

Cholsey Parish Council



Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan

2nd Reg. 14 Submission Feedback Report - Community

Spring 2018

Page Left Intentionally Blank

Feedback Report

This document presents the feedback Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) has received to its Pre-submission consultation with the statutory bodies, various landowners and the general community during its 7 week process.

The names of respondents are held as a separate list to protect individuals anonymity.

The third column records the comments received. The right-hand column records CNP's reply including references to the relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies which have been adjusted where the comment has highlighted an opportunity to improve the Plan.

CNP thanks all those who responded for their constructive and helpful comments which have allowed us to significantly improve the Cholsey Neighbourhood plan.

Ref	Issue	CNP Response
1	<p>Category: Document approval</p> <p>The feedback below includes verbatim commentary and the CNP response in each case. Where feedback received mirrors other feedback, only the original has been included to avoid multiple duplicate entries.</p>	<p>123 responses were received of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenting 25 • Objecting 9 • Supporting 104 • Unclear* 9. <p>An approval rate of 92% of those expressing a view. We also received 1 complaint about the notification of events.</p> <p>* During the consultation period to which this document refers, the landowner/agent of CHOL2 distributed a leaflet and held a drop-in session describing their proposals for the development of CHOL2. Some of the subsequent feedback received by the CNP was in direct response to those proposals and hence a categorisation of 'objecting' may indicate an objection to the CHOL2 proposal and tacit support of the CNP. The reverse is also possible, but no such response was received. Best efforts have been made in each case to fairly interpret the true intent of the categorisation indicated. Where this was not possible a categorisation of Unclear was noted.</p>
2	<p>Category: Clarity of document</p>	
2.1	Well constructed and thought out, based on best possible options for all stakeholders.	We appreciate your support
2.2	It accurately reflects the discussions which I have had or heard of and aims for a sensible balance of development and maintenance of existing community cohesion. It also represents the fruit of an extensive and transparent consultation process for which the organisers should be congratulated. The plan is acceptable in its current format	We appreciate your support
2.3	Having a plan to guide sustainable changes to our village makes sense. Making provision for increases in housing stock must be controlled and come with the guarantee that additional community services are provided. We cannot sustain uncontrolled expansion without damaging the very nature of the village. A sensible plan of well thought out and limited expansion is key. I actually think the plan could proceed as is.	We appreciate your support
2.4	It is a well researched, concise and well constructed plan that covers all the key issues for	We appreciate your support

	the village. I congratulate all involved. I see no need for alteration in what is an excellent document.		
2.5	This plan has been carefully worked on with good consultation and has provided a good balanced solution to the difficulties of development. I fully approve and support what is being presented. It is important to deliver the plan as soon as possible to protect the village from the devious attempts of developers who wish to destroy the scale of the village and in effect, its community! I have no objections at all! Please submit as it is!		We appreciate your support
3	Category: Document effectiveness		
3.1	The first consultation recommendation has been ignored and now the village is being asked to start over again with a completely different plan		The original draft consultation document set out an acceptance that c250 dwellings be built on CHOL2 however that proved to be undeliverable as the landowner chose not to accept that limit. The CNP group has now proposed an alternative approach as set out in the Chairman's Forward to the latest draft plan. That new approach is now under consultation by the local community.
3.2	The amount of consultation for the plan has been good. As a community we have to take a fair amount of housing. The amount of houses in the plan and the location of the largest site seems reasonable. Plans to explain the school also look good.		We welcome your support
4	Category: Location and number of new dwellings		
4.1	Develop CHOL2 with access via roundabout opposite the layby. It's going to happen one day so look at the bigger picture now		The overwhelming message from previous consultations is that the community wishes to maintain the integrity of Cholsey as a village and that development delivering more than 250 new dwellings is undesirable. The landowners propose around 500 new homes on CHOL2 but it has the capacity for more than this
4.2	Building 550 houses on CHOL2 would change Cholsey from a village to a small town. Fewer houses on small sites would be more in keeping		The proposed plan supports this approach
4.3	Far too many houses on such a small piece of land		SODC has indicated that we are required to allocate land for development of around 175 new dwellings in Cholsey. The CNP has to balance this requirement with the wishes of the community, the available land plots, and the landowner's ambitions while also adhering to local, district and national planning rules. The Chairman's Forward to the CNP V2 sets out the CNP reasoning behind the choice made.

4.4	Scrap it – no one in this area wants this	This is not an option open to the CNP
4.5	Appropriate scale and location. A true reflection of neighbourhood planning	Your support is appreciated
4.6	Smaller pockets of housing would maintain the charm of the original village whilst providing the housing needed. New large sites will create separate communities, not as integrated as smaller ones	The proposed plan aims to achieve this approach. There are a limited number of smaller sites available.
4.7	What of the other sub-plots of CHOL7?	Please refer to the Site Assessment Table for details
4.8	Smaller clusters of new additional housing will be far less impactful to the character of the village and will allow the new housing to be very much a part of the village. Large amounts of housing in one location (be it 200 or 550), has the effect of creating stand-alone communities (as has been the case with Cholsey Meadows/Fair Mile to a significant extent). Our village has wonderful character, history and community spirit - adding new housing in smaller clusters within the heart of the village is an opportunity to retain all that is good whilst complying with the requirement for additional housing.	The proposed plan aims to achieve this approach. There are a limited number of smaller sites available.
4.9	The neighbourhood plan should provide for extra homes but on small, infill parcels of land only therefore maintaining Cholsey as a village, not some sprawling conurbation. No more than 180 houses should be permitted in total throughout the village.	The proposed plan aims to achieve this approach. There are a limited number of smaller sites available.
4.10	The proposal to develop CHOL1 and CHOL7 is the best in the circumstances. I would object to developing CHOL2 because it would result in excessive development	We appreciate your support
4.11	Smaller developments suit the community. Further development should be pressed onto other villages	The number of new houses required for each village in South Oxfordshire is set by SODC. The number required for Cholsey is 175
4.12	CHOL6 is not appropriate for development	CHOL6 is not supported by the CNP
4.13	CHOL1 + CHOL7 is clearly the more desirable option of those remaining. The cramped nature of CHOL5 & CHOL6, the fact it is a regularly flooded area, high water table that existing sewage capacity in Wallingford Rd can often not cope with, and concerns about road opening up onto narrow Church Lane opposite the school all have to be major concerns.	Agreed
4.14	Whilst any more building in Cholsey is not my preferred option I think the two separate chosen sites are the best of all possible choices	We appreciate your support
4.15	Much more in proportion. Sympathetic to the residents of Rothwells Close. Attractive development. A vast improvement on previous suggestions	We appreciate your support
4.16	The developer's plans are for too many new residents. There are already far too many children at my daughter's school, I believe it is affecting her education. I will not even be able to get the 15 hours free pre-schooling for my other daughter when she's 3, there's no room in the pre-school. I'm already struggling to get an appointment at my local GP,	The proposed plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2-form entry and a second pre-school is to be built.

