



Benson Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement

October 2017



Contents

Introduction	3
Aims	3
Background to the Plan.....	3
Consultees.....	5
Consultation Bodies	5
Other Local Groups and Organisations.....	5
Transport Team Consultations.....	5
Community Infrastructure Team Consultations	6
Heritage & Design Consultations	6
Green Infrastructure Consultations	7
Summary of main issues and concerns raised	8
Statutory Bodies.....	8
Developers	20
Local Residents.....	32
Appendices.....	47
Appendix A – Flyer advertising village meeting.....	47
Appendix B – Poster stating the Vision for the Plan	47
Appendix C – June Drop-In Session.....	47
Appendix D – December Drop-In Session	47
Appendix E – Village Meeting 3 rd February 2017.....	48

Introduction

This Consultation Statement has been prepared in order to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 Section 15(2). Part 5 of the regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- a) Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan;
- b) An explanation of how they were consulted;
- c) Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- d) Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Aims

The aims of the Benson Neighbourhood Development Plan consultation process were:

- a) To involve as many of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of Plan development in order that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process;
- b) To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken;
- c) To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques; and
- d) To ensure that results of consultation were fed back to local people and available to read (in both hard copy and via the Benson Neighbourhood Plan website) as soon as possible after the consultation event.

Background to the Plan

Benson Parish Council took the decision in early 2016 to embark on a Neighbourhood Development Plan in order to provide local people with an input into where additional housing, required as a result of South Oxfordshire District Council Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), should be located. A Steering Group made up of Parish Councillors and residents was established to deliver the Plan.

The work was divided into 5 'work streams'; Housing, Strategic Infrastructure (Transport/ roads), Green Infrastructure, Design and Local Infrastructure. Each work stream was led by a member of the Steering Group.

The following events were held to inform residents about the work on the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Benson Parish Neighbourhood Plan

■ Consultation Statement

Date	Activity	Comment
15 th Jan 2016	Village Meeting open to all residents. Advertised via the flyer at Appendix A	Initial Neighbourhood Plan kick-off meeting.
7 th – 14 th March 2016	Flyer delivered to all houses requesting support for the Plan Vision and Objectives	Total of 328 responses 308 in support 15 not in support 5 could not be interpreted
7 th – 26 th May 2016	Housing Needs Survey	595 surveys completed. 42.4% response rate.
10 th & 11 th June 2016	Drop-In sessions to obtain feedback on draft generic policies. See Appendix C	
9 th July 2016	Benson Summer Fayre Stall to gain access to a younger demographic (mainly young couples with children)	Dissemination of results of Housing Needs Survey
3 rd December 2016	Drop-In session to show residents progress with the Plan and advise them of other developments impacting Benson. See Appendix D	160 residents attended
3 rd February 2017	Village meeting to appraise residents of progress with the Plan and our draft proposals. See Appendix E	356 people attended with over 300 indicating support for the draft proposals via a show of hands
9 th & 10 th February 2017	Drop-In session at Benson School in order to update those parents unable to attend the village meeting on 3 rd February	



Figure 1 - Residents attending a Neighbourhood Plan meeting in the Parish Hall

Consultees

List of all those that were consulted about the Plan

Consultation Bodies

South Oxfordshire District Council
Natural England
Oxfordshire County Council
Historic England
Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Other Local Groups and Organisations

Bensington Society History Group
Oxfordshire County Council Highways Department
Benson Church of England School
RAF Benson School
Wallingford School
Benson Nature Group
Benson Parish Council Youth Facilities Working Group
Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
Butterfly Conservation
Chilterns Conservation Board
Thames Valley Environmental Records
Environment Agency
Earth Trust
Benson Community Association
Icknield Community College
Oxfordshire County Council Education Department
Oxfordshire County Council Library Service

Transport Team Consultations

The Transport Team undertook the following consultations:

Oxfordshire County Council Education - Barbara Chilman (emails)
Oxfordshire County Council Library Service – James Hazelwood/Jillian Southwell (Meeting plus emails)
Oxfordshire County Council Highways – Jason Sherwood/Aron Widom (4 Meetings plus emails)
Benson Church of England School – Headmaster (emails)
RAF Benson School – Headmaster (emails)
Wallingford School – Headmaster (emails)
Benson Parish Council
Berrick & Roke Parish Council
Watlington Parish Council
Benson Community Association (3 meetings)
David Wilson Homes (3 meetings)

Cala Homes (3 meetings)
 Thomes Homes (2 meetings)
 Homes & Communities Agency (3 meetings)

Community Infrastructure Team Consultations

June 2016	Face to face meetings with retailers and other shops/ food outlets in the village.
September 2016	Discussions with Scout and Guide leaders about what facilities to proposed new Youth hall/Scout hut on Littleworth Road site should have.
September 2016	Meeting with Parish Councillors Patricia Bayliss and Teresa McTeague over the PC Youth Facilities survey undertaken
June 2017	Meeting with Anne Lankaster of Oxfordshire NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (John Reid, Chair of Millstream Surgery Patients' Panel also participated)
August 2017	Meeting with Cala Homes to discuss the village's aspirations for the proposed new Youth hall/Scout hut and also to possibility of changing the proposed retail facility on the Littleworth Road Phase 2 site into a replacement library and heritage centre.

Heritage & Design Consultations

Heritage	
April 2014	Correspondence with Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record, who provided information regarding archaeology and historic landscape characterisation.
August 2016	Email to SODC requesting advice on whether it would be acceptable to include a list of buildings of local heritage note as part of the Plan. Substantive reply from Samantha Allen of SODC Conservation and Design 7th September 2016 with advice and possible format. NB List to be of buildings subject to policies in the NP - not a request for SODC to make a "local list".
Sept 2016	email to Bensington Society History Group requesting help to survey buildings of local heritage note - group of four volunteers formed; suggestions given for buildings to be considered.
Oct 2016	Publication in the Benson Bulletin for October 2016 of intention to identify buildings of local heritage note, with request for suggestions.
March 2017	2 meetings of the group to discuss principles/criteria.
April/May 2017	series of 4 walkabouts and 4 meetings to discuss and finalise which buildings to include.
Sept 2017	letters to owners. Response from 5 owners - 3 expressing support, 2 expressing support after resolution of initial concerns.
Design	
March/April 2016	2 meetings of the Design Team re priorities for design consideration. Further email correspondence.
June 2016	Design priorities discussed at the Drop-In session June 2016 - Summary of responses
June 2017	substantive comment on pre-submission Design Statement provided by Marta Bou Fernandez, SODC Urban Design Officer
Aug 2017	follow-up telephone call with Marta Bou Fernandez
July/Aug 2017	Revision of character assessments.

Green Infrastructure Consultations

GI	
March 2016	Meeting with Benson Nature Group Chair
April 2016	Meeting with Benson Parish Council Youth Facilities Group & Chair of Recreation and Lands Committee
April 2016	Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) re: environmental priorities in Benson
June 2016	Butterfly Conservation
June 2016	BBOWT
June 2016	Chiltern Conservation Board
June 2016	Natural England
July 2016	Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre
Aug 2016	Meeting with Environment Agency
Aug 2016	Meeting with Natural England
Aug 2016	Meeting with Earth Trust
Aug 2016	Meeting with Benson Community Association
Sept 2016	Meeting with Dominic Lamb SODC Countryside Officer
Sept 2016	OCC Natural Environmental Team
Sept 2016	Meeting with Phillip Chamberlain local farmer
Sept 2016	Thames Water
Oct 2016	Meeting with Steven Cook landowner
Nov 2016	OCC Rights of Way Team
Nov 2016	The Conservation Volunteers
Dec 2016	Thames Path National Trails Team
April 2017	Meeting with Cala Homes
April 2017	Presentation to Benson Parish Council re Strategy for People and Nature
May 2017	Presentation to Benson Nature Group re Strategy for People and Nature
May 2017	Environment Agency Biodiversity Team
May 2017	Meeting with Wild Oxfordshire
June 2017	RAF Benson survey of airfield grasslands
June 2017	Benson Church of England Voluntary School Trust
Aug 2017	Benson School Chair of Governors

Summary of main issues and concerns raised

The Benson Pre-Submission Plan was issued for consultation in March 2017. Over 250 comments from Statutory Bodies, Developers and Local Residents were received. The tables below detail the comments received and the responses from the Neighbourhood Plan team.

Statutory Bodies

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
	South Oxfordshire District Council		Para 3.11, as detailed in NP1-6	Actual number should be 241+80+240=561 with 25 for BEN7 removed
SB1	Clarification meeting with Ricardo Rios & Gary Palmer	Unclear whether we are recommending 606 or 596 dwellings	Para 3.11	Text on this now included in the introduction to Policies section
SB2		We may wish to include 187 houses from Ben1 Phase 1 to 'benefit from full weight of NDP and to provide robust baseline for monitoring'		Plan period changed to 2011-2033
SB3		Plan period should be 2011-2033	Para 3.5, as detailed in NP2-5	Noted - further evidence is provided in Appendix F of the Benson Neighbourhood Plan
SB4		<u>Edge Road</u> - SODC describes how ELP2 TRANS3 safeguards land for Edge Road (ER) and similar bypasses in other towns/villages) and states that the final schemes proposed to be safeguarded will be informed by the final transport evidence base which will support the next stage of consultation on the local plan - SODC are currently undertaking transport studies of the whole plan area including Benson to establish what mitigation including edge roads/bypasses is required. It should be noted that the ELP2 policy is in draft and carries little weight and that, without the necessary evidence and justification the safeguarding proposals may not be necessary	NP2-5	Noted. Revised scheme for BEN1 Phase 2 now incorporates Relief Road (previously called Edge Road) - the prospective developer has included the Relief Road in Conceptual Masterplan (17212/C01C) submitted to SODC as part of 106 negotiations. The NP team has good links and has shared data with Watlington. Whilst the Inspector's report has been noted, we also note that OCC's view has changed with more recent changes to road architecture, such that in a recent planning application OCC describes the revised Littleworth Road as being "developed as a residential road and not a thoroughfare."
SB5		SODC Reminds NP team re provisions of NPPG with respect to planning obligations and the tests that must be applied to 'prioritised infrastructure' and suggests NP team look at studies at Chinnor and Watlington and at the Inspector's report on Littleworth		

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		Road improvements for BEN1 Phase 1 and OCC's lack of objections. It also comments that the current layout for BEN Phase 2 does not include an Edge Road		
		SODC makes other suggestions to us regarding the ER:		Noted. This is detailed in the final Neighbourhood Plan
SB6		- need to explore why ER is the best solution rather than other works		The numbers of dwellings reflect discussions with developers regarding development viability; the actual numbers will be negotiated between the developers and SODC; we have considered alternative numbers but no other scenarios would deliver the Relief Road.
SB7		- why is the number of dwellings proposed necessary to provide the ER and have we considered alternative numbers?		So far it has only been possible to estimate the costs of building the Relief Road very roughly, as the precise route and connection methods of the road have inevitably not been finalised yet. That said, estimates from the soundings we have taken suggest a cost of £10-15m, with OCC advising £15-20m.
SB8		- what costings have we undertaken to arrive at this number?		Having the commitment from the developers of the allocated sites, we are confident that the Relief Road will be built by these developers, collaborating at junctions. As we have funding commitments from all the developers and, if required, from Homes and Communities Agency, we are also very confident that the project is financially viable.
SB9		- how would ER be delivered and is it financially viable?		Discussions have been held with the developers of BEN1 Phase 2 and our points have been included in SODC's recent requirements advice to them.
SB10		- consider discussing proposals with developers of BEN1 Phase 2 prior to them submitting any reserved matters		We have met with the developers of all allocated sites individually and collectively and they have all committed to deliver the Relief Road across their sites and between their sites and to link it via junctions/roundabouts to the B4009 in the East and to the A4074 (or B4009) in the West .

