

# 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:

<b>Title</b>	ms
<b>Full name</b>	Ailsa Barber
<b>Business / Organisation name (if relevant)</b>	-
<b>Job title (if relevant)</b>	-
<b>Address line 1</b>	██████████
<b>Address line 2</b>	-
<b>Address line 3</b>	-
<b>Postal town</b>	██████████
<b>Postcode</b>	██████████
<b>Telephone number</b>	██████████
<b>Email address</b>	████████████████████

## 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.

<b>Document / Policy / Paragraph:</b>	SODC Local Plan 2034/Larger Villages/Policy H4 – 5.32 (see p2 & p4); H5, H6, H7 (see p4)
---------------------------------------	--

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.

Since 2010, when Nettlebed was reclassified as a 'larger village', Nettlebed Parish Council (NPC) has endeavoured to rectify the basic error in the re-classification of Crocker End & Catslip as an 'other village'. This development to the east of Nettlebed was originally the site of small cottages for the workers of the local brick-making industry and, even now, with the conversion of groups of 2-3 cottages into large single dwellings – the opposite of the 'unlimited infill' permitted in what has been categorised as the 'built form of Nettlebed - there are still some 55 dwellings in this area; all are on the electoral roll for Nettlebed, use the amenities and services of Nettlebed and have representatives on NPC. Crocker End & Catslip has always been an integral part of Nettlebed. When the Providers were initially asked for their opinion for a further (at the time) 20 more dwellings for Nettlebed, all without exception estimated that an additional 20 dwellings could be accommodated – but the 55 Crocker End & Catslip dwellings had already been taken out of the equation. Residents of ALL these dwellings use all the facilities as for the 'built form of Nettlebed' – water, sewage, school, transport. Ergo, the survey results remain distorted and meaningless.

Q8. 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.

Re: Policy H4 / 5.32:

When Nettlebed was reclassified as a 'larger village' in 2010, Nettlebed Parish Council (NPC) sought the advice of SODC Planning Policy Department as to whether or not to adopt a Neighbourhood Plan. SODC's advice was that it would be 'prohibitively expensive' and 'disproportionate in terms of time involved' to do so; NPC was subsequently allocated a SODC 'designated officer' to work alongside the Council. The four subsequent 'officers' each in turn remained in post for a very short time, during which NPC held two Public Exhibitions in November 2012 and June 2014 but has had no confirmation of any SODC support since the results of the 2014 results were published.

Policy H4 /5.32:

In the meantime, NPC has worked constantly alongside Nettlebed Estate (local land-owner) to work out the best way forward for Nettlebed to address its allocation of new housing, according to the Local Plan, and to best protect the integrity of the community of Nettlebed, situated as it is in an A.O.N.B. with the High Street in a Conservation Area and surrounded almost completely by common land. NPC has responded to each edition of the Local Plan.

NPC responded to SODC Local Plan 2032 on 14.8.16: "The allocation of 20 extra homes for Nettlebed will

put pressure on school places, sewerage treatment and roads and footpaths but we know that the comments and figures supplied by the 'providers' in the previous Local Plan 2031 were distorted by the removal of Crocker End & Catslip (55 homes) from Nettlebed".

NPC also recommended in 2016 that "The creation of a 'medium village' category would however allow for the spread of housing between 'smaller' and 'other' villages to be proportionate to the facilities, infrastructure and nature of each. An expectation of growth somewhere between the 10% required for larger villages and 5% required for smaller villages would be sensible".

NPC also added in 2016: "NPC has been advised that grants are available to finance Neighbourhood Plans BUT understand that these may only cover 50% of the total cost. As NPC's precept is only £13,000 (in 2016) and has been told that a NH Plan could cost in the region of £18,000-20,000, this would mean an increase in NPC's precept of some £9,000 (69%)."

NPC also responded to the emerging Local Plan 2033 in 2017 with the following comments: "NPC is currently working towards fulfilling the housing allocation for Nettlebed (according to the Local Plan 2033) and has, over the past 12 years provided some 23 'windfall' homes within the built form of Nettlebed. We therefore respectfully urge SODC Planning Policy Department to reconsider allowing 'unlimited infill' (as required since Nettlebed became a 'larger village' in 2010) as such infill is seriously

damaging our beautiful village and causing distress to our community".

This request was resubmitted to SODC Planning Department in June 2018; Senior Planning Officer Paul

Lucas replied to NPC with: "Our Planning Policy Team do not have any such comment recorded under the Local Plan 2033 consultation from NPC, which is now closed. However, I encourage you to submit this comment for our consideration the next time we go out for consultation".