	<p>even for my children. Roads are too heavily used, damaged and rarely repaired. The streets are used heavily for parking, on yellow lines and across pedestrian paths, without consequence. The housing that is being developed is not affordable. My neighbour's children, a teenage girl and boy, share a bedroom as they cannot afford appropriate housing, despite both parents holding jobs. My family of 4 squeeze into a tiny 2 bed social housing house that we cannot afford to move out of, we're trapped. I feel the Plan will help to tackle these issues, but mainly ensure that new homes that are built in manageable numbers.</p>	<p>This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed. We are liaising with the doctor's surgery and clinical commissioning group to try and achieve improved provision of medical services.</p>
4.17	<p>Cholsey has never been more vulnerable to inappropriate, large scale, speculative development such as approximately 650 homes now proposed for the Chol 2 site. Our local plan is the only voice we have to encourage more sustainable development around the village to preserve the essential character of Cholsey, and prevent it becoming in effect a suburb of nearby Wallingford. The development proposed for Chol 2 is far too dense and much more suitable for a large town or city outskirts rather than a rural village location like ours on the edge of an AONB. The local roads cannot support a site of this size: the Reading Road junction is already a known hazard for drivers and pedestrians due to increasing traffic flows. Furthermore it is in contradiction to already agreed housing targets as SODC have only asked us to accept an additional 200 new homes. Consequently there appears to be no reasonable grounds for imposing 650 homes on a village of Cholsey's size and infrastructure. Cholsey's local plan already recognises agreed housing targets requested by SODC. It is a thoughtful and well-structured plan that recognises the need for suitable housing but at a level that works for the local infrastructure and services.</p>	<p>We agree, and appreciate your support</p>
4.18	<p>As someone whom lives in Honey Lane, this is very concerning. Traffic in the narrowing bottleneck halfway down is already dangerously heavy and fast after the Fairmile development. It cannot cope with it increasing further as the main route for this development to school, shops, Didcot etc. There are no traffic calming measures in place and the current situation is already dangerous to residents, road users, pedestrians and animals. I am also shocked that we are only notified of the proposals little over a week before the consultation meeting enabling little time for organised objections. Traffic and parking in Papist Way and roads around the station are already overloaded and dangerous. The village centre road system is already overloaded and a danger to road users, residents and pedestrians.</p>	<p>The notification for the CNP events was circulated to households providing reasonable notice. The notification to which this comment refers is believed to be that distributed by the landowner agents of the CHOL2 site, titled 'Cholsey Fields' by them. The distribution of said leaflet could be perceived to be a spoiler of the official CNP. The said leaflet is not the work of the CNP group and the proposed development it describes is not supported by the CNP. As a result of this belief, this comment has not been counted as an objection despite being categorised as such by its originator.</p>

4.19	<p>This proposed development on chol2 is far too large and unsustainable for the village. We still have unsold houses in the Fairmile development, as well as the fact they are still to develop that site further; then we have the new houses being built in Celsea place- which is causing complete chaos; not to mention the damage to the road surface and the environmental noise, lights etc. There is also Existing houses for sale in Cholsey- where is the evidence that we need such a large development. The schools are at bursting point and trying to get a Drs appt is already extremely difficult due to sheer number of additional patients that they took when Fairmile was developed. I do not see evidence for more nursing/residential homes- there is 2 in Wallingford, 1 in Shillingford and 1 just outside Cholsey. Plus we have the new development of over 55+ flats being built in Wallingford. There seems to be more development at the top of the village- the Reading road is already a complete nightmare to cross or to come out in. This would have to be the access during the extensive building work and then for the length of the homes etc there.</p> <p>There is little detail as to what else apart from accommodation on the proposal and this feels like leaving it with a loose description allows them to change the initial proposed use. It is also far from the train station- this is no doubt going to lead to further growth people parking down Papua [Papist] Way, West End etc to avoid paying the station car park fees or because its full up. I have grave concerns for the future of the village with this large proposal. I feel we do not need the number of houses proposed, and these need to</p> <p>Be dramatically cut- and also not in the area they suggest but moved to the Wallingford road- rather than the already busy Reading road.</p> <p>I cannot see the need for additional nursing care homes- when there are many close and even more in the surrounding area; and these have large vacancies due to the extensive provision of care, dementia care etc in peoples own homes by OUH, the GP service & OHT.</p>	<p>The proposed plan does not support the development of Chol 2. The plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2-form entry and a second pre-school is to be built. This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed. We are liaising with the doctor's surgery and clinical commissioning group to try and achieve improved provision of medical services. The CNP has not been involved in gathering evidence supporting the need for nursing/residential homes though it does recognise the need in general for a mix of housing for all ages. In addition to existing care homes, permissions exist for at least two more care facilities in Wallingford.</p> <p>The CNP V2 is supporting the development of c190 new houses.</p>
4.20	<p>As a Cholsey resident and I will be directly opposite the new development I believe that some of the ideas in the development are good and will bring a new lease of life to the village like retirement village, and shop as there needs to be a more substantial shopping place for people in Cholsey as Tesco cannot cope with the amount of people shopping there on a daily basis and the village itself gets congested around schoolgirl as well. The residential old people's home tho I'm a bit against as there are many residential and nursing homes in this area that still have space and the provision for homecare is already</p>	<p>The detail to which this comment refers is believed to be that distributed by the landowner agents of the CHOL2 site, titles 'Cholsey Fields' by them. The distribution of said leaflet could be perceived to be a spoiler of the official CNP. The said leaflet is not the work of the CNP group and the proposed development it describes is not supported by the CNP.</p>

	<p>day to move into the retirement village. Freeing up some more properties for families in already over occupied properties lessening the burden on SODC. I do not feel that there is a need for so many residential units on this site. However again some more properties do need to be available for affordable housing this doesn't always mean flats so people can be packed in like sardines on top of each other I am apposed to the build your own house plots as I feel that if you can afford to build your own house then you can afford to find the right area. There has been a lot of friction in the past between privately rented and brought properties residents and council tenants. And I think by offering the sort of plots it will be adding to the friction between this. I believe that in order to put more houses there needs to be more education provision as the village school is already quite full. In my experience the bigger the school class sizes get the teaching standard goes down. And Cholsey is a lovely school so would hate to see that happen under the burden of over population. There also needs to be some safe crossings put in place for the children of both the secondary and the primary school to cross that reading road from papist way as this currently is unsafe and very busy with cars and vehicles whizzing through the village. The community building is a good idea as long as it is for all the community Use and not just those who can afford to use it. Would be nice to also see some sort of holiday scheme for all school holidays, as there is a distinct lack of affordable childcare for 5-11 year olds in Cholsey. This is only my opinion but I would like to say Thank you for asking us villagers for our options and I am glad I have been able to express it.</p>	
4.21	<p>Far too many houses. Cholsey can't support the people we have already! School is too full, the local secondary school is full, local Drs are full, roads are full- sometimes I cant park my car outside my house!!</p>	<p>It is not clear if this feedback is in response to the CNP V2 or the leaflet distributed by the landowner/agent of CHOL2. As such it is included for completeness only and does not feature in the feedback statistics.</p> <p>The proposed plan does not support the development of Chol 2. The plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2-form entry and a second pre-school is to be built. This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed.</p>
4.22	<p>I am in support of the plan as I believe the village cannot support too much further development. With the recent additions of 350 homes at the old Fairmile site, the village and its' infrastructure will not cope with many more homes. The Cholsey plan is allowing in the region of another 200 homes, which I support but this has to be the limit. There</p>	<p>We appreciate your support</p>

	<p>are families already living in the village who are being turned away for Primary School places when their children are due to start school at the age of 4 or 5. Cholsey will not be an attractive village to new families if they know they will not secure village school places. The village centre around the shops does not have the infrastructure in place to accommodate additional traffic. It is already nearly impossible to park in the village; there is too much traffic congestion in the centre, which is becoming a dangerous area for children to walk home from school and cross busy roads. Cholsey is a village not a town.</p>	
4.23	<p>I am broadly supportive, but I have to say that the Cholsey built up area boundary is not very 'natural' -- there is a big gap in it where those developers want to put the new houses, to the north of Papist way and west of Cholsey meadows. My inclination would be to say that we should build as much as possible there, and face the fact that Cholsey, especially away from the Forty, is more of a suburb than a rural village. There is an enormous traffic crunch caused by parked cars between Tesco and the Red Lion pub, and this makes cycling from Cholsey station to that area pretty difficult. Papist way is also not very bike friendly. So I would propose trying to find bike lanes so that people who live in the new developments can commute to the station. If there is new development to the north of Papist way, I would like there to be an off-road cycle path.</p>	<p>This comment says it is broadly supportive but says that 'we should build as much as possible' on the land North of Papist Way i.e. CHOL2, which is no longer supported by the CNP. For statistical purposes it has been categorised as neutral even though it was categorised as supporting by the contributor.</p>
4.24	<p>We fully support the principles and ideals of the Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan. Unfortunately the Leavesley Group has reneged on their original commitment to support development on CHOL2 as recommended in the original submission of the Neighbourhood Plan. This forces the Steering Group to come up with an alternative proposal based on less appealing options i.e. a package of smaller, scattered sites. The Leavesley Group has proposed a development which would completely swamp the existing community with up to 600 houses thereby putting impossible strains on existing village infrastructure. The amenities and facilities they include in their plan are entirely idealistic. They have no obligation to provide these and we have reduced faith in their integrity following their pulling out of their original commitment. Sites CHOL1 and CHOL7, Boshers and Fairmile are far preferable to Leavesley's proposals which they are trying to force on the village. However, these sites are not ideal and we would urge the developers and landowners to release land, which allows development along the lines of the original CHOL2 proposals, which would be to the advantage to the village and residents. We are concerned that the package of smaller sites are developed and then Chol2 at a later stage, making a solid mass of houses and removing natural amenity areas. We might end up spoiling the character of the village and become a small town.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the original CNP allocated part of the CHOL2 site for development, but this was not accepted or committed to by the landowners/agents. It is now clear that the landowners/agents are determined to develop the whole site, which is why the CNP has undergone a change of approach. Landowners/agents have the right to determine what part of their land may be considered for development and may choose not to consider a part-site development.</p>

	<p>We believe these comments refer to the CHOL2 development, which is no longer supported by the CNP. The proposed plan does not support the development of CHOL2. The plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2-form entry and a second pre-school is to be built. This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed.</p>
<p>First agree the principles of the village Plan. Release land for development as outlined in original Cholsey Village plan to develop Chol 2 site to the advantage of the village and its inhabitants rather than to further the interests of developers and landowners at the expense of the community.</p>	<p>Too many houses. Not enough infrastructure in village. No school. Developer not listening to villagers. Reduce number of properties. Include primary school or extension to existing one</p>
4.25	<p>Excessive urbanization in a single rural location which will increase the current built-up size of the village of Cholsey by an astonishing 50% (i.e. from approx. 139 acres to 209 acres) at a stroke. The site immediately adjacent to the proposed site is currently under construction. The pressure on the current infrastructure of the village caused by the current extension to the village has yet to be determined: Furthermore the consequences of a further increase of 50% in the size of the village are not addressed by the proposed plan. A series of smaller developments across the whole village commensurate with sustainable local needs should be considered.</p>
4.26	<p>I have always felt that the planned growth in the village of about 175 dwellings is possible without completely disrupting the character of our village and that this level of development will go a good way towards meeting vital local housing needs. Even at this lower level of development I do not have total confidence that medical and schooling/pre-schooling facilities will adequately keep pace with new building. These are already strained in our village and this must inevitably worsen before any new facilities are built or developed. School places provision is already in great uncertainty this year. In the earlier consultations I always proposed that these new houses should be distributed around the village in smaller sites which will inevitably have less impact on what we wish to preserve than large new blocks in any one place. This is the reason that I am opposed to the Leavesley proposal for a monolithic block of 650 houses on the so called Cholsey fields. This is not a sensible proposal in any shape or form and will contribute nothing to the sense of local community and well-being for existing residents. Even the proposed retirement properties and care home if required would be better placed in a more distributed way around our area rather than in street after street of new build. That way the needs of elderly residents for society and community could be met in ways which could never happen on anonymous housing estates which are largely deserted during the daytime. The plan would be improved by incorporating a definite linkage to a commitment to provide new school places, increased medical provision in the village and a new</p>
4.27	<p>We appreciate your support. Please see the entries below about schooling provision.</p>

	preschool. However I am assuming that these powers do not fall within the capacity of the plan-makers!	
4.28	The Cholsey Plan V2.02 (Winter 2018) makes sense. The number of houses "175 - no more than 300", has risen in the "Cholsey Fields" leaflet by "The Leavesley Group" posted to us for CHOL2 is 650!! This is in the interests therefore of the developers and not in the interest of Cholsey. The Cholsey Plan V2.02 (Winter 2018) breaks up the development areas and complies with the number requirement. We would be flooded with service needs impacting on our infra-structure and the Cholsey station advantage could become a stressful amenity with parking already pressured from the Fairmile development etc. The character and well being of the Cholsey residents is a priority to any development of the village overall. I am happy with the Cholsey Plan V2.02 (Winter 2018) as it reads at present. I am hoping to attend the meeting on 24th March to get more information and clarity on this complicated and difficult consultation and have a more to say perhaps regarding your request for my views.	We appreciate your support
4.29	I am objecting to the development on site CHOL2 of 550 homes this is excessive and the village cannot sustain this with regards to increased traffic in Celsea Place and Ilges lane, which is already seriously congested. There is no provision for helping the existing primary school to expand or build a new one or the existing pre school, which will not be able to cope. The area by the vets is very rural and this will be lost by the huge development proposed Cholsey is a village at present just but if this goes ahead it will become a small town and lose its identity. The level of housing needs to be below 200 in order for the villages existing facilities to be able to cope for example the school pre school doctors surgery Wallingford, pharmacy and the traffic in the village. All of which are under strain at present before the increased development.	From this we assume support for the latest version of the CNP
4.30	I think this is a good balance that considers the needs of both SODC and the interests of the residents of Cholsey. The only objection I have is to the Leavesley Group Development which ignores the interests of the residents of Cholsey, places further pressure on limited resources such as the school and the local medical practice. It will destroy the village and the community spirit that currently thrives in Cholsey. I think this plan should proceed as it is without any consideration to the Leavesley plan whatsoever.	We appreciate your support
4.31	I object to the Leavesley development on Papist Way. In my opinion, 200 or so homes for Cholsey is fine, especially for that space which would have been a great site (between Papist way and Ilges lane). However, the proposed 550 new homes is ridiculous. It would turn Cholsey into a sizeable town and would cause extra unnecessary congestion. Surely, the village could reject planning permission or prevent more than a reasonable amount	We appreciate your support. The highway authority is satisfied with the proposed access arrangements for the East End Farm site. Further comment on access to the combined CHOL1 and CHOL7 sites is being sought from the Highways authority.

	<p>of homes being built. We can't allow for big corporations to push us around, just so they can make maximum profit and take no care in village life. East end farm plan has only one road access which is not good enough for 100+ homes.</p> <p>The houses should be built, with facilities in CHOL2, but only 300 homes as we are required to build. The current proposal on East End Farm is a terrible idea because there is no way to support the traffic generated in the centre of Cholsey. CHOL2 fills in a gap in the village, but if 550 houses were to be built, that would be too large of a development for the village. 300 is reasonable given the size of the field and the roads around it. Tell Leavesley Group that 300 homes is the absolute limit. Also, it should be guaranteed that they will develop some facilities (medical, a school, shops) before permission is given</p>	<p>It should be noted that the original CNP allocated part of the CHOL2 site for development, but this was not accepted or committed to by the landowners / agents. It is now clear that the landowners / agents are determined to develop the whole site which is why the CNP has undergone a change of approach. Landowners / agents have the right to determine what part of their land may be considered for development and may choose not to consider a part-site development.</p>
4.32		<p>We appreciate your support</p>
4.33		<p>We appreciate your support</p>
4.34	<p>This is credible plan which will provide in the region of 190 houses in Cholsey</p> <p>"Cholsey does not have the infrastructure to support an additional 550 houses which is proposed by the Leavesley Group. The neighbourhood plan will increase the number of houses by 190 which can be supported by the local school and medical facilities offered by Wallingford Medical Centre. The roads in the village are narrow and a significant increase in the number of houses will create additional pollution and traffic congestion, which will inevitably add to the financial burden placed on local highways division of SODC. Ultimately, the developers are interested in providing the additional houses as part of their organisational strategic plans which do not consider the well being of this local community."</p>	<p>We appreciate your support</p>
4.35		<p>It should be noted that the original CNP allocated part of the CHOL2 site for development, but this was not accepted or committed to by the landowners/agents. It is now clear that the landowners/agents are determined to develop the whole site, which is why the CNP has undergone a change of approach. Landowners/agents have the right to determine what part of their land may be considered for development and may choose not to consider a part-site development. The CNP has no power to dictate how landowners divide their property. The CNP, once adopted, will set out where development should take place in the village from the point of adoption to 2033 with regular reviews during that time. Prevailing conditions will determine how the plan develops in future. We take the view that the development of a large number of</p>