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
SB11		- consider coordinated discussions with all developers involved	NP2-5	Noted and actioned - see Housing Allocation Policy NP1
SB12		SODC comments 'The NDP group may also wish to consider preparing an indicative layout of the Edge Road to encourage the sites to work together. The group may wish to stipulate that development of the sites should be roughly in accordance with this masterplan/layout also taking into consideration the emerging Local Plan. They may also wish to stipulate that each developer shall allow unrestricted access along the Edge Road onto the neighbouring sites and roads. The group may also wish to refer again to the influence of the wider strategic sites.'	NP2-5	Noted. We have provided evidence on the need for the ER at Appendix F of the Neighbourhood Plan
SB13		We must provide as much evidence of the need for an ER and be aware that developers may seek to challenge	NP2	We have met with the developers of all allocated sites individually and collectively and they have all committed to deliver the Relief Road across their sites and between their sites and to link it via junctions/roundabouts to the B4009 in the East and to the A4074 (or B4009) in the West .
SB14		NP2 requires provision of ER connecting to A4074, but site BEN1 does not extend to A4074. Land between west end of BEN1 and A4074 in in Warborough and Shillingford NP Area - how will the remaining section of the ER to the A4074 be safeguarded and implemented?	NP2	Noted. Detailed discussions on the route, including these considerations, will be discussed with the developers and OCC at the appropriate time.
SB15		The western area of BEN1 and land to west of this is in Flood zones 2 and 3 - this could have implications on design, cost and construction	NP10	Comments noted, Policy NP9 has been amended.
SB16		<u>Car Parking</u> - OCC set parking standards and ELP2 reflects these - we would need to provide evidence to justify any departure	NP13	Comments noted, Policy NP12 amended
SB17		<u>Electric Vehicle Charging Points</u> - TRANS5 of ELP2 states that development proposals should make provision for facilities to support takeup of of electric/low emission vehicles, especially where air quality issues in an area have been identified - we would need to provide evidence to justify our policy NP13		The Parish Council has compiled a list of potential CIL projects - see Appendix I
SB18		<u>Other Infrastructure</u> - For strategic sites, CIL payments will not apply in full and developers will be required to deliver facilities on site under a Section 106 agreement - Appendix I of NP is blank - we should consider which community facilities and infrastructure could	NP19, NP6	Noted. BEN7 not allocated in Final Plan and unlikely that GP Surgery expansion will require move from current location. See Para 10.17.1 and NP18

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		be supported through CIL as this attracts 25% where NP is 'made' - NP should see also SODC's Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) and maybe comment on it		
SB19		NP19 allocates space for GP surgery at BEN7, but IDP Stage 1 identifies current surgery has 4,741 registered patients vs capacity for 5,219 - we need to comment on this and justify our allocation	Para 3.11, as detailed in NP1-6	Actual number should be 241+80+240=561 with 25 for BEN7 removed
SB20		NP2-5 require contributions for capital costs of replacement GP surgery - clarify if this is in addition to CIL and justify . Alternatively put GP surgery on parish's CIL list and provide evidence of need. Note Oxfordshire CCG did not object to BEN1 Phase 2 provided contributions were made to Mill Stream Surgery for another consulting room	NP19, NP2-5	Noted - Doctors Surgery expansion is included on Parish Council list of potential CIL projects
SB21		<u>Site NP6 (BEN7)</u> - BEN7 has twice been refused for reasons of significant noise impacts and is therefore not suitable for residential development - it should not be allocated; GP surgery is likely to be suitable use on this site	NP6	Actioned - BEN7 no longer allocated for housing and Inspector dismissed appeal at recent Public Inquiry; part allocated for burial plot; GP surgery extension options under review
SB22		<u>Habitat Regulations Assessment</u> - HRA work continues as part of ELP2 to assess impact, specifically with regard to impact of increased visitor numbers to Little Wittenham Special Area of Conservation; Benson Screening Statement based on 309 houses concluded HRA was not required - with larger number of houses now proposed, HRA might be required		Noted. HRA advice awaited from SODC. This Plan mitigates this risk by proposing substantial new green space, providing suitable alternative green space locally to meet recreational needs of residents. Edits incorporated into 'Create new green spaces' section and mentioned in section on importance of access and recreation.
SB23		<u>Other Comments/Matters of General Confirmity</u> - SODC provide detailed comments and suggested changes to NP text - see xxxx. Most of the significant points included in these comments are covered earlier in the SODC comments, but two additional ones are:		Noted and edits made in most cases
SB24		<u>Definition of settlement boundary</u> - NP team needs to consider Horsham judgement and justify how boundary round Benson has been drawn; also consider impact of boundary discouraging suitable village edge developments to come forward (NP policy clash with CSR1?) and whether other forms of development could be accommodated within proposed boundary		Boundary definition removed and issues now addressed by Housing Allocation Policy NP1
SB25		<u>Naming conventions for sites</u> - replace BENn with NPn or use both?		Naming convention revised for clarity
	South Oxfordshire DC, Marta	Design statements should have illustrations		Illustrations added

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
	<u>Bou Fernandez, Urban Design Officer</u>			
		Text amendments to Design Statement	Appx B?	Amendments made
		Reconsider Principle F4		Limit to size of cul-de-sacs removed. Requirement for pedestrian through routes retained.
		No mention in F4 of principles such as perimeter blocks, legibility by means of focal points, back-to back arrangements		These further principles are set out in the SODC Guidance and are therefore expected where relevant. Comment added regarding focal points.
		Reference Principle G2, non-allocated on-street parking offers greater efficiency – see section 6 of SODC Design Guide.		The community is very wary of any advocacy for on-street parking given the problems that have arisen so far. Consultation shows very strong support for measures to avoid replication of such problems in future.
		Section H, 2nd bullet - Check minimum width for paths in Manual for Streets.		Checked and included in text.
		Section J – Stress desirability of making green spaces accessible to all.		Included in text.
		L – Need to demonstrate the different character areas of Benson.		Character Assessments now included as an Appendix.
		Section M - Note the advice in the SODC Design Guidance is not to provide flats of the type illustrated but to consider the design as appropriate to the area.		While this may be the intention, the strong visual message of the urban examples illustrated in the SODC Design Guidance will not be appropriate to Benson, and it is desirable that this is clearly understood.
	<u>Oxfordshire CC, Lynette Hughes</u>	<u>Edge Road</u>		
SB26		More detail required to justify Edge Road, including modelling the impact of the Edge Road on other roads and junctions in and around the village; OCC willing to work with Benson NP team and PC as resources allow	Paras 6.2-6.4, NP2-NP5	Noted. Evidence provided at Appendix F
SB27		Also need to consider the potential effects of SODC's preferred options for major developments in Local Plan 2033 and the strategic	Paras 6.2-6.4, NP2-NP5	Noted. We have included consideration of this as best we can given the lack of detail and certainty

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		transport proposals in OCC's Local Transport Plan 4		relating to these major developments
SB28		The Edge Road, if built, would become the new B4009 and so will need to be built to a high standard, wide enough to take buses (at least 6.75 metres) and with footway/cycle provision on each side	Paras 6.2-6.4, NP2-NP5	The developers have all undertaken to build the Relief Road to OCC's required specification.
SB29		OCC has no funds to contribute to the Edge Road and is not currently seeking funds given other priorities. It notes that the NP does not state whether the Edge Road is expected to be fully funded by the proposed developments or whether there will be a funding gap. If there is a funding gap, it is not clear whether it is expected that OCC will be requiring a contribution from another large development (eg Chalgrove Airfield), nor is it known whether OCC will be able to require such a contribution. It estimates the total cost of Edge Road scheme is likely to be £15-20m in total.	Paras 6.2-6.4, NP2-NP5	Noted. We do not expect to need any funding from OCC, as the developers and, if required, HCA will be able to fund the whole road.
SB30		It may be difficult to get developers to provide the Edge Road to the appropriate standard, given the limitations on what contributions OCC can require of them	Paras 6.2-6.4, NP2-NP5	Noted, but given developers' commitments to date and OCC's specification of the Relief Road, we are optimistic this will not be a problem.
SB31		Delivery of the Edge Road may also be difficult given the dependency on multiple developers working on different timescales	Paras 6.2-6.4, NP2-NP5	Noted - we acknowledge this is an issue and will be holding discussions with all parties to reduce risks.
SB32		The provision to limit housing numbers until the Edge Road is built may need to be assessed in more detail on a site by site basis	NP2b, NP3b, NP4b, NP5b	Noted and agreed - we expect SODC to negotiate details on thresholds on a case by case basis, such that the right balance is struck between incentivising developers to build the Relief Road in a reasonable timeframe and enabling them to manage their cashflow.
SB33		OCC notes the resolution to approve that is outstanding on BEN1 Phase 2 and that Benson may get significant new development but no Edge Road if one or more of the applications for allocated sites is not successful	NP2	Noted - we have secured appropriate commitments on the Relief Road from developers of all the allocated sites and we are confident given their goodwill and the support of OCC and SODC, that these developers will deliver on their commitments.
SB34		A full assessment is needed of the impacts of the Edge Road on the A4074 and the Elm Bridge Roundabout, given this would add a fifth arm to the roundabout; when it has the necessary information, OCC will need to assess the overall design and any mitigation measures required	NP2-NP5	Noted - we expect to discuss this in detail with developers, OCC and SODC, as soon as the planning process allows.

