

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034

Publication Version Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Monday 18 February 2019 to: Planning Policy, South Oxfordshire District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email it to planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk

This form has two parts:

Part A – contact details

Part B – your comments / participation at oral examination

Part A

Are you responding as an: (please tick)

Agent

Business or organisation

Individual

Due to the plan-making process including an independent examination, a name and contact details are required for your comments to be considered. If you are acting on behalf of another organisation, please provide their details in column one and your company name and contact details in column two.

	1. Personal Details	2. Agent Details (if applicable)
Title	<input type="text" value="Mrs"/>	<input type="text"/>
Full Name	<input type="text" value="Valerie Adams"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="Retired"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 2	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Postal Town	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	<input type="text"/>
Postcode	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	<input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	<input type="text"/>

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

For comments on the Local Plan, please provide the paragraph or policy to which your comments relates.

If you wish to comment on one of the evidence documents or the policies maps, please state the document title as well as the paragraph or policy reference.

Document / Policy / Paragraph:

Policy STRAT 13: Land North of Bayswater Brook (LNBB)

Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:

(1) are legally compliant

Yes

No

Don't know

(2) are sound

Yes

No

Don't know

(3) comply with the Duty to Cooperate

Yes

No

Don't know

Please provide further information in relation to the previous question. e.g. why you do or do not consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound.

Legal Compliance

- The Bayswater Farm development (wrongly named as land North of Bayswater Brook- it lies to the South) was a late addition to SODC's 2034 document. Indeed, the whole of the 2034 plan is so far removed from the 2003 plan (significant changes to the number of houses required, changes to the number of strategic sites are but two) that it should be considered as an entirely new plan.

Cont.

(Continue on page 4 if necessary)

Please set out any modifications you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to your comments above. (NB - any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested wording of any policy or text as precisely as possible.

Strat 13 LNBB should be removed from SODC's LP 2034; there is insufficient evidence to support the need for this development to meet Oxford's unmet housing need.

The Bayswater Farm field development has not been subject to any of the necessary assessments or consultations (Section18) and the proposal should be removed from the plan as being non compliant.

(Continue on page 4 if necessary)

Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process? *

Yes No

* **Please note:** the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the public hearing.

Signature: Date:

Sharing your personal details

All comments will be submitted in full to the Secretary of State alongside a submission version of the Local Plan. The Secretary of State will appoint an independent planning inspector, who will carry out an examination of the plan.

Your name, contact details and comments will also be shared with the planning inspector and a programme officer, who will act as a point of contact between the council, inspector and respondents. This means that you will be contacted by the programme officer (and where necessary the council) with updates on the Local Plan. This is required by Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

We have received assurance that the data passed to the planning inspector and programme officer will be kept securely and not used for any other purpose. The inspector and programme officer will retain the data up to six months after the plan has been adopted. South Oxfordshire District Council will hold the data for six years after the plan has been adopted.

Comments submitted by individuals will be published on our website alongside their name only. No other contact details will be published. Comments submitted by businesses and/or organisations will be published on our website including contact details. If you would like to know more about how we use and store your data, please visit www.southoxon.gov.uk/dataprotection

Future contact preferences

As explained in our data protection statement, in line with statutory regulations you will be contacted by the programme officer (and where necessary the council) with relevant updates on the Local Plan. South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils have a shared planning policy database. If you would like to be added to our database to receive updates on other planning policy consultations, please tick the relevant district box(es):

- I would like to be added to the database to receive planning policy updates for South Oxfordshire
- I would also like to be added to the database to receive planning policy updates for Vale of White Horse

Further comment: Please use this space to provide further comment on the relevant questions in this form. **You must state which question your comment relates to.**

Legal Compliance (cont)

- o There has been no Section 18 consultation for the Bayswater Farm field development: residents and other stakeholders were unaware of the plan until it was published on 7.1.19 (residents of the estate then received the information by word of mouth.) This is not compliant with SODC's own Statement of Community Involvement'We wish to ensure that people are involved at the early stages of the Local Plan' SODC has never put Bayswater Farm field through an assessment process. It was not included in the original call for sites pro forma from Kemp & Kemp in 2014, neither is it on the map submitted to SODC by Berkeley Homes on behalf of Wick Farming Ltd. (p.2 22nd December 2015) SODC did not consider this plan to be needed in 2017. Why the change now?
- o Nowhere in the 2034 plan or in any supporting documentation is there any information about the types and numbers of houses, housing density or of the development on this field. How can residents and local representatives form a sound view of the pros and cons when this information has been withheld?
- o SODC has a duty to consider areas outside the Green Belt for development first - there is no evidence that this requirement has been met. There has been no objectively assessed need of the site. There is no evidence of assessments that meet the criteria of 'exceptional need' in order to remove this land from the Green Belt and there is much uncertainty in the documents around the accuracy or consistency of the housing unmet need figures (see SHMA and Oxford City HELAA analysis)
- o This plan is not compliant with para 136 of NPPF guidelines ...Green Belt Boundaries can 'only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. The proposed development appears to ignore the 5 principles of the Green Belt completely. The Housing White Paper (February 2017) reiterated the Government's commitment to maintain protection of the Green Belt.
- o NPPF guidelines (para 138) state: 'strategic policy making authorities should consider the consequences for sustainable development and should first consider land that has been previously developed.' **Where** is the evidence that this requirement has been met?
- o It is also a requirement that there should be a permanent, defensible, Green Belt boundary and a strong countryside edge. The proposed change to the Green Belt relies on some hedging and a significant amount of barbed wire.
- o There is also no evidence of consultation between SODC and Oxford City Council about the development and its impacts.