	to plan A. If, as I was told today, they will eventually get their way anyway, would it be better to strike a deal with them now, even if it meant agreeing to a few more houses than we would ideally want in return for no new houses for 25 years for example, maybe this would be worth doing?	dwelling on CHOL2 is undesirable at this time.
4.36	If this is the only way to stop evil Leavesley group building 550+ home, I'm all for it. I think that it is essential to pressure these developers to provide money for extra school, infrastructure etc. It is also important to have some diversity of homes, and not the same, cheaply made, tacky home repeated over and over, as seen in the Didcot developments. However this neighbourhood plan is essential to prevent the Leavesley group turning Cholsey into a city.	The CNP is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available.
4.37	Cholsey does need new house, but it needs to be controlled and managed, not a free for all profit chasing solution. Keep the number of houses built to the minimum, and not to exceed the council's demands.	The number of houses required by SODC is 175. The CNP allows for the development of c190.
4.38	Our infrastructure and amenities can't cope with any new houses. no more houses	The CNP must take account of the requirement set by SODC. Without doing so, the CNP would not pass examination and would not be adopted. This would leave the village open to uncontrolled development.
4.39	It seems to be a good balance for the village. I'm one of the new-comers coming in to the Fairmile development 5.5 years ago, and I know that new houses need to be built, but it takes a long time to build a cohesive community (having experienced it on Cholsey Meadows) and I think it's really important that the village grows steadily, and not too fast. It is a really special place to live, with a real feeling of local community, and swamping the place with hundreds of new homes will damage both the beautiful habitat and surroundings and the wonderful community. It is a country village, not a new town.	We appreciate your support. As a resident of Fairmile you stood to gain from the pedestrian and cycle paths that the CHOL2 development promised. Taking the wider view is commendable.
4.40	The CNP team have done a lot of work to consult the village and listen to our views, and have perfectly encapsulated the desired change in housing locations to prevent development on CHOL2, as it is now not needed. We are delivering the required homes elsewhere, and the village cannot sustain another major development. No changes required, a great job has been done.	We appreciate your understanding and support
4.41	We are opposed to the proposed plans for future development in Cholsey. The village is creaking at the seams already.	The CNP must take account of the requirement set by SODC. Without doing so, the CNP would not pass examination and would not be adopted. This would leave the village open to uncontrolled development.

4.42	<p>"As an architect with nearly four decades experience, having read the emerging CNP I can appreciate the considerable effort and time you and your colleagues have put into its creation. I further have great sympathy for your position where central government issues future housing numbers that you then have to find the best way of accommodating across the district to best serve the current and future population. With this in mind I would like to make some comments and observations, which are meant to be constructive, and I trust might be considered favourably. You state in a number of places within the CNP that a core principle is to maintain for the village a ""distinctive character, landscape and setting of the village that has evolved over eleven centuries of history"".</p> <p>Upon page 25 you state that for large villages, of which Cholsey is considered to be one, a growth of 15% is what is required to meet the governments stated housing requirements for the district. You then state that due to some other villages not delivering 15% Cholsey will have to provide 19%. Even though from 2011 to 2016 Cholsey has already provided circa 360 units at Fairmile and 60 at Celsea Place, a growth of the village that you state to be 26% in just 5 to 6 years, the period immediately before the CNP period of 2017 to 2033.</p> <p>In my view Cholsey has already greatly contributed to the districts housing need and if the ""distinctive character, landscape and setting"" principle is to have any meaning 15% growth across 2017 to 2033 should be seen as an absolute maximum.</p> <p>Finally on this topic, with Cholsey you state that as the Celsea Place development of 61 units is already committed it cannot count going forward, however you then state on page 29 ""Finally it indicates that two villages, Chinnor and Benson already have commitments which meet their 15% growth"". Clearly on this basis the CNP should be able to count Celsea Place as part of the 15% contribution for the village up to 2033.</p>	<p>The CNP must take account of the requirement set by SODC. The 175 houses required is a minimum.</p> <p>The Celsea Place commitment has been included in the calculation (by SODC) of the 175.</p>
4.43	<p>Within the Fairmile redevelopment we were required to provide some space which could be used to provide employment upon the site. These units are currently boarded up near the northern exit onto the Reading Road. These units are extremely unlikely to be taken up for employment purposes, but could quite readily be converted into additional housing.</p>	<p>The site of these building is now allocated for housing development in the CNP</p>
4.44	<p>Whilst I, like many others in Cholsey would prefer to see no development in Cholsey this is obviously not practical so I think it is important to consider what is best for the village now and in the future. Having viewed the options I firmly believe that smaller developments within the village are far preferable to one large development such as that proposed by Leavesley. Smaller developments will hopefully encourage more integration</p>	<p>We appreciate your support, with an interesting viewpoint on the linking of the village's parts.</p>

	<p>and create a complete community. The 'exhibition' staged by Leavesley on 21st March did nothing to persuade me otherwise. The room chosen for the exhibition was far too cramped making it difficult to view the displays comfortably. The consultant we spoke to was unable to answer any direct questions and sidestepped every issue we raised. It appears that Cholsey is regarded merely as a 'cash cow' with very little thought given to infrastructure, transport, effect on the ethos of the village or the ecology of the area. A development of this size and in this location would in my opinion, instead of bringing the two distinct parts of the village together, create a third faction thereby fragmenting the village even further rather than uniting it. Bearing this in mind I would support the Neighbourhood Plan's proposal that we accept a group of smaller sites for development. With the increase in traffic that will undoubtedly result from these changes it must surely be seen as essential to provide parking facilities around the centre of the village or at the very least ensure that the parking restrictions outside Tesco are enforced before a very serious and possibly fatal accident occurs.</p>	
<p>The overwhelming message from previous consultations is that the community wishes to maintain the integrity of Cholsey as a village and that development delivering more than 250 new dwellings is undesirable. The landowners propose around 500 new homes on CHOL2 but it has the capacity for more than this</p> <p><u>The highway authority is satisfied with the proposed access arrangements for the East End Farm site.</u></p> <p><u>Further comment on access to the combined CHOL1 and CHOL7 sites is being sought from the Highways authority.</u></p> <p>We appreciate your support</p>	<p>I object to CHOL7. It will not leave space for additional infrastructure or any expansion in the future. will inevitably need to be expanded again and CHOL2 will allow for this, so people buying will know it will eventually be built on with our being changed down the line. Wallingford road not capable of extra traffic, needs always for the school. should be developing CHOL2 only to allow for infrastructure and future development. Reading road can cope with increased traffic better than Wallingford road. CHOL2 will connect Fairmile to the village. paperist way and Celsea place need relaying anyway.</p>	4.45
	<p>My preferred option was as detailed in the earlier version of the NP, i.e. for roughly half of the area now known as 'Cholsey Fields' to be built on. In view of the developers' refusal to cooperate with the Parish Council on that proposal, and their holding out for 550 homes to be built there (on the whole of that site), I now favour the NP current proposal to develop the site to the North of Rothwells Close, i.e. East End Farm plus the adjoining land to the north of it. The Leavesley Group plan for Cholsey Fields site is excessive, and should be resisted.</p>	4.46
<p>SODC has indicated that we are required to allocate land for development of around 175 new dwellings in Cholsey. The CNP has to balance this requirement with the wishes of the community, the available land plots, and the landowner's ambitions while also adhering to local, district and national planning rules.</p>	<p>The change of approach from CNP has given the developer's en-masse a field day. We are going to end up with many more houses than the villagers wanted all over the village due to the lateness of production and inconsistency of approach. CHOL2 should have been represented to the village, in the new consultation as another option - Pegasus state on their website viz East End Farm that their development has clear benefits for the</p>	4.47