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
SB35		Measures to discourage people using the existing roads may be needed in order to encourage use of the Edge Road (e.g. traffic calming). The feasibility and funding for these measures will also need to be considered.	NP2-NP5, NP9	Noted - we expect to discuss this in detail with developers, OCC and SODC, as soon as the planning process allows.
		<u>Bus Services</u>		
SB36		OCC notes the NP comments on bus services and emphasises the importance of their plans to use developer contributions to increase the frequency of the X39/X40 bus service to Oxford and Reading. OCC suggests that over time the increased frequency of this strategic service will afford alternative commuting options (to private car usage) and mitigate the loss of local bus routes and the walking distances from Benson's new developments to the A4074 bus stop, which it acknowledges to be 'lengthy'.	NP11, Section 9.9	Noted - but we believe the proposed improvement in bus services mentioned is more likely to pose fresh issues for Benson with "park & ride" increases in Benson.
SB37		OCC notes NP11 which requires new developments to invest in existing and new bus services but adds that it will seek 'per dwelling' contributions as a matter of course	NP11	Noted.
		<u>Traffic Flow and Pinch Points</u>		
SB38		OCC notes the potential need for Castle Square to have a weight restriction and observes that weight restrictions normally apply to an area or a particular road. The NP would have to consider how a weight restriction would function - i.e. what alternative routes would HGV traffic use and how would the restriction be enforced and funded. Though OCC will consider environmental weight restrictions under the LTP4 Freight Strategy for areas subject to significant levels of HGV traffic, it is unlikely to have any funding available in the coming years.	NP9	Noted
		<u>Parking</u>		
SB39		OCC notes the NP comments on parking but suggests that the NP needs to consider parking options not associated with development sites and use its share of CIL contributions to fund its chosen parking projects. These projects must conform to SODC and OCC parking standards for residential developments.	NP10	Noted, but we are confident we have reviewed all possible parking options in the existing settlement. We will be very happy to discuss further with OCC.
SB40		NP10 wording - need to consider removal of 'minimum', as parking requirements will be determined on site by site basis in accordance with NPPF Framework and OCC/SODC standards	NP10	Noted

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
SB41		Comments on Parking Plan in Appendix G - Para 2.2 - suggest new walk-to-school initiative and school to create/refresh travel plan, to identify opportunities to reduce car use and increase walking and cycling; Para 2.3 - no need to restrict buses turning right out of Church Road, as they no longer do this anyway; Restrictions to A4074/Church Road junction discussed in NP - would need analysis and modelling of proposed changes, approval from OCC and funding is unlikely	Appendix G Paras 2.2,2.3	Noted.
		<u>Footways</u>		
SB42		OCC notes comments in NP on inadequacy/non-existence of footways in various parts of village, but says there is little scope to improve this. It may be possible for the NP to identify road marking improvements to enhance pedestrian safety.	NP11a	Noted. We would welcome discussions/suggestions on this.
SB43		NP expects new and/or improved cycle paths for all significant developments. Although OCC considers safe cycle access to new development sites when reviewing applications, provision of separate cycle paths within developments is uncommon. Any specific requirements for such paths should be itemised in a list of CIL aspirations.	NP12	Noted.
		<u>Education</u>		
SB44		The number of new homes already approved or allocated in the NP means that Benson Primary School will need to expand from current 1 form entry to 2 form entry - and even then space will be tight if developments are built over short period. Therefore the proposed developments should not be built until OCC confirms formally that it has secured the means to expand its primary school capacity (including transfer of land). If other developments are approved before the NP is 'made', the OCC may need to advise that capacity is insufficient to accommodate the allocations in the NP.	Paras 10.12.1-10.12.15	Noted and agreed. We have amended Para 10.12.12 to reflect OCC guidance on house numbers.
SB45		On secondary education, Wallingford has capacity to expand by one form of entry in the short-term and could add another form of entry in the future. Given all the current and possible developments in the area, it is not clear whether this will be adequate, but OCC will continue to work with local schools to ensure there are sufficient secondary places available.	Paras 10.12.1-10.12.15	Noted and agreed.

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		<u>Public Health</u>		
SB46		The NP Vision and Objectives need to make the case for new development improving the health and wellbeing of residents - lists key points and examples of 'provides opportunities for people to be more active', 'provides opportunities to make healthier food choices', 'fosters good mental health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness' and 'enables people to maintain their independence for longer'	Paras 5.1,5.2	Noted. Appendix K and L recognise the importance of green space provision in providing for recreation and managing mental health problems in communities. Recognising the limitations of a Neighbourhood Plan - policies and text are generally focused on land use matters.
SB47		The emphasis of NP Section 9.12.1 should be changed to reflect ways in which existing narrow roads can be made safer and more accessible to sustainable and active modes e.g. by adopting 20mph zones	NP12, Para 9.12.1	Noted, but we are unclear how Benson PC can effect traffic calming measures in the manner described
SB48		Para 9.6.2 of NP seeks to realise additional parking facilities wherever possible. OCC believes this is unlikely to foster an environment where people choose to walk and/or cycle. Where additional parking is necessary, it needs to conform to OCC's transport hierarchy and not impede walkways.	Para 9.6.2	Noted, but given that current parking facilities are failing to cope with demand, we cannot see how a large increase in the size of the village will not make matters worse. We would welcome any practical suggestions.
		<u>Minerals and Waste</u>		
SB49		OCC has no minerals or waste policy objections for any of the allocated sites.		Noted
		<u>Property</u>		
SB50		OCC supports allocation of land at the end of The Meer, identified as part of BEN4	NP3	Noted - this site is included as BEN10 in Site Assessments Appendix A
SB51		OCC reminds Benson PC that the land known as Benson Materials Store (or 'Salt Store') is suitable and available for development.		This matter has been considered and this Plan does not allocate this site for development. The site is adjacent to Benson Brook/Ewelme Stream, a chalk stream which is a BAP habitat, and it lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3. It is an open scrub mosaic-type habitat, which is of biodiversity interest in its own right, and it complements and supports the village's main green infrastructure asset, Cuckoo Pen/Millbrook Mead complex. See GI Audit for Benson. EA Biodiversity team advice is that this site is not suitable for development.

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		<u>Archaeology</u>		
SB52		OCC is satisfied with the NP policies for identification and protection of the historic environment and pleased that this takes into account archaeological deposits.	NP7	Noted
		<u>Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP)</u>		
SB53		OCC commends the opportunities afforded by the planning system to encourage sustainable local economic growth and supports the NP Vision and Objectives, well aligned as they are with the priorities of Oxfordshire's Strategic Economic Plan	Vision & Objectives (Section 5)	Noted
SB54	<u>DIO (Estates), Christine Ide</u>	DIO objects to development on BEN7 and therefore to NP Policy NP6	NP6	BEN7 is no longer allocated
SB55		BEN7 site does not conform to PPF Para 123 re a) avoidance of noise and its impact on health and quality of life and b) unreasonable restrictions imposed on businesses by changes of use on nearby land	NP6	BEN7 is no longer allocated
SB56		SODC discounted BEN7 site for development after assessment that included noise assessment carried out in Feb 15	NP6	BEN7 is no longer allocated
SB57		BEN7 is right under helicopter departure/arrival point and this, together with road noise from the A4074, would expose future residents to 'noticeable and disruptive' levels of noise and would be detrimental to their amenity contrary to saved policy EP2 of South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and advice in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance	NP6, NP8 & Design Principle D1	BEN7 is no longer allocated
SB58		DIO believes that Benson has already met its growth figure under the SODC Local Plan (Second Preferred Options) and that all further development allocations should be removed from the Benson NP	Para 3.11, NP1-NP6	In the current planning context where SODC cannot demonstrate 5 Year Land Supply, we do not believe this approach can be successful.
SB59		DIO is concerned that any further developments could result in unacceptable residential environments for future occupiers and give rise to noise complaints	Para 3.11, NP1-NP6	Noted
SB60		Where developments come forward, DIO would wish to ensure that noise assessments are carried out and that any significant adverse effects of noise can be adequately mitigated - DIO therefore supports NP8 and Design Principle D1 of the NP	NP8 & Design Principle D1	Noted
SB61		DIO suggests amended wording re availability of RAF Benson	Para 2.1	Wording of Para 2.1 changed.

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		facilities to non-service personnel (Page 12, Para 2.1)		
SB62		Proposal for a path linking RAF Benson to the Benson Edge Road (Page 40 Para 8.4)	NP12	We assume this proposal seeks to complete the footpath connecting RAF Benson to Ewelme. Improving pedestrian connectivity around the wider parish is an aspiration (see People and Nature Strategy). We are happy to discuss practicalities of this proposal with RAF Benson.
SB63		Comment that the 136 bus service is also important to RAF children (Page 49, Para 9.9.4)	NP11	Noted, the present wording recognises this.
	<u>DIO (Safeguarding), Louise Dale</u>	No concerns		Noted.
SB65	<u>NHS Oxfordshire CCG, Anne Lankester</u>	Keen to work with Benson PC to understand and manage impact of development on patient numbers - measure is 2.4 patients per housing unit	NP6a, NP19	Noted. See Para 10.17.1 and NP18
SB66	<u>Environment Agency, Cathy Harrison</u>	EA notes that a key finding of the SA/SEA is that additional housing will put pressure on water and sewage capacity. EA expresses concern that the Water Cycle Study for SODC Phase 1 update (Nov 2016) concludes that there is minimal or no capacity for wastewater treatment to cope with growth in Benson. EA recommends that the NP needs to address this lack of capacity and associated water quality risks	Draft SA/SEA Appendix 1	Noted. These issues are addressed in Section 11.12.1 and NP33. It will be necessary for the LA (SODC) to impose Grampian Conditions on developers such that appropriate S106 contributions are provided that will enable Thames Water to improve both fresh water supplies and foul water drainage impacts of developments. Thus will ensure that housing cannot be built until the necessary infrastructure upgrades have been provided.
SB67		Wastewater treatment capacity and clean water needs addressing in NP	Draft SA/SEA Appendix 1	Noted. This matter is addressed in Section 11.12.1 and NP33.
SB68	<u>Historic England, Martin Small</u>	Welcome brief description of historical development of Benson but more detail needed eg: Number of designated heritage assets (74); date when conservation areas designated and reason for designation.	Section 7	Para 2.8 amended to give number of listed buildings. All other heritage information is now supplied in Heritage Appendix.
SB69		More needed re findings of heritage study mentioned in 4.7 – what	Para 4.7	Para 4.7 amended to refer to Heritage Study at

