

Option 1	Funding	Pro's	Con's	Planning
<p>Do Nothing</p> <p>(Implies oppose any development on site 1 and/or 2)</p>	<p>Not Req'd</p>	<p>Easy</p> <p>Maintains current appearance of the village</p>	<p>No improvements to school or village hall</p> <p>Leakage of pupils to NE Didcot new schools</p> <p>Continuing increased school maintenance costs</p> <p>Village Hall in need of repairs and investment</p> <p>Pre-school unlikely to achieve 30 hours</p> <p>no change to present travel and parking problems.</p> <p>Site 1 planning application will likely progress (Appeal)</p> <p>If Site 1 given consent on appeal little S106 for village</p> <p>Doesn't meet needs of village for the medium term</p> <p>NP , loss of major drivers and benefits</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Option 2	Funding	Pro's	Con's	Planning
<p>Refurbish and extend village hall.</p> <p>(As original Wittenham Vision)</p>	<p>Would rely on grants and PC funds (However if Site 1 were developed it may be possible to get some S106 ?)</p>	<p>Simple procedures.</p> <p>Improvements to V/H and less maintenance in short/medium term.</p> <p>Pre-school near School</p>	<p>Does not address maintenance and other issues with school.</p> <p>Does not resolve traffic concerns</p> <p>Loss of use of V/H during Works. Pre-school would need to relocate (would they come back?)</p> <p>Loss of income during works</p> <p>User groups would need alternative accommodation during works and may not come back?</p> <p>Unlikely to achieve 30 hours for Pre-School.</p> <p>Doesn't meet any of the needs for housing from village survey unless site Developer offers help?</p>	<p>Extension to V/H would require Planning consent and may infringe on Highway which would need OCC approval.</p>

Option 3	Funding	Pro's	Con's	Planning
<p>Refurbish village hall and school on present sites</p> <p>Assumes Site 1 to contribute which would require village support for Developer</p>	<p>S106 from Site 1</p> <p>Grants and parish council funds</p>	<p>No land issues</p> <p>Only one developer</p> <p>Potentially lower costs</p>	<p>School almost impossible to operate during refurbishment</p> <p>Village Hall almost impossible to operate during refurbishment ...loss of income.</p> <p>Compromise outcome on both School and V/H facilities particularly loss of outside space at V/H</p> <p>Parking and travel problems unresolved</p> <p>Pre-school competing with other uses of Village Hall unlikely to achieve 30hrs</p> <p>Risk of children being relocated away from School and Pre-School during disruption caused by works (would they come back)</p>	<p>Would need agreement of OCC</p> <p>Site 1 may not be seen to provide sufficient community facilities by SODC and be rejected. At Appeal S106 could be much reduced. Little cross-funding if Site 1 goes to appeal</p>

Option 4	Funding	Pro's	Con's	Planning
<p>Revised plan for Site 1. Developed for housing and include a Village Hall + some Community facilities (approx 25 houses and V/H and carpark)</p> <p>Reduced level of S106 contribution used to refurb / extend the school on present site</p> <p>Assumes we support Site 1 Developer.</p>	<p>S106 from Site 1 (reduced amount depending on the community facilities on Site 1)</p> <p>Income from redevelopment of the village hall site (Unless this is offered to Pre-school for their sole use instead of moving to new V/H)</p>	<p>1 developer</p> <p>1 land owner</p> <p>continued use of village hall until new one is built</p> <p>potentially less overall costs</p> <p>Brand new V/Hall and pre-school would achieve 30hrs in new village hall</p>	<p>School almost impossible to operate during refurbish</p> <p>compromise outcome for school</p> <p>village hall remote from school / pre-school (unless P-Sch remain in old V/H vs loss of funding for other work)</p> <p>parking and travel remains an issue</p> <p>Impact on conservation area</p>	<p>Improvements at school would depend on OCC agreement.</p> <p>Planing on Site 1 wold be subject to SODC accepting whole package and community support</p> <p>Probably have to include Affordable Housing which reduces funding income.</p> <p>Would SODC consider this as sufficient community benefit to justify consent?</p>

Option 5	Funding	Pro's	Con's	Planning
<p>Site 1 and site 2 developed (either together or in phases)</p> <p>village hall and parking on site 1 together with approx 25 houses</p> <p>school and other community facilities on site 2 together with enough houses to cross fund community facilities)</p> <p>Assumes we support Site 1 Developer and Site 2 Owner doesn't walk away</p>	<p>Reduced land costs on site 2 for the school</p> <p>cross funding housing on site 2</p> <p>income from redevelopment of school and village hall sites</p> <p>land and S106 funding from site 1</p>	<p>Least number of new homes</p> <p>no loss of use of school or village hall during work</p> <p>brand new facilities</p> <p>village green on school site</p> <p>parking and travel resolved</p> <p>pre-school achieve 30hrs on new village hall</p>	<p>Land owners not committed – disparity of land values</p> <p>complicated land / legal / planning processes</p> <p>2 developers who presently won't work together</p> <p>site 1 impact on conservation area</p> <p>Large mount of work to find an acceptable solution.</p>	<p>Likely to get support from SODC if PC can manufacture a secure overall package</p> <p>Could be suitable for a community development order instead of NP or NP if site 1 willing to work at our pace</p>

Option 6	Funding	Pro's	Con's	Planning
<p>Site 2 community hub and cross funding housing all on one site</p> <p>Assumes oppose Site 1.</p>	<p>Reduced land costs</p> <p>cross-funding from housing on new site</p> <p>income from redevelopment of school and village hall sites</p>	<p>Least parties involved and more control / certainty</p> <p>lower number of new homes</p> <p>no loss of use of school or village hall while works in progress</p> <p>new village green on school site</p> <p>brand new facilities</p> <p>parking and travel issues resolved</p> <p>relatively easy to find a development partner</p> <p>the best links between pre-school and school</p> <p>pre-school 30hrs achieved</p>	<p>Probability that site 1 will be developed at some point increasing total number of new homes.</p> <p>no cross funding from site 1 if it is agreed at appeal</p> <p>possible negative views from residents that alternatives with lower impact have been discounted</p> <p>significant work and risks in resisting site 1 proposals</p>	<p>Likely to get support from SODC officers and Councilors due to community facilities if fully supported in NP</p> <p>Significant risk Site 1 will get consent in medium term.</p>