

# South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034

## Page 3: Part A - contact details

Q1. Are you responding as an:

Individual

## Page 4: Individual contact details

Q2. Due to the plan-making process including an independent examination, a name and means of contact is required for your comments to be considered:

Title	Mrs
Full name	Polly Allen
Business / Organisation name (if relevant)	-
Job title (if relevant)	-
Address line 1	██████████
Address line 2	██████████
Address line 3	-
Postal town	██████
Postcode	██████
Telephone number	██████████
Email address	██████████

## Page 7: Part B - your comments

Q5. For comments on the Local Plan, please provide the paragraph or policy to which your comments relates. You can view a list of policies here. 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 STRAT6: Green Belt

Q6. Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:

	Yes	No	Don't know	Not answered (OPTION HIDDEN FROM LIVE SURVEY)
are legally compliant?	X			
are sound?	X			
comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	X			

Q7. 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.

I agree that there are exceptional circumstances which mean that altering the greenbelt to accommodate developments at Culham science centre, Berinsfield, Grenoble Road, Northfield, North of Bayswater Brook and Wheatley

Q10. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q11. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

Yes

## Page 9: Part B - your comments

Q12. For comments on the Local Plan, please provide the paragraph or policy to which your comments relates. You can view a list of policies [here](#). 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 8 & Strat 9

Q13. Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:

	Yes	No	Don't know	Not answered (OPTION HIDDEN FROM LIVE SURVEY)
are legally compliant?	X			
are sound?	X			
comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	X			

Q14. 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.

I agree with the first element of Policy STRAT1 (The Overall Strategy) which states "Focusing major new development in Science Vale including Didcot Garden Town and Culham so that this area can play an enhanced role in providing homes, jobs and services with improved transport connectivity". The strategic developments at Culham Science Centre, the land adjacent to Culham Science Centre and on the land at Berinsfield will very much support this strategy, providing homes in or close to the centre of the Science Vale with excellent transportation links.

Q17. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q18. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

Yes

## Page 11: Part B - your comments

Q19. For comments on the Local Plan, please provide the paragraph or policy to which your comments relates. You can view a list of policies [here](#). 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: STRAT11

Q20. Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:

	Yes	No	Don't know	Not answered (OPTION HIDDEN FROM LIVE SURVEY)
are legally compliant?	X			
are sound?	X			
comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	X			

Q21. 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.

Previous drafts of the Local Plan (2017) had a fundamental inadequacy in that it failed to adequately satisfy the Oxford City Unmet Need. The Strategic Developments in that version of the Plan (at Culham, Berinsfield, Chalgrove Airfield and Wheatley) are all some distance away from the city and therefore would not adequately satisfy the needs of people working in the city – particularly people on low incomes who ideally would be looking for accommodation within walking / cycling / short bus ride from their places of employment.

I am delighted to see that this version of the plan states that, because of this situation 'exceptional circumstances' exist that warrant the modification of the Green Belt boundary. Agree that all three sites represent good locations for housing for people working in Oxford, with good proximity to the main areas of employment (particularly the BMW Mini plant and Hospitals) with good or potentially good public transportation links.

Delighted that developments at these locations will have a higher density and high percentage affordable homes, helping to satisfy the needs of people on low-incomes.

Q24. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q25. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

Yes

**Page 13: Part B - your comments**

Q26. For comments on the Local Plan, please provide the paragraph or policy to which your comments relates. You can view a list of policies here. 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:** STRAT 7

Q27. Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:

	Yes	No	Don't know	Not answered (OPTION HIDDEN FROM LIVE SURVEY)
are legally compliant?		X		
are sound?		X		
comply with the Duty to Co-operate?	X			

Q28. 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.

I think that STRAT7 doesn't support a few of SODC's Strategic Objectives stated in Chapter 3 of the plan:

- OBJ 1.2: SODC have stated a clear objective that it must "support rural communities and "their way of life", recognising that this is what attracts people to the district" – This development would more than triple the size of the Chalgrove community and totally destroy the rural community in that village today.
- OBJ 1.4: SODC have stated an objective to "focus growth in the Science Vale" - yet this development would be some distance from the Science Vale with very poor transportation links, making it unsuitable for people working in the Science Vale.
- OBJ 4.2: SODC have stated an objective to "make sustainable transport, walking and cycling an attractive and viable choice for people" – yet, even with some growth of employment opportunities in Chalgrove, the vast majority of people living in this new town would be forced to drive to work, due both to the remoteness from the main centres of employment (Science Vale, Oxford, Reading) and poor public transportation facilities. With regards the public transportation, it is very unlikely that this could ever become a practical proposition for people at this location.
- OBJ 5.2: SODC have stated an objective to "support development that respects the scale and character of our towns and villages, enhancing the special character of our historical settlements and surrounding countryside" – yet this development would more than triple the size of the community, will create an environment that is fundamentally different to the current environment and attract people whose motivation for living there would be fundamentally different to the people currently living in this quiet rural community.
- OBJ 6.1: SODC have stated an objective to "champion neighbourhood planning, empowering local communities to direct development within their area and provide support to ensure Neighbourhood Development Plans are deliverable, achievable and sustainable" – yet this development contradicts the Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore the site is not supported by Martin Baker, the current lease holders at Chalgrove airfield (the main employer at the site, a strategically important Defence business) and the development is therefore likely to be non-deliverable.
- OBJ 8.2: SODC have stated an objective to "minimise carbon emissions and other pollution such as water, air, noise and light, and increase our resilience to the likely impact of climate change, especially flooding: - yet this this development would create significantly more carbon emissions than the developments closer to the main areas of employment due to increased road traffic, and is likely to exacerbate and already difficult flooding issue in Chalgrove today.

Finally, In addition to the all of the above negatives, in the event that a Compulsory Purchase Order was placed on the Martin Baker Organisation and was successful, the proposed development at Chalgrove airfield would incur huge costs that would make it uneconomic compared with the other strategic developments: These would include:

- The cost of moving the main runway
- The costs of major changes to the road-transport infrastructure in and around the area including bypasses at Stadhampton, Little Milton, Cuxham;
- The cost of massive works to resolve the flooding issues.

Policy STRAT7 should be removed from the plan. This has no further implications to the overall Plan as other developments proposed by SODC meet the stated actual housing requirement.

Q31. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q32. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

No