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		info is available on Oxfordshire HER and Historic Landscape Character Assessments (HLCA in preparation)?		Appendix C
SB70		Highlights NPPG guidance that NP should include enough info about local heritage “to guide decisions and put broader heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale” and about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest - to guide decisions.	Section 7	Heritage Appendix expanded to include relevant information, including schedule of Buildings of Local Heritage Note.
SB71		Welcome Vision, but substitute “conserving and enhancing” for “respecting”.	Foreword, Para 5.1	Edited as suggested.
SB72		Disappointed that there is no specific heritage objective.	Para 5.2	Heritage objective now added.
SB73		Characterisation study should underpin NP.		Characterisation study including heritage detail is now included at Appendix E Character Assessment
SB74		Incorporate need for care re setting of Preston Crowmarsh Conservation Area in NP6 – suggest use of burial ground as a buffer.	NP6	NP5 no longer allocates BEN7 for housing - burial ground only.
SB75		Note that NP6 confuses east and west by proposing houses in the east furthest from the RAF.	NP6	NP5 - not retained in previous form - no need to amend.
SB76		Assess each development site against HER and HLCA for non-scheduled archaeological remains.	NP2, NP3, NP4, NP5, NP6	These factors are now included as part of the Site Assessments in Appendix A
SB77		Helpful to indicate proposed route for Edge Road on Policies (Proposals) Map.	Figure 3 under Para 6.4	The Relief Road is now shown on Policies Map.
SB78		Welcome section on Conservation and Heritage.		Noted.
SB79		Identification of buildings of local interest would help to meet NPPG advice.		Schedule of Buildings of Local Heritage Note is now provided in Heritage Appendix
SB80		Welcome NP7 in principle, but change “preserving” to “conserving” in first 3 bullet points; add “significance” before “special architectural and historic interest” in 1 st bullet point; add(?) “the special interest, character and appearance” to “characters” in 2 nd bullet point.	NP7, NP7a, NP7b, NP7c	Edited as suggested.
SB81		Welcome and support NP8 and Design Statement.	NP8 and Design Statement	Noted.
SB82	Natural England, Rebecca Micklem	Commend NP plan approach to GI, inclusion of policies NP25-30 and development of Strategy for People & Nature	NP25-30	Noted.
SB83		For NP27, need to consider how developers will demonstrate	NP27	Noted. This Plan supports the principle of net

Consultation Statement – Statutory Bodies				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		biodiversity 'net gain' - maybe use DEFRA offsetting metrics as a requirement on biodiversity		gain (see NP 26), and intends to work with developers to ensure biodiversity enhancements are locally relevant.
SB84		Concerns re impact of allocation of sites within the setting of the North Wessex Downs and Chilterns AONBs and that 365 houses over and above those approved is too much. NE refers to SODC's 'Landscape Assessment for Sites on the Edge of the Larger Villages of South Oxfordshire', which has recommend reduced areas for many such sites, and advises that further Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment needs to be undertaken to inform our allocations and our proposal for an Edge Road.	NP2-5, NP32, Section 11.11	The additional development is necessary to make the relief road viable. Plan specifies a multifunctional landscape buffer to mitigate landscape impacts of development including the new relief road.

Developers

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
DV85	Cala Homes	Application of Edge Road (ER) requirement to Littleworth Rd Phase 2 is 'unwarranted at the present time', as the ER proposal is not detailed yet and requires a lot of work	NP2, NP2a, NP2b	CALA Homes has stated in discussions that they are willing to provide the Relief Road across their site and their latest Conceptual Masterplan (17212/CF01C) shows this. The full version of Benson's NP allocates BEN1 Phase 2 (Littleworth Phase 2) on this basis.
DV86		Work is required on the ER proposal to determine nature, form and cost, plus clarity on commercial, regulatory and ownership factors and their impact on its delivery	NP2, NP2a, NP2b	Discussions with Cala have covered these issues and we believe they are now resolved.
DV87		Cala intends to deliver their Phase 1 site as soon as possible, along with the associated highway works. As the Phase 2 site will be accessed through Phase 1, they are concerned the ER requirement on Phase 2 site may delay these works	NP2, NP2a, NP2b	As DV86 above, this has been discussed and we believe the issue is now resolved.

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
DV88	<u>Gladman</u>	Limiting development on BEN7 to just 25 houses is not in accordance with NPPF guidance on ensuring viability	NP6, NP6a, NP6b, NP6c	BEN7 is no longer allocated for housing.
DV89		Benson PC needs to justify the contributions specified in the NP (burial plot and land for a GP surgery) against the tests of NPPF Para 204	NP6a, NP6b	BEN7 is no longer allocated for housing. Any use of the land for burial ground will be based on direct negotiation with the landowner.
DV90		Developers should not be required to solve existing infrastructure issues like lack of burial space	NP6a, NP6b	BEN7 is no longer allocated for housing. Any use of the land for burial ground will be based on direct negotiation with the landowner.
DV91		The policy on mitigation of noise in the NP (Design Principle D1) is subjective and should be deleted	NP8 referring to Design Principle D1	This principle has been supported by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation and no respondents to the consultation other than the developer have expressed concern. The principle does not look to impose noise standards that might be subject to future debate and change, but merely seeks a reasonable approach to sound mitigation and the impact on the living standards generally expected in this rural community. The principle reflects the recent appeal decision for BEN7.
DV92		Gladman recommend that they build 130 houses on BEN7		BEN7 is no longer allocated for housing.
DV93	<u>Hunter Page – Giles Brockbank</u>	Hunter Page client has interest in BEN4 (NP5), asked to discuss this with NP team in early May	NP5	Discussion held - no further action required.
DV94	<u>Turley (DW Homes)</u>	Turley believe the Benson NP will pass the Basic Conditions test and would be supportive of the Plan being 'made', if suggested amendments are adopted. These suggested changes are provided with reference to Para 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country		

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		Planning Act 1990 as follows:		
DV95		(1) The examiner must consider the following:		
DV96		(a) whether the draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions (see sub-paragraph (2))		
DV97		(b) whether the draft neighbourhood development plan complies with the provision made by or under sections 61E(2), 61J and 61L		
DV98		(d) whether the area for any referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area to which the draft neighbourhood development plan relates		
DV99		(e) such other matters as may be prescribed		
DV100		(2) A draft neighbourhood development plan meets the basic conditions if:		
DV101		(a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood development plans compatible with the Convention rights)		
DV102		(d) the making of the neighbourhood development plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development		
DV103		(e) the making of the neighbourhood development plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)		
DV104		(f) the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations		
DV105		(g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood development plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood development plan		
DV106		(h) The examiner is not to consider any matter that does not fall within sub-paragraph (1) (apart from considering whether the draft neighbourhood development plan is compatible with the Convention		

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		rights).		
DV107		Para 33 - Change reference to "South Oxfordshire Plan 2033" (not 2032)	Para 3.3	Noted and date changed.
DV108		Turley welcomes the fact that the emerging Local Plan is consistent with the NP in making provision for a road to the north of Benson; and considers the NP's definition of the Benson Village Boundary, encompassing its proposed allocations, as a positive approach to facilitating the development envisaged	NP1, Para 3.4	Noted
DV109		Requirement to provide Edge Road as condition of developments allocated under NP2, NP3, NP4 and NP5 should be explicitly applied to the provision of the Edge Road within the site in question	NP2a, NP3a, NP4a, NP5a	Noted, superceded by discussions with developers.
DV110		Turley encourage 'coordinated discussions' involving all the developers of sites allocated under NP2, NP3, NP4 and NP5, to ensure that the individual segments of Edge Road and their connections to the A4074 and B4009 are coordinated and realisable	NP2, NP3, NP4, NP5	Noted and agreed.
DV111		Sites BEN3 and BEN4 are currently allocated under separate allocations NP4 and NP5 in the NP. As a single application for these sites will shortly be submitted to SODC, they should be treated as a single allocation - NOTE - Turley makes this combined allocation point at many points, but includes identical comments for each of NP4 and NP5 for completeness. This document captures each comment only once but refers to both sites/policies	NP4, NP5	Noted. Separate site assessments and separate labels are maintained for audit purposes, but sites treated together where appropriate.
DV112		It is envisaged that the combined BEN3 and BEN4 sites will accommodate up to 240 houses (the Draft Plan states 110 and 140 houses respectively). A single allocation will afford greater flexibility with respect to layout and density. Wording should be changed accordingly to reflect '240 dwellngs across combined site"	NP4, NP5	Noted and wording changed.
DV113		Technical work has identified no reasons why development could not be accommodated at BEN3 and	NP4, NP5	BEN3 and BEN4 have been allocated in this Plan - see Site Assessments

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		BEN4 ; and has shown that landscape and visual impact considerations can be managed in an acceptable manner		Appendix A
DV114		NP4a and NP5a should each be amended to read "The provision of and safeguarding of land for a route for an Edge Roadthrough the site"	NP4a, NP5a	Noted and text amended.
DV115		NP4b and NP5b should be deleted, as the distribution of dwellings within the overall site is not yet known, so the location of the Edge Road cannot be confirmed; also it is onerous to ask developer to take responsibility for road adoption, as this belongs to Highways Authority	NP4b, NP5b	Noted. Policy NP4b and NP5b amended to state that "The Relief Road should be fully constructed across the combined BEN3/4 site before occupation of more than 50% of the total housing permitted for the combined site"
DV116		Requirement of NP4c and NP5c for a housing mix to need local needs is noted, but this should be balanced against the requirement for development to be consistent with local character (as Para 5.1 of the NP's Vision statement itself suggests). The wording as it stands is inflexible and needs changing to take account of local character and market conditions. This is also in line with the conclusions of Inspector determining appeal at Land west of Reading Road, Wallingford.	NP4c, NP5c	Noted. Policies NP4c and NP5c amended to read "A housing mix to meet local needs as identified in the Community Questionnaire Report (Housing Needs Survey) balanced against the need to protect local character and reflect prevailing market conditions."
DV117		NP4d and NP5d should be deleted as it duplicates Local Plan Policy	NP4d, NP5d	As the Neighbourhood Plan will be in place prior to Local Plan, we believe this policy is necessary.
DV118		Turley supports provision of open space but believes that allotments may not encourage wide participation. They therefore propose a Community Garden. SODC's standards will apply but should cover both BEN3 and BEN4 sites. Wording should be changed to "Provision of Open Space and allotments provided to SODC standards in place at the time any application is granted, allowing for a coordinated approach between sites NP4 and NP5"	NP4e, NP5f	SODC standard (0.3 ha/1000 people) is noted but evidence supports higher requirement in Benson (0.51 ha/1000 people) Wording on coordinated approach for Ben 3 and 4 adopted, but traditional allotment space will be required in addition to the community garden to accommodate the growth proposed at Ben 3 & 4, with the overall total of garden and allotments equalling 0.51ha/1000 people. See edits in site-specific policy and in Allotments section in Community facilities chapter.

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
DV119		Contributions for GP Surgery cannot be funded through S106 funds, as they are covered by District Council's CIL funds	NP4f, NP5g, NP19	Expansion of the Doctors Surgery has been included as a potential CIL project at Appendix I
DV120		Add to NP5d so it reads "Provision of a dedicated pedestrian route to Roke through the site, allowing for a coordinated approach between sites NP4 and NP5"	NP4g, N5e	Amendment made to Policy NP4
DV121		NP5h is unachievable, as it is necessary to provide appropriate visibility splays for the proposed site access. Existing hedgerow will be removed and subsequently reinstated. Change wording to "retention of the existing hedge forming the southern boundary where possible, and if removal is required to facilitate development the removed sections should be reinstated. The number and species of replacement hedgerow plants should be consistent with the existing hedgerow and the local landscape"	NP5h	Noted . Where hedgerow removal is required, any replacement should reflect the locally-specific planting requirements set out in Appendix x, which are in keeping with the Pollinators theme of the People and Nature Strategy.
DV122		Proposals for NP4 and NP5 will be informed by character assessment of local area and tie in with Conservation and Heritage section of NP and Design Guide in Appendix B	NP7	Noted.
DV123		Change wording of NP7d to better reflect national and local policy - thus "No development will be supported without a range of prior investigations to determine the archaeological potential of any proposed development site. Any impact on archaeological remains needs to be mitigated to reflect the significance of those remains, and schemes where mitigation can maximise preservation in situ of identified archaeological remains will be especially encouraged."	NP7d	Suggestions for wording of this policy are appreciated and policy is re-worded in part. However, the wording retains and strengthens reference to the significant potential for discovery in the Plan area, and looks to encourage provision for the preservation in situ of remains that are important. This is in line with national and local policy. Expert comment from Historic England, OCC and SODC had no concern with the policy as previously worded.
DV124		Turley note NP8 and Design Guide but have issues with "the predominance of two-storey buildings with low rise height and modest mass". Design needs to provide	NP8 and Appendix B	The Design Statement notes "the predominance of two-storey buildings with low-rise height and modest mass"

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		variety in the built form and streetscape		because such buildings are predominant. These buildings do, however, present plenty of variety in form and streetscape, and the statement is not intended to preclude variety that reflects local character. The modest height will be particularly relevant for the site in which Turley is interested as this site is on higher ground than much of the village and particularly exposed in landscape views.
DV125		NP9 needs to be amended to reflect NPPF assumption that local authorities should not resist developments unless the cumulative residual impact is 'severe'	NP9	We believe that our Plan conforms to the spirit of the NPPF in that it supports considerably more housing than is required under SODC's Emerging Local Plan. This Policy NP8 seeks simply to emphasise the key transport dependencies of the Plan.
DV126		NP10 is generally reasonable, but specific parking provision levels will need better evidence and should include garages. Reference made to written statement from Secretary of State of DCLG in March 2015 which said that developers were best placed to justify an appropriate level of parking	NP10	Noted and Policy NP9 has been amended.
DV127		Overarching principle of NP12 and H1 to H6 of Design Guide in Apendix B is acceptable, but wording of cycling policy in NP12b should be changed to reflect lack of formal cycle routes in Benson and limited opportunities to deliver new cycle infrastructure - thus "Where feasible, new developments should provide on-site cycle paths that encourage the use of bicycles for journeys to local amenities and surrounding areas. Where a need is established, they should also make appropriate contributions towards identified improvements to existing cycling facilities"	NP12, NP12a, NP12b	Noted and wording changed.
DV128		NP13 should be deleted as the SODC's Local Plan policy TRANS5 is the appropriate context to deal with	NP13	Noted and wording of NP12 has been changed.

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		strategic planning policy issues like this		
DV129		NP14 refers to Appendix I - Community Facilities, which is missing. The proposed developments on BEN3/4 will create more demand for local services	NP14	Noted and agreed. Appendix I now in place.
DV130		NP19 requires contributions for GP Surgery as does NP4f and NP5g above. This cannot be funded through S106 funds, as they are covered by District Council's CIL funds	NP19, NP4f, NP5g	Expansion of the Doctors Surgery has been included as a potential CIL project at Appendix I
DV131		A Connectivity Statement will be submitted as part of Utilities Statement, in accordance with NP20	NP20	Noted.
DV132		NP22 asks for levels of allotments well above SODC standards and the wording should be amended	NP22	Noted. The SODC standards have been considered in the context of the evidence of allotment usage in Benson. That evidence indicates a higher than average requirement for the village at 0.51ha/1000 people. The requirement has been scaled back from that originally proposed, but remains above SODC standards on the basis of the evidence.
DV133		Turley will meet SODC's standards for play facilities provision across the combined BEN3/4 site as a whole	NP23	Noted. Amendments have been made to NP4 to note a co-ordinated approach to play facilities.
DV134		Turley recognise the need for a green buffer on the north of the proposed sites BEN3/4, for settlement separation between Benson and Roke and for retaining open views of countryside to the north. However, they believe that the current layout is not efficient and will increase the density of the development and create unappealing outlooks for some of the new houses. They therefore wish to discuss the alternative layout proposed in their forthcoming planning application for the site.	NP25	Noted. There was an error in the map provided in the Presubmission draft of the Plan, which has now been corrected.
DV135		Turley also suggest that consideration should be given to routing the green corridor to the north of properties along Port Hill Road, in order to provide better views north to open country	NP25	Providing for pedestrian connectivity (with routes that offer separation from road traffic) between the new green spaces proposed in the plan is an

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
				important part of Benson's overall strategy. We are keen to work with developers to optimise pedestrian routes in a way which balances efficiency, security, amenity and attractiveness.
DV136		The application for BEN3 and BEN4 will be submitted as a single development and will conform to SODC's standards for green space provision across the combined site as a whole	NP26	Noted.
DV137		The requirements of NP27 are not precise enough in some points and are not practicable or appropriate in others - Turley propose the following rewordings:	NP27	
DV138		NP27a Development proposals should maintain and enhance existing on-site biodiversity assets, delivering ' overall net gain' in line with the District Council's core strategy, and provide for wildlife needs on site, where possible . For smaller sites, a contribution to biodiversity enhancement elsewhere in the parish may be made.	NP27a	Noted, wording amended.
DV139		NP27b Where possible, important hedgerows and mature trees and/or trees with a definable ecological value (for example those which support roosting bats or form part of a significant flight corridor) should be maintained'. Also a margin adequate to protect the hedgerow, including trees and root structures, should be maintained where possible and should aim to include a diversity of botanical species of interest to pollinators and local wildlife.'	NP27b	Noted. Amendments incorporated into Policy wording but with a requirement to replace any hedges that are removed.
DV140		NP27c On-site biodiversity enhancements, such as new roosting features for bats or nesting features for birds, must be incorporated into the fabric of the development.	NP27c	Noted. Amendments incorporated into Policy wording.
DV141		NP28 ties wildlife corridors and other measures to the locally-specific aims of Benson's Strategy for People and Nature. Turley believes this does not allow for fresh information or revised strategies for nature	NP28	Noted. Amendments incorporated into Policy wording.

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		conservation over the lifetime of the Plan. They suggest rewording thus - "The green space and landscape buffers provided through development and related planting schemes should, where ecologically appropriate to do so, reflect the locally-specific aims set out in Benson's Strategy for People and Nature'.		
DV142		Turley also argue that not all fences and walls need to be designed with biodiversity interests in mind and propose rewording the final sentence of NP28 "where walls and fences constitute a barrier to wildlife dispersing through areas of green open space or gardens, or from using wildlife corridors, and where it offers ecological gain to do so, features should be included to allow safe passage	NP28	Noted. Some amendments incorporated into Policy wording.
DV143		NP29 requires Green Infrastructure management plans with funding for the lifetime of the development. Turley believes this lifetime needs to be defined or a fixed term set or the wording on funding removed	NP29	Noted. A period of 15 years has been set.
DV144		NP30 Turley has conducted an assessment and their resulting landscape masterplan reflects the need to protect View 9 (North and South) and the need to create a substantial vegetated edge to the settlement and partially screen new development, with lengths of native hedgerow with hedgerow trees, areas of open space and groups of native trees. They believe their proposals take account of important views as required by NP32	NP30	Noted.
DV145		Specific typographical/minor corrections suggested		Edits made.
DV146		Specific notes of approval - Para 3.4, NP1	NP1	Noted.
DV147		No comments	NP11, NP15, NP16, NP17, NP18, NP21, 30, NP33, NP34	Noted.
DV148	West Waddy	Supportive of NP allocation of land to N of Littleworth Rd, but 'NP in its current form fails to meet the Basic Conditions Test in Para 8 Schedule 4B of Town & Country Planning Act 1990'. This Test requires of Neighbourhood Development Plans that:	NP2, NP2a, NP2b; NP9 (all)	

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		(a)"having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order"		
		(b)"having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order"		
		(c)having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order		
		(d)the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development		
		(e)the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)		
		(f)the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations		
		(g)prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order		
		West Waddy make the following specific comments with respect to these Test conditions:		
DV149		Under (a) NPPF requires significant boost in housing supply, but trigger levels for Edge Rd are not supported by evidence and no timeline for implementation is offered, so needed housing may be delayed; support for 25 dwellings on BEN7 is contrary to SODC position (BEN5 would be more sustainable)	NP2b	BEN7 no longer allocated. Plan now includes evidence in support of Relief Road.
DV150		Under (a) NPPF requires that, in the absence of a Policy in the NP defining the precise location for the Edge Road, it must be assumed to run across Flood Zone 2 and 3. The Edge Road fails to conform to the NPPF's approach to developments within areas at risk of flooding, as there is no evidence that either the Sequential Test (to explore alternatives) or the	NP2a	Noted

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		Exception Test (where no alternatives are shown to be available) have been applied. Until these Tests have been completed, no allocation of development, including roads, can take place. Further, the Edenvale Young flood risk review submitted by West Waddy states that the flood risk evidence for Benson currently held by EA is inadequate, so a detailed hydraulic modelling of Lady Brook is required to understand the flood. risks of building the Edge Road and the mitigation required		
DV151		Under (a)NPPF Paras 173 and 174 state that sites identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened, but 'little or no consideration has been given to the and deliverability of the Edge Road'. Also the Draft SA/SEA refers, in its discussion of the need for an Edge Road, to traffic arising out of Chalgrove and Wallingford growth. Requiring developers in Benson to pay for such a strategic road would be contrary to advice in Para 204 of NPPF that "planning obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development".	NP2a	Noted. Traffic data in support of the Relief Road is provided in Appendix F of this Plan. It should be noted that all the developers across BEN1, BEN2, BEN3 and BEN4 have committed to building the Relief Road and we are confident in their ability to deliver to an agreed timetable.
DV152		Under (d) the NP does not provide sufficient and proportionate evidence base demonstrating how the bypass contributes to sustainable solutions	NP2a	Noted. Traffic data evidence is now provided at Appendix F
DV153		Under (e) OCC's Local Transport Plan updated in 2016 does not make provision for a bypass for Benson; and the inclusion of SODC's Draft Policy TRANS3 for Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Transport Schemes (including Benson's bypass) should be given no weight, as it is not supported by any evidence in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and is therefore contrary to the European Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive 2001/42/EC. TRANS3 also looks just to	NP2a	The Relief Road is reflected in the SODC Emerging Plan 2033 and we expect it to be included in OCC's Infrastructure Strategy (OXIS). The developers of allocated sites are supportive and committed to fund this road.

Consultation Statement – Developers				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		safeguard land for future use rather than implement an Edge Road in the short-term as required by the NP.		
DV154		Under (f) the Draft SA/SEA accompanying the NP fails to provide environmental and other information relating to the Edge Road, as listed in Schedule 2 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes 2004.	NP2a	Final SEA/SA has been updated
DV155		West Waddy also include a Representation Paper on Transport & Highways commissioned from Peter Brett Associates. This provides arguments in support of the West Waddy letter and states that the proposed changes to Littleworth Road make the Edge Road unnecessary. The paper also states that the traffic flow evidence is insufficient to justify an Edge Road; concludes that there will be significant engineering problems to be overcome relating to crossing the flood area; estimates the cost of delivering the Edge Road to be over £5m excluding land purchase; and draws attention to the likely 4-5 years timescale involved.	NP2a, NP9	Comments noted. Traffic data is provided which supports the need for the Relief Road and developers have committed to delivering the Relief Road. We have discussed delivery timetable and are confident in their ability to deliver the Relief Road to an agreed timetable.

Local Residents

Consultation Statement – Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
LR156	Jane Akazi	Support plan; keen to see boundary formalised by NP and adoption early as possible to prevent further development	NP1, Policies Map (Fig 3, p24)	Noted.
LR157	Lynne & Geoff Allen	Support vast majority of plan, but wish PC to consider:		Noted.
LR158		ER must be number 1 priority of NP and its complexity means it must receive even higher focus - LA/GA recommend that all future planning applications must confirm support for ER and demonstrate how their development will contribute to its construction and operation	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR159		Recent development applications have clearly disadvantaged some existing Benson residents		Noted. Plan attempts to do this where feasible.

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		significantly - believe that NP should establish area-wide principles and policies that guard against these situations		
LR160		Relocation of GP surgery would have detrimental impact on village centre and disadvantage patients in north/north-east of village; also GP practice is owned by the partners, so contributions called for in NP2-5 would be going to them not the NHS - suggest that this needs further review and discussion with the partners	NP19, NP2-5	Noted. BEN7 not allocated in Final Plan and GP Surgery expansion will not require move from current location.
LR161		NP does not cover the need for smaller, more affordable properties - despite the fact that recent history shows that developers will seek to alter housing mix from smaller 1- and 2-bedroom properties to larger houses (as in case of approved Littleworth Rd development)	Objectives (Para 5.2)	Noted, but this is not strictly true. Specific site allocation policies NP2 to NP5 each specify "delivery of Affordable Housing to SODC standards".
LR162		The high proportion of 'family homes' in current development applications mean that Benson Primary School will not have capacity to cope with more than a small amount of development - OCC needs to start planning now to meet the likely demand, before demand outstrips supply	Objectives (Para 5.2), Section 10.12	Noted. OCC has plans for extending the school and its capacity is noted.
LR163	Maisie Andrews	Support plan; success of enlarged GP surgery will also depend on securing enough doctors	NP19, Para 10.17.1	Noted and agreed.
LR164		Relationship of managing 'sustainable drainage system' with risk of bird strike is not clear	Para 11.12.3	Noted. This point relates to the fact that developments in low-lying areas often use "attenuation ponds" to reduce the risks of flooding. These ponds can attract birds which can increase the chance of 'bird strikes'. Para 11.12.4 states that developers need to take account of both issues.
LR165	Nancy Bailey	Traffic data error (Appx E , Item 2); people parking on double yellow lines in High St is dangerous (Appx G, Para 2.1)	Appx E, Appx G	The data table in Appx E, Section 2 is correct. Comment on parking on yellow lines is noted.
LR166	John Barwick	Asked where he could find details of schooling in Benson in the NP	Para 10.12.1	References provided to respondent.
LR167	Mick Brown	Suggestions to manage 'off road parking' for new	NP10	Noted, but these matters are managed

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		houses - covenants to ensure this is used where it is provided and garages must be large enough to accommodate modern size vehicles so they can be so used		by SODC and OCC and Benson PC/Benson NP have little influence.
LR168	Gordon Browne	Support plan, no comments		Noted.
LR169	David Cook & Hazel Nicholson	Support plan; additional houses proposed in Plan is acceptable in order to secure the Edge Road	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR170	Paul Day	Support plan - detailed and thorough; needs to stress even more that new housing is only sustainable with ER	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR171	Peter Ellingworth	Edge Road - traffic increase will pose significant risks to horses, riders and wildlife at proposed junction of Edge Rd with B4009 near Braze Lane - junction should be moved closer to village; NP5 is intrusive on village boundary and poses risks to people using equestrian facilities at Porthill and Orchard houses	NP5	Concerns noted. Safety on the new road will be the concern & responsibility of OCC Highways.
LR172		New green space should be designed to secure separation of Benson and Rokemarsh; development should be phased, with reviews at each stage	NP26, Sections 11.9 and 11.11	Noted. New bullet added to NP4 to require separation. Not possible to require phasing and review
LR173	Anna Field	NP needs to state more strongly need to avoid large scale development between A4074 and Preston Crowmarsh	???	Noted. This is addressed new Design Principle N1 for Preston Crowmarsh.
LR174	Richard Foster	Support plan, especially Edge Rd; if new GP surgery is sited on BEN7, could old surgery be used to increase parking in centre of village?	NP6, Section 9.6	Noted. BEN7 not allocated in Final Plan and unlikely that GP Surgery expansion will require move from current location.
LR175	Michael & Barbara Goss	Support plan - covers all concerns		Noted.
LR176	Christine Grieve	Support plan; hope SODC will adopt it in timely fashion; SODC should put all application decisions on hold till plan adopted		Noted.
LR177	Carole Heron	Increase in traffic expected is terrifying prospect - Benson already has serious and dangerous traffic and parking problems - particularly Castle Sq and Oxford Rd - and this will get much worse with proposed development; also need a solution for enormous vehicles passing through the village - the ER is desperately needed and CH worried that it will take a long time to materialise	NP9, Section 9.5	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan, including that it should be constructed in reasonable timeframe.
LR178		Also concerned with impact of additional housing on		Noted - Plan seeks to balance all these

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		resources and risk to character of village		factors pragmatically.
LR179	Alice Jones-Evans	Support plan, excellent plan with no surprises, because of regular communications; specific points:		Noted.
LR180		Very pleased re sustainable transport policies - walking ways along key routes are not currently safe and need to be; also need to be easy to maintain; bricked pavements like one on Brook St is not safe and will discourage people walking into village centre	NP12; Design Principles H1-H6 in Appendix B	Noted. The Plan seeks to provide secure pavements and walkways where this is feasible.
LR181		Local sports clubs need better facilities - changing facilities, more lockers and standard of football pitches	Section 10.9	A Neighbourhood Plan addresses land use issues and there is currently no suggestion that new sports field facilities will be provided apart from a new pitch within BEN1. This will be provided with changing facilities and toilets although is intended primarily for use by Benson School. However, its broader useage will be determined in due course.
LR182		Number of nurseries within 5 miles of Benson looks wrong; lack of childminders in Benson is worrying; younger classes in school are full/close to capacity; some children in Benson believed not to have been allocated place at Wallingford	Sections 10.12.1, 10.12.3, 10.12.6	Comment noted. The nurseries etc have been cross checked and up dated, with references now given. The places in Benson CoE School have been taken into account in line with information provided by OCC. The Head of Wallingford School has assured us that no child in Benson who meets the catchment area criteria has been refused a place at Wallingford.
LR183		Could library be combined with Post Office?	Section 10.13	Review of Library Services is underway between FOBL and OCLS. Suggestion noted and will be considered.
LR184		Section 10.14.1 says that NP18 sets out an approach for the development of new retail units - suspect this is the wrong reference as NP18 talks about loss of an asset of community value	NP18; Section 10.14.1	The wording of Section 10.14.1 has been ammended to reflect better our views on protection of retail facilities in te village centre.
LR185		Local Green Spaces map needs enhancing and some sites added; update maps provided for Appendices A &	NP25, Figure 9 (p74); Appendices A & H	Noted - maps updated in this Plan.