For these reasons this plan must be considered legally uncompliant.

Duty to Cooperate

- o SODC's Statement of Community Involvement says that they pledge to cooperate with neighbouring Local Authorities. This has not been the case in respect of the Bayswater Farm field and there has been no Section 18 consultation.
- o Proposed access to Bayswater Farm field is shown to be via Delbush and Burdell Avenues, both are cul de sacs and both part of Oxford City. Again, no consultation.
- o There is no mention of Bayswater Farm field in SODC's Local Plan 2034 strategic site selection background paper - how can it then be said to be a viable part of any Local Plan?
- o 'Unmet housing need' for Oxford was not calculated using the latest Government methodology which is a requirement.

For these reasons this plan does not comply with the duty to cooperate.



Soundness

- o The Bayswater Farm field has been subject to previous planning proposals in 1961, 1973 and 1989. On each occasion the application was refused. Grounds given include: 'it would be detrimental to the amenities of the locality'; it is 'in an area of great landscape value'; 'the number of people who regularly use this attractive bridle path and benefit from this view is unknown, but there is an unquantifiable

loss of amenity. Nothing has changed - except that the need for such a facility in today's world becomes ever more vital.

- o Sandhills is a development of approximately 360 dwellings, mostly dating from 1930's. There is a small additional development which contains a Primary School. The roads - Avenues - are narrow and tree lined and the only access to the estate and school is via the junction at Thornhill onto the busy A40. This junction becomes very congested at peak times - it is also where many pupils cross to access the school. The addition of a probable 2-300 cars at this point would have an enormous impact on safety, pollution and the further congestion of the already overstretched A40 and Headington roundabout.
- o No information has been provided on the density, type, or number of houses for Bayswater Farm field in the 2034 plan. Unofficial reports suggest 160 - 200 units, an increase of around 60% on Sandhills. This is against NPPF principles and against the Councils own policy which discourages disproportionate development near relatively small communities.
- o Separation of the site from the rest of the development has a significant impact on sustainability, being too small to include additional amenities. The new housing would not enhance or maintain the vitality of the existing community (NPPF guidance paras 78 & 79) It is too removed from the rest of the proposed development to benefit from the proposed amenities on the larger site.
- o Sandhills has no other amenities apart from a tiny play area near the school. The only green space we have is the view over the field with its brook and old, established woodland. A walk along the bridle path that provides the Northern boundary to the estate, and is adjacent to the field, provides the only local peace, tranquillity and relatively fresh air we have, and the only clean air zone away from the constant vehicle emissions on the A40; it is **vital** for the health and wellbeing of all who use it. This peaceful path is well used by pupils on their way to and from school, residents, dog walkers, riders and the residents of a small Care Home immediately adjacent to the cul de sac. The woodland is a haven for wildlife, including deer, red kites, buzzards, sparrow hawks, woodpeckers and other small mammals. Have there been 'appropriate landscape and visual impact assessments that demonstrate how harm...will be avoided.'?
- o SODC's Sustainability Appraisal states (para 2.3) that it 'encourages sustainable modes of travel once the A40 and Bayswater Brook barriers have been overcome'. Nowhere are there any sound recommendations as to HOW this might be done.
- o The Defra policy paper 2015 acknowledges that air pollution from road transport harms our health and wellbeing and could be equivalent to 29,000 deaths a year.

- o The County Council has proposed a road to run through the Elsfield/Wick Farm development from the Marston Junction at the West end to Bayswater Road in the East - they perceive an opportunity to persuade the developer to extend to extend that road across more Green Belt fields to the A40, creating a new junction somewhere near Thornhill (ludicrous in itself). No consideration has been given to the impact of a road through that site, it would rapidly become a rat run for lorries and other traffic anxious to avoid the Headington roundabout. There has been no thought about the management of this traffic as it passes through, and adjacent to, new developments. The impact on safety, the wellbeing of the householders, emissions and noise would be huge.

All these points demonstrate that this proposal is fundamentally unsound; too much is placed at risk if it goes forward.

Please, see sense, not financial gain.



Alternative formats of this form are available on request. Please email planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk or call 01235 422600 (Text phone users add 18001 before you dial).

Please return this form by 5pm on Monday 18 February 2019 to: Planning Policy, South Oxfordshire District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email it to planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk.