date
	Legal legal@southandvale.gov.uk		No comment	26.05.22
	Finance Finance@southandvale.gov.uk	Emma Creed	Amendment to financial implications	27.05.22
	HR hradminandpayroll@southandvale.gov.uk		No comment	26.05.22
	Climate and biodiversity climateaction@southandvale.gov.uk	Heather Saunders	No comment	25.05.22
	Equality and diversity	Lynne Mitchell	No comment	25.05.22

	equalities@southandvale.gov.uk			
	Risk and insurance risk@southandvale.gov.uk		No comment	26.05.22
	Communications communications@southandvale.gov.uk		No comment	26.05.22
	Senior Management Team ExecutiveSupportSAV@southandvale.gov.uk	SMT	No comment	26.05.22
	Cabinet member	Cllr Simpson	No comment	20.05.22
	Ward councillors	Cllr Casey-Rerhaye	No comment	26.05.22
Decision maker's signature To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.	Signature:  Date: 07.06.2022			

Appendix 1: Examiner's recommendations

Policy/ Section	Examiner's recommendations	Council's Decision	Justification/Reason
Policy LW1: Community Hub	<p>In Part A replace d with:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">‘An appropriate level of pick up/drop off parking should be provided so that parking pressures on nearby roads are limited whilst also ensuring that high quality walking and cycling provision (including appropriately located/designed cycle parking) is provided in order to encourage the use of active modes of travel as opposed to private car usage.’</p> <p>In part B of the policy delete ‘as a minimum’</p> <p>In part C of the policy add the following at the end of the first sentence: ‘In particular:’</p> <p>Thereafter delete criteria a and b and re-letter the remaining criteria.</p>	Agree	<p>The modification to Part A will help ensure the policy is clear and unambiguous. Also, the council agrees the wording removed in Part B is unnecessary and its removal will allow for the consideration of any relevant additional matters.</p> <p>In addition, the modifications to Part C of the policy will take account of work which has been undertaken since the Plan was submitted in its most recent form and allow for direct association between the initial element of the policy and the various criteria.</p> <p>Overall the council consider the proposed modifications to the policy to be necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.</p>
Supporting text for Policy LW1: Community Hub	Replace paragraph 46 with ‘The adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 policy TRANS3: Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Transport Schemes, safeguards land including for the widening of the A4130 at Didcot, Clifton Hampden	Agree	The council consider the proposed modifications to the supporting text to be necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.

	<p>Bypass, Didcot Science Bridge and Culham River Crossing'</p> <p>In paragraph 53 delete the second sentence.</p> <p>Replace paragraph 82 with: 'The final piece of the jigsaw was achieved at the end of August 2018 when the Diocese and Oxfordshire County Council agreed to move the school to the proposed new site and release the current school land to the developer working on behalf of the Parish Council for housing. In addition, the County Council has agreed to cover its own fees and the Diocese have also offered to meet the cost of furnishing the new school if it became an Academy, though to date the school has not become an Academy'</p>		
Policy LW2: Safeguarded Sites	<p>In Part B of the policy delete 'it may be argued.....Under these circumstances,'</p> <p>In Part C of the policy replace 'Where is' with 'Where it'.</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification to the policy to be necessary to correct a spelling mistake and ensure that the policy is precise and concise as required by national policy and guidance.
Policy LW3: Housing Mix	<p>In the opening part of the policy replace 'will be required to' with 'should'</p> <p>In criterion b of the policy delete the final sentence</p>	Agree	<p>The council consider the proposed modification to the policy to be necessary to ensure the policy plans positively to support local development as required by national policy.</p> <p>In addition, for clarity the council agrees that the final sentence of criterion b would be better placed in supporting text so the policy refers to the latest available evidence.</p>