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		H		
LR186		Appendix D, Transport Spatial Assessment may be right, but seems unqualified, what's the evidence?		Comment noted. Distances from facilities and bus tops are given in the Plan; Traffic Pinch Points and Road Safety considerations have been identified. However, the assessment was done by the Strategic Infrastructure Team so inevitably there is a subjective element to it
LR187	John & Anona Hewitt	Great work on NP - support plan but some concerns/suggestions:		Noted.
LR188		Location of GP surgery - site proposed is not 'relatively central and will result in people using cars; no buses pass this site, so elderly and infirm will not be able to access easily; could current GP surgery be expanded upwards or over car park to leave parking intact?; or consider a GP outpost on new developments?	NP19	Noted. BEN7 not allocated in Final Plan and GP Surgery expansion will not require move from current location. See Para 10.17.1 and NP18.
LR189		Traffic flow pinch points - Consider adding Brook St by Wisteria Cottage - cars have to mount pavement when cars coming in opposite direction and they can't see pedestrians safely	NP9, Section 9.5	Noted but Brook St has no officially recorded traffic issues to date.
LR190		Oxford Rd - no part of school field should be used to provide dropping off point for cars and lay-by for dropping off would add to traffic and be dangerous due to lack of visibility for cars drawing out	Para 10.12.15	Noted, this approach is not proposed.
LR191		Support plan; without Edge Rd, developments will make Benson unsustainable in terms of traffic, pollution, parking and essential facilities	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR192		Support plan, confident in the analysis process, no issues		Noted.
LR193	Felicity Hoad	Strongly support plan; BEN3&4 should be treated as single allocation; prefer community garden rather than allotments; developer should drive housing mix; agree with points made by Turley	NP4-5	Noted.
LR194	Richard Irwin	Overview - Draft NP allocation of 330 houses on top of 400 already committed is excessive and highly damaging to local environment, creating an	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. SODC in its Emerging Local Plan requires at least 383 new houses from Benson over and above the 187 houses

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		unsustainable form of development contrary to SODC Local Plan and NPPF guidance; it appears to be predicated on need to provide a developer funded Edge Road		on BEN1 Phase1 (approved before the planning window). This Plan allocates 241 houses for BEN 1 Phase 2 (currently in Section 106 discussions with SODC) plus 324 houses for BEN 2, 3 and 4. It is our judgement that on balance the best outcome for Benson's future is to allow more housing than the SODC minimum quota in order to secure the Relief Road.
LR195	Graham Keable (obo Peter & Janet Keable)	Proposed housing is disproportionate - 42% increase on existing level, well beyond 15% suggested in SODC Local Plan Second Preferred Options; NP could fail Basic Conditions test as being so significantly at variance with emerging Local Plan	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. See LR196 above.
LR196	Paul & Anne McCann	Much of proposed development under NP4 and NP5 will be distant from village centre services and relate very poorly to rest of village - same argument used by PC when objecting to application for development on land south of Watlington Rd	NP4-5	Noted. NP4 is allocated, despite its relative distance from the village centre, because of the significant benefits it provides in facilitating the Relief Road.
LR197		Respondents discuss the Kirkham/Terra Firma Landscape Assessment performed for SODC in 2014, which noted the proximity of the North Wessex Downs AONB and thus the potential for harm 'through unsympathetic incremental expansion of the settlements of and adjacent to NWD AONB, detracting from the surrounding countryside'; they quote the assessment's recommendation that development on BEN3 (NP4) should be constrained to the western end of the site in order to avoid harm being caused by incremental expansion to the setting of the AONB and surrounding countryside, as above; they observe that no assessment was performed on site BEN4 (NP5), but argue that the case for avoiding harm applies even more strongly to this site; they recommend that any development on BEN3 (NP4) should be restricted to the land bounded by Hale Rd to the north and The	NP32, Section 11.11	The Site Assessments now added to the Plan note the Landscape Assessment quoted and acknowledge the harm that development of BEN3 and 4 will cause to the setting of the AONBs and the rural landscape setting of the village. The site allocation and strategic policies take account of this harm but also of the significant benefits to the community that will derive from a Relief Road. In determining where the balance between the harm and benefit lies, the strategy must take account of the means of achieving the Relief Road and the relative certainty of those means being available. Based on these factors and our negotiations to date, this Plan

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		Meer to the south; and that no development at all should be allowed on BEN4 (NP5), on the grounds that it is more prominent in landscape terms and more difficult to mitigate; this reduction in development may reduce developer funding, but this can be recouped from HCA or elsewhere		accepts the need for development in the western part of BEN3 and over much of BEN4, but requires mitigation (landscape buffer, Design Principles etc) to minimise the harm in landscape terms.
LR198		ER remains uncertain, so all development sites should be treated as 'safeguarded' only to come forward when there is complete certainty on delivery of ER	NP1-6	Noted, but discussions with developers on building and funding the Relief Road have been very positive.
LR199		If no further housing is allocated, the improved Littleworth Rd will be able to handle the traffic arising from the committed sites and provide potential relief for some traffic heading north to Watlington	Para 9.5.8	Noted, but some further new housing is inevitable, given the minimum allocation identified for Benson by SODC's Emerging Local Plan, and consideration must also be given to the other significant developments in South Oxfordshire which will impact on Benson.
LR200		NP should consider designating School field as "Local Green Space" as well as "Important Open Space" (as per Conservation Area Plan), to provide extra protection	NP25, Section11.9	Noted. This approach has been considered. Expansion of the school was proposed as part of the BEN 1 Phase 2 planning application, which is currently at Section 106 negotiations stage. OCC is reviewing options for expanding the school, one of which may be to extend on part of the school field. The revised plan text strongly encourages the Voluntary School Trust to retain as much as possible of the school field to meet childrens' needs for greenspace for informal recreation.
LR201		Congratulations on sound, consolidated proposal that represents concerns and aspirations of residents. Comments/suggestions:		Noted.
LR202		"Improved road safety" is key transport element and is described in detail in NP, but it needs an associated policy	NP9, Section 9.5	Noted. It proved impossible to draft a meaningful single policy on road safety so the Plan attempts to deal with safety in its various components.

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
LR203	Donal McGurk	ER is most important element in NP - needs to be emphasised even more and stressed as a condition for any development	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR204		Support plan; without Edge Rd, developments will make Benson unsustainable in terms of traffic, pollution, parking and essential facilities	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR205		Support plan, confident in the analysis process, no issues		Noted.
LR206		Consider ways of expanding/rebuilding school without losing playing fields - eg 2 storey element for older children or building on car park and creating new offsite parking	Para 10.12.4	The school expansion was proposed as part of the BEN 1 Phase 2 application and our NP has little weight in this matter. That said, OCC is undertaking a feasibility study into the school expansion, examining a range of options, and this is not yet complete. The Plan strongly encourages retention of as much as possible of the green space to meet recreational needs.
LR207		Rebuild library over 2 storeys on current site (which is large enough)?	Section 10.13	Friends of Benson Library are consulting with Oxfordshire Library Services about the future of Benson Library. This NP supports this activity - see Paras 10.13 onwards
LR208		Edits - Change plan table colour in NP; mention A4074 pedestrian crossing at Berinsfield		Comment accepted. The colour of plans etc will be handled elsewhere, but a mention of the crossings at Shillingford & Berinsfield will be included.
LR209	Henry Merryweather	NP6 fails to mention effects of high level noise, despite fact that SODC refused application on these grounds (3 extracts from SODC planning objection document are provided) and that NP's own Design Principle D1 states mitigation measures for noise should not prejudice living standards of future residents - D1 cites need for natural ventilation and enjoyment of garden amenity specifically	NP6, Design Principle D1	Noted. BEN7 no longer allocated for housing.
LR210		HM questions whether the opinions of the Church, PC and Community would change now that SODC has	NP6, Design Principle D1	Noted. BEN7 no longer allocated for housing.

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		objected to development on BEN7 and now that it is clear that the living standards of future residents will be below levels recommended by WHO and BS		
LR211		HM quotes NPSC Minutes of 22/3/17 Para 5.1 and asks whether SODC comments on our draft NP will be published in full in (say) a future set of minutes of NPSC		Noted. Given the numbers of comments and consultees commenting on the Plan, it would be logistically very onerous to publish everything online. If anyone has any specific interests, they should contact the NP group and we will try to help.
LR212	John Murphy & Richard Cousins	Not enough space for cyclists and pedestrians on Benson's roads - NP should include objective to develop safe separation for these from road traffic; maybe using PC land along edge of Watlington Rd	NP12	Noted. This NP encourages footpaths/cycleways with safe separation wherever possible, but SODC and OCC are the statutory authorities.
LR213	Pat Peers	No houses should be put on BEN7; new burial plot - favours a 'Natural Burial Ground' becoming woodland over time; existing burial plots are full and St Helen's Avenue should be considered; Sunnyside created in 1946; Bertie West Field covenanted in 1980	NP6, Para 10.16.1	Noted. BEN7 no longer allocated for housing. Dates corrected in Final Plan. Suggestion re Natural Burial Ground will be considered.
LR214	Stuart Phillips	Average household size in Benson is small, so increase in houses has disproportionate impact on population - not sure if NP covers this		This may be true, but planning quotas for new housing are based on number of dwellings and do not distinguish size of dwellings or number of inhabitants.
LR215	Alison Reid (via John Reid mailbox)	Concerns - traffic at junction of Church Rd and A4074 is dangerous - why does plan not require developers to fund roundabout there? Village centre needs relief road	NP9, Section 9.5	Noted. This NP suggests a traffic light system for this junction.
LR216		Suggestions for parking arrangements on Church Rd and Village Centre	Section 9.6	Noted, though suggestions may not be supported by OCC.
LR217		Green spaces dealt with well by NP but School Field should be designated as green space	NP25, Section11.9	Noted. This approach has been considered. Expansion of the school was proposed as part of the BEN 1 Phase 2 planning application, which is currently at Section 106 negotiations stage. OCC is reviewing options for expanding the school, one of which may be to extend on part of the school field.

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
				The revised plan text strongly encourages the Voluntary School Trust to retain as much as possible of the school field to meet childrens' needs for greenspace for informal recreation.
LR218	John Reid	We should not be condoning further housing beyond the 428 houses approved for BEN1 Phases 1 and 2; this is already well over the numbers in Core Strategy, Local Plan (Second Preferred Options) and we should not allow more to secure the ER; ER is likely to be a 'rat run' anyway	NP1-5, Section 6	Comments noted, but the houses in BEN 1 Phase 1 are not included in Benson's new housing allocation (as the permission predates the start date for the housing targets); and the new road is not just about development in Benson.
LR219	Alexander Sen	Asks where the replacement sports facilities will be located if the existing playing field is used for expansion	Para 10.12.4	RFO replied 6/3/17
LR220		Benson play facilities are limited and run down - hopes this development will provide opportunity to expand and improve facilities	NP23-24, Section 10.20	Noted. The Parish Council has secured grant funding from SODC to refurbish some of the play facilities. It also plans to add playing equipment to several of the play areas in the village over the next year.
LR221	Suzy Smith	Fully supports ER , but thinks NP should place more emphasis on protecting Benson's existing character	NP7, NP32, Section 11.11	Comments noted and support welcomed. This Plan seeks robustly to protect Benson's character and now includes a detailed Design Statement (Appx B) and Character Assessments (Appx E)
LR222		Does not support NP9 re support for developments which result in improvements to free flow of traffic - this conflicts with objective of NP to maintain Benson's distinct and separate character and risks being interpreted by developers to mean road widening and straightening and associated increased speeds	NP9	Comment noted but we believe both aims can be achieved.
LR223		Does not support intention in NP6 to site new GP Surgery off St Helen's Ave, as this will reduce vitality of centre and increase traffic; does support NP6 proposals for 25 new dwellings and burial ground and retention	NP6	Noted. BEN7 not allocated in Final Plan and unlikely that GP Surgery expansion will require move from current location.