<p>village. Nonsense. The CHOL2 site even with additional houses to those originally proposed has much more to offer the village than there mere erection of 68 houses filtering onto the Wallingford Road as is now underway. Represent CHOL2 in the consultation - its 350 homes, plus a care home and retirement homes. Albeit, 500 odd units, but NOT 350 homes with children, with corresponding strain on school places etc. The present interpretation by CNP and presentation to the village of the proposed development on CHOL2 is misrepresentative.</p>	<p>The Chairman's Forward to the CNP V2 sets out the CNP reasoning behind the choice made. The current CNP makes no representation of the proposed development by the landowners/agents of CHOL2.</p>
<p>4.48 Initially the neighbourhood plan supported CHOL2, and was against any development on CHOL1, CHOL7 - a complete U-turn resulted in you supporting CHOL1 and 7. The developers come to you to say we will put less houses on CHOL1 if we develop CHOL7, utter nonsense. The village will end up with far more houses than it can cope with. CHOL2 will get developed on, how can you get the NP in place before they submit plans? I still believe that CHOL2 is better for the village, shops, pre-school etc. etc. (If developers stick to their word). I am not convinced that the school will cope with the amount of houses, how will 15 more places be enough? At present 68 East End Farm, 70 Celsea Place, Chol 7 100 plus numerous small developments going on in the village. How will 15 places be enough for this? It won't. Cholsey seems to be doomed, it's terribly sad, and I totally feel for you all at the NP. Do not let CHOL1 get developed on, CHOL2 should be developed on so that infrastructure can be put in place, pre-school, shop etc. But like I said Cholsey in my opinion is doomed....</p>	<p>The reason for the CNP change of approach is set out in the CNP Chairman's Forward. The CNP group will continue to work with the landowners and agents of CHOL1 and CHOL7 to deliver the proposed number of houses. Once the consultation period is complete and all feedback is taken into consideration (both supporting and objecting) the plan will be amended to reflect that feedback and it will be submitted to the Parish Council and to SODC for examination and adoption. The final stage in the process is when the plan will be put to the community in a referendum – agree or not agree. If more than 50% agree with the plan it will be adopted by SODC and form part of planning rules. The plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2 form entry and a second pre-school is to be built. This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed.</p>
<p>4.49 It is difficult to support the new plan on the grounds of all the original objections to the development of CHOL1 East End Farm, none of the damaging aspects will be resolved and the problems exacerbated. The single access and exit point will not be safe for 68 homes it will be positively dangerous for residents of the proposed development of CHOL1 and CHOL7; residents of Goldfinch Lane opposite and the users of Wallingford Road. Traffic calming will not solve the problems, it will do nothing to reduce the volume of traffic using Wallingford Road, cause frustration and risk taking at peak times and slow moving traffic will increase air and noise pollution in the immediate vicinity. To be viable and safe at least one other means of accessing and exiting the development has to be achieved. The number of homes proposed, 165 for CHOL1 and CHOL7, will not be economically viable. When a developer can and is allowed to cram 68 homes into CHOL1 (2.65ha) who in their right minds believes that a developer will settle for circa 97 homes</p>	<p>Approval for the CHOL1 development has been given and hence pre-dates the adoption of the CNP. The CNP does not propose or support the development of more than the c165 houses stated. The plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2-form entry and a second pre-school is to be built. This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed.</p>

	<p>on CHOL7 (8.8ha) when they could build 225 on the site at the same density, it seems naive at the very least and at worst mendacious to suggest otherwise. So we are likely to be faced with nearer circa 293 homes on CHOL1 & CHOL7, in total more than we need or are required to take. Finally the developments on the face of it offers nothing to the village other than new homes and the problems on the creaking local infrastructure the increase in population will bring; we need urgent solutions to the parking problems in the centre of the village; more housing for an ageing population (bungalows etc); improved, preferably local medical facilities and more school spaces at Cholsey and in Wallingford.</p>	<p><u>The highway authority is satisfied with the proposed access arrangements for the East End Farm site.</u> <u>Further comment on access to the combined CHOL1 and CHOL7 sites is being sought from the Highways authority.</u></p>
4.50	<p>Opposed to the proposal by the Leavesley group. Too large, inappropriate mix and out of step with what is required. Not supportive of the proposal for a larger development at East End Farm, but happy to see smaller developments at Boshers' yard and on the Cholsey Meadows site of the previously planned nursery. Concerned at the implications for access to school and pre-school places by Cholsey children. Concerned about the deteriorating parking problems around the village and for safety of children going to school. Concerned about the lack of suitable safe crossing places at Reading Road for access to and from Cholsey Meadows. General concern that the promises made by developers are not followed through. Page 60 Evidence item 205. There has been NO baby clinic in Cholsey since Feb 2017. Efforts at trying to re-establish one have so far fallen on deaf ears. Consistency in spelling it is Laurence Hall not Lawrence Hall.</p>	<p>SODC has indicated that we are required to allocate land for development of around 175 new dwellings in Cholsey. The CNP has to balance this requirement with the wishes of the community, the available land plots, and the landowner's ambitions while also adhering to local, district and national planning rules. The Chairman's Forward to the CNP V2 sets out the CNP reasoning behind the choice made. <u>The Baby clinic reference will be altered and the spelling error corrected.</u></p>
4.51	<p>I support the neighbourhood plan for Cholsey. Specifically the change of approach to spread housing development over a number of smaller sites, with 189 houses over CHOL1, CHOL 7, CHOL 9 and CHOL 10. I do not believe the village and infrastructure could support a larger development. I support Policy CNP H5, CNP H7 and objectives H08 regarding appropriate development and adequate provision of parking for new development. I also support the objectives E01 and E02, especially in regards to exploring the retrofit of railway electrification gantries that are less intrusive on the rural landscape and AONB. I also support the Objective T2 to improve public transport facilities, and secure off-road car and cycle parking provision for rail users at Cholsey Station and support the pledge T3, as commuter parking around surrounding residential roads is becoming worse and will likely continue to get worse with new developments in Wallingford and Benson advertising Cholsey as the closest station to commute to London. I also strongly support objective ED01 to ensure enough school spaces for children in the</p>	<p>We welcome your support</p>

	village to be able to attend Cholsey Primary School. Developers should not be able to keep building houses without ensuring adequate essential provision of enough school spaces. I also strongly support the pledge ED1 for the committee to work with Wallingford school to ensure places for Cholsey children at Wallingford secondary.	
5	Category: Design	
5.1	Build more environmentally friendly houses	All new development must comply with current building regulations. While the CNP cannot dictate the design of houses or their features such as solar power or water recycling, CNP H3 supports self-build houses where design criteria may be more creative
5.2	At the last open meeting when Plan B was promoted I commented to your leader that this change was going to put upwards of 700 homes into community as if he thought the Chol 02 developer was going to go away he was being at best naive. I was thanked for my opinion but as an expert in these matters he knew better. Clearly not, and at the very least the group who opted for Plan B.ans isolated the CHOL2 developer should hang their heads in shame and the leader at the very least admit his errors before passing on the baton to someone with experience with development, planning and the management of capitalist greed. Go back to Plan A engage with the Chol02 developer to do a two phase development phase 2 of which can include a school and adjust the plan to allow East End Farm to use the CHOL2 access/egress and avoid the expense of attempting the use of Wallingford Road. Practically and pragmatically this can work and the Plan completed ASAP before submission to HMG. This will also reduce the current preferred developer to being a too late for planning applicant as no doubt Leavesley is ready to submit.	It should be noted that the original CNP allocated part of the CHOL2 site for development, but this was not accepted or committed to by the landowners/agents. It is now clear that the landowners/agents are determined to develop the whole site, which is why the CNP has undergone a change of approach. Landowners/agents have the right to determine what part of their land may be considered for development and may choose not to consider a part-site development.
5.3	The changes for any homes in the area would be to see more homes for first time buyers who live in the area, less social being taken before houses are put on the market. More thought put into parking i.e. carpports instead of garages few modern cars fit into a garage a carpport gives parking for two cars on the property less on the roads.	Please see policy CNP H7
5.4	Thank you for the very informative display on Saturday 24th March. I noticed on one of the documents, specifically CNP H1a, the requirement for 5m buffer planting to be included between all homes in Rothwells Close and the adjoining new development, and wondered if a similar condition might be added for any other proposed developments. Living as we do at the end of Charles Road, I'm being selfish in worrying about a development arising on the small plot of land north of Charles Road and east of CHOL3.	We welcome your comments and will require before final publication

6	<p>Category: Housing Mix</p>	
6.1	<p>CNPH4 – Policy should be changed to include reference to Shared ownership.</p>	<p>Shared Ownership is included under the heading Intermediate housing in Appendix 1.</p>
6.2	<p>Good afternoon, having been Cholsey residence since 1986 we have seen a lot of change, from being a relatively quiet village it has become, quite a busy place to live. However, it has still maintained a lovely variety of green space. My husband and I would like to add our support to the neighbourhood plan, and agree if we have to have houses, lets infill smaller pockets rather than use the larger open spaces. It would be nice if some of the new developments could offer first time buyer houses, and stop wealthier people living outside the village buying up just to rent out, we need residence who will continue to support all walks of village life, not just reside here are the weekend, whilst working in London etc.</p>	<p>The CNP (Policy CNP H4) seeks to ensure that priority is given to those with a local connection on first letting of affordable homes.</p>
6.3	<p>I quote from the first paragraph on page 38 of the CNP which states "The community survey identified that there were at least 48 households looking to find affordable housing locally. SODC has indicated in their Housing Allocation Policy that they may give priority on first letting of 20% of affordable rented properties to those with strong local connection to the parish." The wording to me is not clear. It appears to offer the possibility of only up to 20% going to local people and I've also highlighted the invidious word "may" which has been used and implies even this small number might not be achieved. My view is that those with a strong local connection should all have first priority to any available affordable rented properties and only then should those that do not fall into this category be offered the remaining units.</p>	<p>In order to meet it statutory obligations SODC must give priority for affordable housing to those in greatest need in South Oxfordshire. Whilst doing this they have indicated they are happy that 20% of new homes may be allocated to those with a local connection. This is the best that we can achieve.</p>
6.4	<p>The big attraction for me about the Leavesley scheme is that it takes account of the needs of older people. I have just watched the trauma of two 90-plus-year-olds moving out of Cholsey and being cut off from friends and services. Val Bolt mentioned to me on Saturday that a care home is to be built in Cholsey – but it will be at the far end of the village near the Wallingford by-pass where hardly anyone else lives and could be even be seen as duplicating Winterbrook Care Home. Where do we want our older people to live? Where do you want me to live in ten years' time? I have lived in Cholsey for 28 years, not so long as some people, but long enough to send down roots. So if the Leavesley plan is rejected please make some alternative provision.</p>	<p>The plan makes provision for a range of homes of different sizes including a significant number of one and two bedroom properties, which will be suitable for older people. A number of care homes exist locally and new ones are being provided in Wallingford just two miles from Cholsey.</p> <p>The CNP welcomes the diversity of having the full age range of residents in the community. The CNP Housing Mix strategy fully supports the development of smaller dwellings of whatever tenure.</p>

6.5	i believe the neighbourhood plan has been well researched and carefully thought out to sit with the needs of Cholsey in the future. it would be good if some provision come be made near the centre of the village for older people to downsize.	Please see ref 6.4 above
6.6	The plane for c.200 homes seems reasonable and sustainable. i would support the need for better facilities. e.g. although the plan proposed by the Leavesley group is horrendous in view of the number of homes. perhaps facilities such as a care home or assisted living would be a useful addition to the village.	Please see ref 6.4 above
6.7	i think the plan from the Leavesley group is better. it would help to join Fairmile to the rest of the village. it includes a retirement village which is really good idea. new shops there would hopefully help solve the problem of not enough parking new the current shops.my 2 elderly neighbours who have lived in CHOLSEY SINCE THE 60'S HAVE HAD TO MOVE TO WALLINGFORD to get the care they need	Please see ref 6.4 above
6.8	It is sad that Cholsey has to provide additional housing and this plan allows the village to keep development to a minimum. The plan does not insist that allowed development aids the elderly members of the community. All new development has to have 40% affordable housing, and yet there is nothing for the over 55's. The only housing available for the over 55s is Marymead and that is run by SOHA and you have to be on the housing list to be able to apply for the accommodation. There is nowhere else in the village where the older/more vulnerable members of the community can downsize to and free up houses more suitable for families. Developers do not typically want to build bungalows etc as they take up precious land. Therefore, the NP should place a proviso for accommodation for these members. I have spoken to a number of retired residents and they are not aware that they cannot apply to live in these apartments if they are owner-occupiers and/or have more than £60,000.	Please see ref 6.4 above
7	Category: Traffic and Transport	
7.1	CNP7 – Policy should set out requirements for visitor parking	The policy states that new proposals should meet the requirements set out in the Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Parking Provision Policy, which refers to the combination of Visitor and Unallocated parking spaces.
7.2	CNP4 'Local connection' should be widened to other local Parishes and the need monitored by the Parish Council	See comment on item 57. Affordable homes are managed by registered providers who work with SODC housing services and as such have knowledge of local need beyond the parish boundary
7.3	Need to minimise traffic flow through the village centre	Agreed
7.4	Wallingford Rd cycle path not fit for purpose	Existing cycle path maintenance falls outside the remit of the CNP

7.5	Papist Way / Reading Road junction 'a problem'	Studies have shown that the wait time and queue length at this junction is not a significant problem. However pedestrian use of this junction is a significant issue and may be addressed by the installation of a controlled pedestrian crossing. See CIL Projects.
7.6	Parking for the station on neighbouring roads	See CNPT2
7.7	Parking for the school	See Pledge T5; CNP ED2; Site Assessment Table
7.8	Parking at the village centre – 'we will lose the centre of the village'	The CNP Chairman's Forward states: 'As part of our proposals we still want to provide new community facilities including a second preschool, improved children's centre, a satellite surgery if the medical practice will agree, improved parking at the station and improvements to safety and the environment around the shops at The Forty'. See also CNPI5; Pledge I2; Pledge T4
7.9	Traffic number and speed on Wallingford road a concern. Need for traffic calming	The combined CHOL1 and CHOL7 (part) development will result in additional traffic on the Wallingford road and traffic-calming measures are planned.
7.10	I would like to see a car park in CHOL6 coming out to Church Road to relieve the parking congestion outside the school and day centre	See Site Assessment Table 'the access points onto Church Road are likely to cause conflict with other road users and encourage an increase in traffic through the village and at the already difficult junction of Church Road with Wallingford Road. The County Council has indicated that the Church Road access at CHOL6 is particularly difficult and school parking should not be included on the site. The parking benefit is not considered to outweigh the other issues with these sites'
7.11	The Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan Committee have come up with an excellent alternative for new housing in the Village in the proposal of CHO1 and CHO7, which I feel should be wholly supported by S.O.D.C It will give enough homes to meet the requirement originally stated by S.O.D.C. especially given other planning permission already passed. The sites 1 and 7 will have the minimum impact on the houses already surrounding the area suggested. Also with the Village Plans considered suggestions of a blend of building and green areas, should have the minimum effect on the environment. The suggestion of 500+ houses on CHO2 by the developer is a classic example of the greed that often goes hand in hand with them. It would be a travesty if S.O.D.C. were to take this route, especially as the committee have worked so hard to comply with the	We appreciate your support.

	<p>requirements of the new housing legislation and be as fair to the inhabitants of Cholsey as possible. (All who live here have been given the opportunity to comment throughout this process)</p> <p>My only other comment would be as many affordable homes as is feasibly possible please. Also, as much encouragement to local people of all ages from young to old who wish to remain in the village but have struggled to finance any transaction.</p>	
7.12	<p>The new proposal for CHOL1 and CHOL 7 reduces the impact of the developer's original submission, and whilst I am sure that the surrounding residents must still have concerns at least there will be a buffer zone and a lower density of building than first suggested. The access to the Wallingford Road needs careful consideration however.</p> <p>The Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan original proposal for CHOL2 seemed positive as it provided connection between Cholsey Village and the Fairmile development. The developer's insistence on 500 dwellings feels like an attempt to hold the village to ransom and will place great strain on the existing infrastructure and village dynamics. My only concern with the outright rejection of CHOL2 is that the developer will continue to pressure for full development of the site in the near future and may get their way.</p>	Agreed
7.13	<p>Developers should purchase a property near the Forty and turn it into a car park</p>	<p>This suggestion will be added to the list of ideas for the improvement of facilities at the Forty</p>
7.14	<p>Traffic the road by the development is dangerous due to speeding. The location is impossible and will cause too much traffic on an already busy road.</p>	<p>It is unclear as to which 'development' this comment refers. Traffic calming is proposed to be provided on the Wallingford Road in association with the development of CHOL 1 and Chol 7. This will benefit existing residents who use the road and footpath.</p>
7.15	<p>Although I have said supporting I feel I am in a difficult position as I live directly opposite the only entrance to the site. I preferred the original Celsea Place site but totally disagree with the number of houses that Leavesley wanted to put on the site. None of the other sites are suitable so in the best interests of the village I support the Neighbourhood Plan. I do not agree with the only entrance being where the current farm entrance is now even though the suggestions are reasonable. Perhaps the exit and entrance should be at Caps Lane - it is then away from the nasty bend near the Red Lion. Visibility at the Caps Lane junction would be no more difficult than from the East End farm exit but could be safer. When I did a traffic count between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. 462 vehicles passed that entrance causing difficulties to people trying to get onto the Wallingford road and this would be true of the vehicles trying to get out of the farm entrance.</p>	<p>The traffic assessment prepared for the development shows that the access arrangements proposed are appropriate for this scale of development and the highway authority are satisfied in principle with the access provided traffic calming is included together with provision for pedestrians on the Wallingford Road.</p>

7.16	<p>Much of the plan seems well thought out but I find the boundary between houses might cause conflict depending on how amicable the occupants of the homes are. Also the sheer number intended by 2033, I feel is far too much for the village to handle without serious expansion of the school. I saw mention of a bus service for primary school children in more outlying parts of the village like Cholsey meadows? I don't support that as they should be encouraged to walk or cycle bus helping combat childhood obesity that I hear is more common issue. some of the plans mentioned working on pathways and crossing why bother if you plan to bring buses into it?</p>	<p>The plan meets the requirement set by SODC for the number of homes to be provided. The plan is designed to ensure that we provide needed new homes in a sustainable way and that there will be appropriate services and facilities available. The primary school is proposed to be expanded to 2-form entry and a second pre-school is to be built. This will give capacity for the number of homes proposed. Please see Policy CNPT1 in the CNP</p>
7.17	<p>The village cannot support any more development; even the proposed number will put a strain on the village and the surrounding areas. The views for the two areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are to be protected as well as the wild life that is squeezed into smaller areas. The pavements and non-existing cycle paths are in a bad state. With an ageing population who need to be kept active and able to move around the village as long as possible. When pavements and cycle paths are provided and in a good condition (which they currently aren't) you are minimising the barriers. This plan supports alternative solutions to the use of a car. Having gone over the plan I think it's the best solution to a very tricky situation.</p>	<p>We appreciate your support</p>
7.18	<p>On page 69 you have summed up the situation relating to parking for those that wish to travel by train away from Cholsey. Painting yellow lines on Papist Way or issuing residents only car parking badges would only push the problem to other streets within the village. Therefore greater parking at the station is what is required and the only way of delivering this would be to either purchase additional land or create a decked level over the existing parking.</p>	<p>On street parking is a recognised issue and discussions are under way with involved parties to address the issue of station parking numbers.</p>
7.18	<p>As far as I am concerned the present plan would only work if some sort of proper traffic calming was organised for the Wallingford road. since 30mph doesn't work then a 20 mph might be better.</p>	<p>Additional traffic calming measures are proposed for the Wallingford Rd. The highway authority is satisfied with the proposed access arrangements for the East End Farm site. Further comment on access to the combined CHOL1 and CHOL7 sites is being sought from the Highways authority.</p>
7.19	<p>Possible traffic calming measures (20mph restrictions, chicanes, but not bumps, please as they hurt people with back problems)</p>	<p>Please see CNP Pledge T6</p>

8	<p>Category: Infrastructure</p> <p>8.1 Need to mitigate flood risk</p>	<p>Considerable work has been done in recent months to mitigate the risk of flood by improving the current drainage system in the lower parts of the village. All new development must make adequate provision for drainage (CNPH5; CNP13; CNP14)</p>
8.2	<p>Road surfaces are in too poor a state to support increased traffic</p>	<p>Road maintenance is beyond the remit of the CNP</p>
8.3	<p>A new doctors surgery will be required</p>	<p>The doctors surgery will need to be expanded, we are negotiating with the surgery and clinical commissioning group to try and secure a satellite surgery for Cholsey. See CNP 12</p>
8.4	<p>In order to limit the number of new houses being built and because it is essential to protect the integrity of the village boundaries. It is also essential to protect the village from excessive amounts of traffic and ensure that local services especially he schools health services are enhanced rather than put under strain. The clear views to the natural environment of this area of outstanding natural beauty needs to be protected. Is it possible to now demonstrate that promises that were made to the village regarding providing services in return for permission to build at the Fairmile. These were not forthcoming when the development was actually constructed. We have absolutely no reason to believe that any of the developers will make good on promises to improve the village environment as it exists and support local business and services roads pavements etc. The Neighbourhood plan is essential to make sure that anyone given permission to build in the area is responsible and answerable to the community's needs first and foremost and do not put out empty promises in order to get access to land and permissions. .</p>	<p>The CNP seeks to achieve the points made. Once adopted, the CNP will condition what planning applications can be approved. Adherence to planning consent conditions is a legal requirement. No CNP was in place during the development of the Fairmile.</p>
8.5	<p>Ensuring controlled development of the village while ensuring community facilities are built to meet the needs as a whole. Guarantee of sufficient station and centre parking, medical/school/shop facilities</p>	<p>Parking in the village is an issue the CNP is concerned with but recognises there are no easy solutions. We believe that limiting the number of new houses will help.</p>
9	<p>Category: School size and location</p>	
9.1	<p>The school is too small to accept any more children</p>	
9.2	<p>Lack of education facilities e.g. schools for the growing village. I understand the primary school is nearly full already. Adding further housing is going to add to the problem. If more housing is being built, think about how many additional places will be needed at schools. The village primary school is in a place where little expansion would be possible. Possibly move the school to a new bigger site to support the additional houses.</p>	<p>As part of the strategic local plan, provision must be made for the numbers of children predicted to attend local schools. Cholsey Primary School is to be expanded to a two-form entry school and a second Pre-school is to be built. This should enable our objectives for education to be met i.e. that every child who wants to attend the local school should have the opportunity to do so. OCC has indicated that these changes should support up to an additional 250</p>
9.3	<p>My biggest concern is the current struggle for the primary school to meet the needs</p>	

	<p>since Cholsey Meadows we are now near the end of meadow view being finished and we still don't have enough spaces to fulfil the need. Another new housing site if 550 dwellings should not be considered until the Preschool and Primary School facilities have been improved to meet the current demand</p>	<p>homes in the village.</p>
9.4	<p>I am not a nimbby. If we need more housing fine but it needs to have adequate infrastructure to support it. Schools, shops, surgeries etc. as well as all the required services, roads and utilities. If the sewage works in Cholsey is being made larger to receive an increased intake of wastewater from new houses being built in Cholsey and Wallingford what infrastructure is being put in place to deal with the extra capacity leaving the sewage works? Where will the waste water go? I am concerned that the sewage works will not cope. Water will be discharged into a millstream that already struggles on occasions with the current volume. If flooding occurs as a result who will pay for the damage to houses, businesses and loss of income. Will it be taken away by a constant stream of lorries like we saw along the Wallingford Road last year? If this issue isn't addressed will wastewater be allowed to flood farmland putting the livelihood of farmers at risk or will it back up into the village and cause flooding there? This issue really is something that needs to be looked at and thought about very closely.</p>	<p>A lot of work has been done in recent months to clear the rainwater pipes in the lower reaches of the village. This should alleviate the flooding problems that have been experienced in the past. Any increase in the number of dwellings in Cholsey will result in an increased flow to the treatment works. All development is subject to there being sufficient capacity in the system to cope and this is the responsibility of the developers and service providers. Thames Water have commented that "further assessment will be required to determine the full impact once there is greater certainty on the location, scale and phasing of growth". The lorries seen at the processing site in recent weeks are the result of remedial work being carried out there.</p>
10	<p>Category: Local benefits</p>	
10.1	<p>Could the newly proposed marina development give rise to improved riverside facilities?</p>	<p>The proposed marina of c350 berths is large scale and gives rise to concerns about its effect on the existing ecosystem and conflicts with existing river users. Though recognised, it does not form any part of the current version of the CNP.</p>
10.2	<p>Cholsey does not need additional recreational facilities</p>	<p>The CNP wishes to ensure that there are good recreation facilities for existing and new residents to encourage healthy lifestyles. The CNP recognises that an outdoor facility for teenagers such as a skate park has proved very popular where provided elsewhere. Such a facility will need to be located to avoid noise pollution while remaining local to the community. A new site lends itself best to such a development.</p>
10.3	<p>Reposition village store</p>	<p>This is outside the remit of the CNP. Any development of commercial premises whether replacement or additional would be a commercial decision.</p>
10.4	<p>There is no outline from the parish council on the revenue they will receive from these and how it will be spent</p>	<p>See CIL Projects document on Cholsey-plan.com</p>