Supporting text for Policy LW3: Housing Mix	Reposition the deleted part of the policy to the end of paragraph 114.	Agree	The council consider the proposed addition to the supporting text necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy.
Policy LW4: Countryside	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>‘Proposals for development outside the built-up area boundary will only be supported if they are appropriate to a countryside location and are otherwise consistent with development plan policies.’</p> <p>The following types of development will be considered as exceptions to this policy approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriate forms of residential development in the countryside identified in national and local policy including rural exception sites, limited infill rural workers dwellings, minor extensions and conversions of existing rural buildings; and • the expansion of rural businesses which avoid unnecessary intrusion into the surrounding countryside; <p>As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals of this nature should comply with all the following criteria as relevant to the site concerned:</p>	Agree	The council considers the proposed modifications to remove reference to the green gap to be necessary in order to ensure that the policy meets basic conditions. As submitted the policy took a negative approach and the council considers that there is not sufficient evidence to support the green gap designation. The amended text will help the policy be positively prepared and provide the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they would conserve or enhance the adjacent North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; • they would not create unacceptable harm to the tranquillity of the countryside; • they otherwise comply with Policy LW5 of this Plan; • they would be closely associated with the existing built form of the village and are well integrated within the wider landscape; and • where appropriate, they limit potential urbanising influences with tree and screen planting at the edge of settlements and other major features such as transport infrastructure.’ 		
Supporting text for Policy LW4: Countryside	<p>In paragraph 124 delete ‘and so it will.... Green Gap policy’ Delete paragraph 128. On Figure 8 change the title to ‘Development Constraints’ and remove the Green Gap area from both the map and the key</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modifications to the supporting text to be necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance and to ensure that the changes made to Policy LW4 are reflected throughout the plan.
Policy LW5: Protected Key Views	<p>Replace the policy with:</p> <p>A. The Plan identifies three Key Views as follows:</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modification to the policy to be necessary to ensure that the policy has the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.

	<p>[List A-C at this point from the submitted Plan]</p> <p>B. The design, layout and massing of new development should take account of the Key Views and safeguard their significance in the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>C. Development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on an identified Key View will not be supported.</p>		
Supporting text for Policy LW5: Protected Key Views	<p>In paragraph 130 replace 'obstruct' with 'have an unacceptable impact'</p> <p>Replace paragraph 131 with: 'For the purpose of development management decisions, an unacceptable impact would arise where a view corridor was originally "wide", showing a broad vista over the area in question and this is unacceptably reduced. This would happen 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 harm takes place regarding individual developments, and this will be a matter for individual proposals to address. Therefore, there may be some instances where the impact is imperceptible, or perceptible but acceptable, to the viewer. However, as the level of impact increases, there will be a commensurate increase in the perception of harm to the view and the viewer's enjoyment of the landscape.'</p>	Agree	The council consider the proposed modifications to the supporting text, including the amendment to figure 8 to be necessary to ensure that there is the clarity that is required by national policy and to ensure it is positively prepared and reflects the boundary of the neighbourhood plan area.

	<p>Replace paragraph 132 with: ‘Development proposals should pay particular attention to the protected views and should seek to avoid harm wherever possible. Where it is likely that a development will have an impact on a protected view the planning application should consider the preparation of a Landscape and Visual Assessment to determine the level of harm and the available options for mitigation.’</p> <p>In Figures 8 and 9 remove any elements of the three arcs which fall outside the Parish boundary (the neighbourhood area).</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 132 add: ‘Policy LW5 applies to the protected views insofar as they are within the designated neighbourhood area.’</p>		
<p>Policy LW6: Heritage and Design</p>	<p>In Part B replace ‘Design Decisions’ with ‘Development Proposals’</p> <p>In Part B insert ‘and’ at the end of criterion g.</p> <p>In Part C replace ‘historic’ with ‘heritage’</p> <p>In Part D replace ‘possible’ with ‘practicable’</p>		<p>The council consider the proposed modifications to Part B of the policy to be necessary to ensure that the policy is more closely related to the development management process, is precise and concise, improves the format and inclusivity of the policy and consequently has the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.</p> <p>Furthermore the council consider that the detailed wording changes to Part C and Part D of the policy ensure that the policy has the</p>

			clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Policy LW7: Cycle and Footpaths	In Part A of the policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> replace 'proposals should demonstrate...Cycle and Footpaths' with 'proposals should make a proportionate contribution to the proposals in Part B of this policy' replace 'sustainable transport' with 'transportation infrastructure' 		The council consider the minor wording changes proposed to Part A of the policy to be necessary to provide the clarity and certainty that is required by national policy and guidance. Furthermore, the modification is necessary for the purposes of simplicity and provides clarity for development management purposes.
Policy LW9: Ecologically Sensitive Sites	Replace the policy with: 'Development proposals within the immediate vicinity of the Wittenham Special Area of Conservation or the south of Fieldside (shown as the ecologically sensitive zone in Figure 13) should assess the ecological and heritage impact in a way which is proportionate to the development concerned. Where appropriate, the development proposal should include mitigation measures including the creation and linking of habitats.'		The council consider the proposed modification to the policy is necessary in order to take into account the language used in the most recent version of the NPPF, to provide the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.
Community Objective	Use a different colour for the Community Objective box to that used for the policies elsewhere in the Plan		The council consider that the formatting change is necessary to separate the Objective from the land use policies and provide the clarity that is required by national policy and guidance.

Monitoring and Review	<p>At the end of paragraph 161 add: 'In particular, the Parish Council will monitor the delivery of the community hub. If delivery is unlikely to proceed the Parish Council will consider a review of the Plan to identify the extent to which an alternative site can be secured for this important scheme.'</p> <p>Add an additional section as follows: Monitoring of the Plan against national policy 163. The Parish Council will monitor the effectiveness of the Plan against national policy. It will also assess the extent to which the Plan has regard to any changes which may arise to national policy. Where necessary, it will consider the need for a full or partial review of the Plan.</p>		The council consider the additional text to be necessary to ensure the plan is supported by appropriate evidence and reflects and responds to the unique characteristics and planning context of the neighbourhood area as required by national policy and guidance.
Other matters - General	Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.	Agree	The council agrees with the examiner that it may be necessary to amend the plan where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of the examiners recommended modifications.

Appendix 2 – Examiner’s Report

The Examiner’s Report is available here: <https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/05/Long-Wittenham-Reviewed-NDP-Examiners-Report.pdf>

Appendix 3 – Consequential and/or Factual Changes

Section	Agreed change	Justification/Reason
Front cover and throughout	<p>Change ‘November 2021’ to ‘May 2022’</p> <p>Change ‘Submission Draft (revised) to ‘Referendum Version’</p>	Factual updates

	Change header from 'Reviewed Wittenham NDP (November 2021)' to 'Reviewed Long Wittenham NDP (May 2022)'	
Throughout	Amend paragraph numbering	Typographical change to make paragraph numbering consistent following the deletion of a paragraph as per the Examiner's recommendations
Page 1	Change 'Gordon Rogers Chair, Long Wittenham Parish Council' to 'Gordon Rogers, Chair Long Wittenham Parish Council 2017-2022 Steve Brown, Current Chair Long Wittenham Parish Council'	Factual update
Table of contents	Amend Figure 8 to be titled 'Development Constraints' Add 'Monitoring of the Plan against national policy' to the table of contents	Factual corrections made to reflect the Examiner's recommendations
Paragraph 6	Change 'NPPF 2019' to 'NPPF 2021'	Factual update
Paragraph 46	Add full stop to end of paragraph	Typographical change to bring in line with rest of document
Paragraph 53	Change 'These facts have' to 'This fact has'	Grammatical correction made to reflect the Examiner's recommendations
Paragraph 82	Add full stop to end of paragraph	Typographical change to bring in line with rest of document
Policy LW1	Add semicolon to the end of Part A Point b Add full stop to the end of Part A Point f	Typographical change to bring in line with rest of document

Figure 8	Remove blue arrow	Correction of error
Policy LW4	Add full stop the end of the second bullet point.	Typographical change to bring in line with rest of document
Figure 9	Remove blue arrow	Correction of error
Policy LW5	Reformat sub-bullet point list to use lowercase letters Add full stop to the end of Part A Point c	Typographical changes to bring in line with rest of document
Paragraph 130	Add 'on' after 'have an unacceptable impact'	Grammatical correction made to reflect the Examiner's recommendations
Policy LW7	Reformat Section A to align left	Typographical changes to bring in line with rest of document
Evidence Paper: Countryside	Remove sections relating to the deleted Green Gap policy	Factual corrections made to reflect the Examiner's recommendations

Appendix 4 – Consequential and/or Factual Changes to supporting documents

Section	Agreed change	Justification/Reason
All Evidence Paper Documents	Change any references to 'November 2021' or 'October 2018' on title pages and in headers to 'May 2022' Change 'Submission Draft (revised)' to 'Referendum Version' on title pages	Factual updates
Evidence Paper: Countryside	Change 'Wittenhan' to 'Wittenham' on pages 2, 11 and 22	Factual changes

	<p>Remove notional green gap and removed the elements of the key views outside of the neighbourhood area in Figure 15 on page 42</p> <p>Remove 'Green Gap as proposed by DCTDP to include woodland buffer' from the 'Policy Response' section of the table on page 43</p> <p>Remove 'and so it will be possible to introduce a notional Green Gap policy' from paragraph 98 on page 46</p> <p>Remove the boxes and policy text titled 'Green Gap' from pages 46 and 47</p>	<p>Factual corrections made to reflect the Examiner's recommendations for Figures 8 and 9 in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Factual corrections made to reflect the Examiner's recommendations to remove the Green Gap from Policy LW4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting text</p>
--	--	---