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		of hedges		
LR224		The 'Salt Store' is too far from Riverside to be suitable parking site; it cannot be used both as a car park and as Open Space for nature conservation - urges NP is amended to retain this land for nature conservation only	Appx G	Comment noted. Discussions are underway with OCC about the potential for the Parish Council to take on the management of the Salt Store (aka the Material Store) for nature conservation purposes under a long term lease. There are no immediate plans to use this site for car parking, but given the critical shortage of parking options in Benson and the ever increasing pressure on space along and around the A4074, we may need to consider dual use on this site in future.
LR225	Richard Soulsby	Support plan and pleased to see consideration given to pollinators; also NP6 proposal for limited housing/GP surgery/burial ground is far preferable to Gladman proposals	NP6	Noted.
LR226		Asks questions on weight attributed to NP as it goes through process; and on need for parishioners to read whole of NP		RFO answered questions 14/3/17
LR227		Proposes edits to NP		Noted. Some edits made
LR228	Tom Stevenson	Parking Plan - Layby along Oxford Rd would be dangerous (Recommendation 5 of 2.2, Appx G); Salt Store would only be used for parking if yellow lines are painted between it and Church Rd (Recommendation 12); various minor amendments to wording etc suggested	Appx G	The Oxford Road layby is no longer proposed. Comment on parking noted, but this is a 15 year Plan and we may need to consider dual use (nature conservation and parking) of the Materials Store site in future.
LR229	Liam Tiller	Publication of SODC's Local Plan 2033 Second Preferred Options means that some parts of NP will need to be looked at again		Plan does reflect SODC's Emerging Local Plan to 2033, specifically their Second Preferred Options document.
LR230		Local Plan 2033 says that permissions already granted exceed Benson's share of 'Large Villages' housing; the 595 houses proposed in the NP is 45% more than proposed in the Local Plan	NP1-5, Section 6	Comment noted. SODC in its Emerging Local Plan expects at least 383 new houses from Benson over and above the 187 houses on BEN1 Phase1 (approved before the planning window). This Plan allocates 241 houses for BEN 1 Phase 2

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
				(currently in 106 discussions) plus 324 houses for BEN 2, 3 and 4. It is our judgement that on balance the best outcome for Benson's future is to allow more housing than the SODC minimum quota in order to secure the Relief Road.
LR231		The NP does not say what is meant by "Edge Road" - is it same as 'bypass' - this is the term SODC uses in Local Plan safeguarding policy	NP1-5, Section 6	In planning terms an 'Relief Road' is not the same as a 'bypass', and does not necessarily have to go round the outside of a settlement. The NP has now agreed with SODC on the use of the term 'Relief Road'.
LR232		If there is to be an ER, there cannot, by definition, be houses beyond it		Noted, but the route actually runs through the allocated sites and is now known as "Relief Road". Wherever possible, the Plan seeks to ensure that a buffer is created beyond the new housing to avoid coalescence with neighbouring settlements.
LR233		Oppose bulding on sites BEN3 and BEN4, as it narrows gap between Benson and Rokemarsh, but accept some development of these sites will be required to help pay for the ER	NP4, NP5	This concurs with the strategy of the Plan. The Plan will, however, need to leave flexibility as to how much development is justified/required to achieve the Relief Road.
LR234		NP accepts need for buffer to separate Benson and Rokemarsh, but this is not included in NP4 and NP5 and should be - gap should be at least half the current gap and include agricultural land to protect rural setting of Roke and Rokemarsh	NP4, NP5	Noted. New bullet added to NP4 to require green space separation. It is not possible to insist on agricultural use given reduced viability of the space, but green space policies require it as part of a green buffer.
LR235	Mark Thomson-Tur	Support plan and approve NP approach to securing ER - needed in order to reduce traffic flow through village, improve conditions for pedestrians and help maintain rural village feel	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted.
LR236		Separation of school and playing fields will cause	Para 10.12.4	The new school playing field came from

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		difficulties - if we secure ER, could Littleworth Rd be made 'residents only' and so improve pedestrian crossing safety?		the application for Ben 1 Phase 2, which SODC will decide through the planning process. This NP has no influence on this. It is not possible to make a public road "residents only", but we believe the new Relief Road should reduce traffic at the crossing point.
LR237		Could existing GP surgery be used to extend Millstream Centre or to provide sheltered housing, pre-school facilities or a relocated library?	NP19, Section 10.17	Noted - See Para 10.17.1 and NP 18
LR238		BEN4 development risks making it easier for developers to make the case for developing BEN5 & 6 - if it is necessary to develop BEN4 in order to secure the ER, perhaps the number of units should be reduced?	NP5	Noted - Plan does not allocate BEN5 or BEN6 and should carry increasing weight as it progresses through the process towards adoption over the next 6 months.
LR239	George Verdon	Congratulations on comprehensive plan in short timescale - comments/suggestions on key issues:		Noted.
LR240		Developer proposals for expanding school on current playing field and providing new playing fields across Littleworth Rd are not practicable - moving children will require additional teachers to accompany children and will add 30 minutes to timetable - why not move Youth Centre elsewhere and use resulting plot for school expansion or demolish old school building and build new two-storey building in its place?	Para 10.12.4	The new school playing field came from the application for Ben 1 Phase 2, which SODC will decide through the planning process. This NP has no influence on this. Options for school expansions are currently under consideration through an OCC feasibility study. That work is not yet complete.
LR241		Addressing need for ER is most important issue - GV lives on corner of Castle Sq - just 3 inches between wall and tyre marks of heavy trucks; wall hit twice in last 2 years; Littleworth Rd cannot provide suitable alternative route for heavy trucks	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted.
LR242		Benson Library cannot accommodate current plans, let alone a 33% increase in population - car park is too small and entrance dangerous; FOBL is currently preparing proposals to relocate library - hope these will be supported by PC and NP	Section 10.13	Noted. The NP has a policy enabling library expansion or re-location and will support either.
LR243	Katie Whell	Concerns - what are we doing about:		
LR244		Increased traffic (already congested, especially Church	Section 9.5 Section 10.12	Noted. The whole point of the Relief

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
		Rd onto A4074 & St Helens)?		Road is to try and deal with traffic issues; the Plan also suggests a solution to the Church Rd/A4074 junction issues.
LR245		Increased parking (in village centre, the school and around A4074)?	Section 9.6	Noted. We are suggesting parking improvements near the A4074, but shortage of land precludes anything significant in the village centre, except managing what we have more efficiently.
LR246		School places?	Section 10.12	Noted. The School expansion is the responsibility of OCC, but this Plan takes their growth projections into account.
LR247		Waiting times to see doctor?	NP19, Section 10.17	Noted. See Para 10.17.1 and NP 18
LR248		Room for village amenities and green spaces?	NP25, Section 11.9	The Neighbourhood Plan proposes the creation of two significant new green spaces associated with allocation of two of the development sites. It is intended that these spaces will meet a range of uses including recreation, allotments/community garden, and providing space for nature. The Plan also allows for small developments to make a contribution to enhancement of existing green spaces.
LR249	Mark Wilkin	Welcome NP proposal for replacement GP surgery, but question suitability of location on periphery of village - could it be located in new development adjacent to Littleworth Rd, maybe in place of retail space?	NP19, Section 10.17	RFO responded direct 7/3/17
LR250		Strongly oppose proposal to extend primary school on existing playing field site - this would dramatically alter character of this part of village; experience of other schools is that off-site playing fields are unsatisfactory and more difficult to use; this is exacerbated by proposed location of new playing fields and the issue of children having to cross busy road; suggests school should be relocated and existing site used for new health centre	Para 10.12.4	The expansion of the school and provision of alternative playing fields across Littleworth Road was part of an application for BEN 1 Phase 2, which will be decided by SODC through the planning process. This NP carries little weight in this. A feasibility study, which is exploring options, is being undertaken by OCC. The Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement –Local Residents				
ID	Respondent	Main Issues / Concerns	Related Policy / Reference	Edits Made / Action Taken
				strongly encourages the Voluntary School Trust to retain as much of the field as possible as green space for informal recreation for the children at the school.
LR251	Adam Wood (obo 1st Scouts Group)	Support plan - "impressively comprehensive and realistic" - and note provision for Youth Facilities building in NP2	NP2	Noted.
LR252		Scout Group is amenable to becoming an anchor tenant of new building along with other users; the group will need comparable level of utility to existing facilities, specifically access to open space for camping, fires, games etc		Noted.
LR253	Anonymous	Broadly agree with NP but concerned re number of houses - land between Benson and Roke should not be developed unless we get an ER; if other sites no allocated in NP, we should reduce NP allocations accordingly	NP1-5, Section 6	Noted. Relief Road is central to Plan.
LR254		Like the inclusion of plenty of green space and play facilities	NP 25-26, NP23-24	Noted.
LR255		Would like more car parking in village centre (though don't know where it can go) - otherwise people will drive into Wallingford to shop	Section 9.6	Noted and agreed more parking would be desirable, but no land is currently available.
LR256		Can we expand the conservation area in any way?		Noted. The Plan notes the associations between the Conservation Areas and areas outside, but cannot extend the designation - that would be for SODC to consider.

Appendices

Appendix A – Flyer advertising village meeting

Appendix A shows the A5 flyer delivered to all houses in Benson advising of the kick-off meeting for the Neighbourhood Development Plan in January 2016.



Flyer.docx

Appendix B – Poster stating the Vision for the Plan

Appendix B shows a poster displayed on notice boards around the village and “A frames” in the village high street detailing the Vision for the Plan and advertising the Plan website



BENSON-PLAN_POSTER.pdf

Appendix C – June Drop-In Session

Appendix C shows the content and subsequent feedback from the drop-in sessions held on 10th & 11th June 2016.



DR Drop In Event Feedback.doc



Drop-in summary of Design comments.doc



Drop In Session – Local Infrastructure.c

Copies of questionnaires / survey and engagement techniques

Copies of leaflets

Copies of press coverage / cuttings publicising the plan

Appendix D – December Drop-In Session

Pictures from the Drop-In session held on 3rd December together with the feedback comments received from residents.



The file below shows the collated feedback comments from the 3rd December 2016 Drop-In session.



3rd December Drop
In Comments.docx

Appendix E – Village Meeting 3rd February 2017