10.5	<p>Honey Lane needs to be made inaccessible for access to Cholsey centre for non-residents, or severe traffic calming measures need to be implemented. Development should include a middle school and main shop (Tesco) as road access to development is more appropriate for traffic than Cholsey centre, which at many parts of the day are a outright danger to residents, road users and pedestrians, particularly young families accessing the school.</p>	<p>Making any road within the village inaccessible to non-residents is not within the remit of the CNP. Traffic calming measures could be installed using the CIL money arising from the new homes.</p>
10.6	<p>I feel that the number of houses now planned is at a level which is more manageable for Cholsey. I moved here for it's village feel and with more houses you would require more shops and amenities. The village centre would be lost. We always suspected that gaps would be filled in and this works. But i certainly love seeing the wildlife off the back of the Celsea place developments. It's a realistic plan which encompasses the affordable housing and planning for the future. Also parking and consideration of ensuring that each house have suffice to spaces. Larger numbers of houses would result a huge requirement for amenities- with large supermarkets already on the Cholsey edge of Wallingford, we would loose more green space. It would be good to see spaces created for adults as well as child friendly areas - also areas for stimulation - playing on lights sculptures as well.</p>	<p>Cholsey Parish Council receives money from the development of new homes known as the Community infrastructure Levy (CIL), this money is for the improvement of infrastructure in the parish. The Parish Council has the responsibility of allocating funds from the CIL and a list of projects exists as part of the CNP. Your ideas will be added to this list.</p>
10.7	<p>Currently the primary school needs to be increased in size (not just the provision of a new pre school - what will happen to the 4 year olds once they finish pre school and there are limited spaces at the local primary school a mile away?); the roads need to be improved (the pot holes are terrible; the many places with on-street parking lead to narrow passing points, build up of traffic and danger for pedestrians; parking around the one village shop - Tesco's - is already limited and leads to people parking dangerously); the public transport needs to be improved (the bus service is scant and the train station does not have the parking spaces, bicycle spaces, staffing (one person who goes at lunch time) or resources - one ticket machine which was often broken last year); the speeding issue needs to be addressed - the number of vehicles breaking the speed limit as they drive along Reading Road or Wallingford Road is scary and a terrible accident waiting to happen, especially with the lack of road crossing points for pedestrians. The medical centre is Wallingford is great but nearing its limit and will struggle to sustain many more patients. The dentists in Wallingford and surrounding villages are also busy. There is a lack of resources for teenagers and young people (and an increase in vandalism and petty grievances) in the village.</p>	<p>Discussions are under way with regard to the increased call on the local schools that will result from any development. Road maintenance is not within the remit of the CNP. On street parking is a recognised issue and discussions are under way with involved parties to address the issue of station parking numbers. Station staffing levels are not within the remit of the CNP. The application of speeding limits is under consideration for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding. The installation of controlled pedestrian crossing at strategic points (A329, by Tesco, Wallingford Rd) is under consideration. The construction of a skate park is on the list of CIL projects. A proposal to look at management of the area around The Forty is included in the list of CIL projects.</p>

10.8	it is important to keep the rural village feel and ensure developments are of a size and nature to integrate successfully with the village. one small change to CIL list as discussed with Val Bolt.	The CIL list will be updated
10.9	One small change to the CIL list in the contribution to the replacement of the tarmac surface of the school playground and a contribution to the fitting t of the press-school expansion is considered as there is not funding in the expansion plan for these.	The CIL list will be updated
11	Category: Environment	
11.1	The new proposal responds adequately to the need for housing, without causing detriment to the existing inhabitants who have chosen to live in Cholsey for the distinctive character and connection to the countryside that would be threatened by as large a scale development as the 650 homes on 'Cholsey Fields'. The need for housing would be more appropriately met by the newly proposed plan, as houses will be more promptly available, disruption during construction would be minimised thanks to the smaller scale and houses would be constructed close to existing amenities. There is no suitable solution for the scale of increased traffic that would be seen at the Reading Road/Papist Way junction, as congestion / noise / pollution would inevitably increase on what is the margins of the village, thereby damaging the 'connection to the countryside' that is so valued by villagers. The 'uncluttered views' (Points 34-35) and centrality of agriculture to the history of the village would be irreversibly lost for all residents of 3 sides of the village, in particular considering the immediate proximity of the AONB to the Reading Road/Papist Way junction. The 'Cholsey Fields' development should not be included just because of its 'convenience' as infill between Fairmile and the historical village - this is 'convenient' only from above, not in terms of its integration with the rest of the village (in fact, the rest of the village has its back turned to this field and the Fairmile development is adequately screened thanks to pre-existing planting. The 'Cholsey Fields' development would risk being an enclave, whereas the piecemeal developments will complement the existing built environment. Re-emphasise traffic issues and environmental impact on migratory birds and deer using 'Cholsey Fields' as transit routes. Further emphasise visual impact of such a large development on views from the AONB.	The CNP places considerable importance on the relationship between the village and the surrounding countryside and AONBs. Improving the footpath network is one of our objectives. A controlled pedestrian crossing of the Reading Rd. is one of the projects on the CIL list for the parish council to consider.
12	Category: Miscellaneous	
12.1	Taken the views of the community into consideration for the best possible outcome for all	We appreciate your support

12.2	Not sure what needs to be done to make sure plan succeeds but assume as many people commenting and supporting it will be the main factor?	All support for the plan is welcome. Once the consultation period is complete and all feedback is taken into consideration (both supporting and objecting) the plan will be amended to reflect that feedback and it will be submitted to the Parish Council and to SODC for examination and adoption. The final stage in the process is when the plan will be put to the community in a referendum – agree or not agree. If more than 50% agree with the plan it will be adopted by SODC and form part of planning rules
12.3	I commend the work of the neighbourhood plan for Cholsey however I object strongly to the insidious additional planning and housing developments outwith (sic) the neighbourhood plans by developers and covertly encouraged by council members. This applies particularly to site CHOL2. Further developments approved whilst the neighbourhood plan is being developed is unscrupulous and makes a mockery of the entire planning process and in particular the neighbourhood plan. [How can we] Guarantee and ensure that OPC, SODC and OCC adhere to the neighbourhood plans and not conduct/encourage further building planning and housing encroachment outside the neighbourhood plan for whatever reason.	We appreciate your support and agree that it is a pressing matter to get our plan to a referendum following which, if accepted, the plan would for part of planning rules applicable to all bodies with the power to grant permission for development.

If you wish to raise any queries regarding this document or what it includes, please contact the Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan Team using the details below:

Email: info@cholsey-plan.com

Phone: 01491 652255 (Cholsey Parish Council)

If you would like to make a complaint please write to:

The Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan Team

Cholsey Parish Council, 31 Station Road, Cholsey, Wallingford OX10 9PT