NPC also offered (on 16.05.17) commenting on the then Policy H5 (Second Preferred Options):

"The OCC-owned Furniture Store on Old Camp Road is a 'brown field site'. Investigations with OCC, Nettlebed Estate and Nettlebed & District Commons Conservators have concluded that this is not 'common land' and would therefore be appropriate to be used for another small development". NPC trusts that this offer will now be considered in the Local Plan 2034.

Local Plan 2034: Housing Allocations at Nettlebed, 5.35 Policy H5: Land to the west of Priest Close  
This site (formerly Net 1) was the least favoured at the Public Exhibition (see SODC Report of Engagement and Participation - published July 2013). It is as distant from the 'built form of Nettlebed' as is Crocker End & Catslip (see above p2) and creates an unacceptable ribbon development beyond the western boundary of the village. It is too far to walk for older people (15 minutes to High Street, and involves a very steep hill. Because of the distance to even get to a bus stop, this would encourage people to use cars to get to any amenities. Priest Close already has a bad crime rate, building yet more houses at this end of the village will not improve this. This would be especially apparent with the essential 'green space'

that would be obligatory between the rear of the Priest Close properties and any new development to the west over common land and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Failing that access would have to be down an ancient Holloway!

Hazel dormice and great crested newts are resident on the site.

Access over common land onto the Watlington Road would be very dangerous as it is a fast road and on the brow of a hill.

5

Policy H6: Joyce Grove:

A Planning Application was submitted in 2015 for the redevelopment of this site with the conversion of the Grade II listed house and outbuildings to provide 20 dwellings. However, this site was not included in Nettlebed's previous allocations and, linked to the comments re H5 above, there is strong feeling in the local community that a sympathetic development in the orchard area adjacent to the Bothy and the OCC-owned Walled Garden would be appropriate. This area cannot be seen from Joyce Grove and therefore would not compromise the parkland setting.

It is important to point out that there is a precedent for this type of development in South Oxfordshire: After Borocourt Hospital (now Wyfold Court) in Rotherfield Peppard was disestablished in 1993, the Grade II listed house was converted into apartments, with a new small development in the grounds – a 'parkland setting' similar to Joyce Grove.

Vehicular access to Joyce Grove could remain, as now, via the B481, and around the southern edge of the parkland to the old orchard.

The local Nettlebed community has established rights of way through the grounds (permitted since the Sue Ryder Hospice moved to Joyce Grove in 1979) – this is included in the planning application conditions.

In discussions with Sue Ryder Care (SRC) NPC has established that SRC has ruled out building an alternative purpose-built Hospice on the site of the old orchard.

Policy H7: Land to the South and West of Nettlebed Service Station

This site (formerly Net 3) was favoured by parishioners at previous consultations. Although it was omitted from the second Preferred Options Local Plan due to the owners' personal reasons, it is still considered an attractive option, along with H6 (conversion plus new development) as both are within easy walking distance to the High Street and Nettlebed's range of facilities and services. Both developments would be on the same side of the High Street as Nettlebed School & Community Centre,

The Field Kitchen Café, the 'Life' shop and St Bartholomew's Church. Adding developments to the south side of the High Street would help to redress the geographical imbalance of Nettlebed's population to the north of the High Street.

**AFTER BREXIT WHY DO WE NEED SO MANY EXTRA HOUSES ANYWAY?**

How is it you are even considering building on a green field site, in an AONB, when no one wants you to? This is sheer madness and IS DEFINITELY NOT SOUND>

TO SUM UP ALL THE DETAILED COMMENTS ALREADY NOTED:

- H5 is removed as an option from the Local Plan 2034. (See reference: Comment to Local Plan 2033 on 29/11/17 by Chiltern Conservation Board (Dr Lucy Murfett – 982031; Comment ID 741)
- H6 is positively pursued as an option with the Sue Ryder Hospice and the SODC Case Officer Tom Wyatt for a new small development to the west of the site – out of site of the converted Grade II listed house. (See reference: Comment to Local Plan 2033 on 29/11/17 by Mr Rod Morgan – 1146430; Comment ID 2089)
- H7 is also positively pursued as a favoured option for a small development.
- The OCC-owned brown field site (the Furniture Store) on Old Camp Road is included as a site for a small development, appropriately linking Crocker End & Catslip back into the village of Nettlebed where it belongs.
- As advised by SODC Planning Department: to please reconsider allowing 'unlimited infill' in Nettlebed as it is seriously blighting ■ beautiful Chiltern village.

Just stop trying to destroy the very thing that makes Nettlebed what it is. It is not "large" it has limited and already overstretched facilities, and is not suitable for young families, or people who cant drive.

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

Yes

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

No

## Page 106: Future contact preferences

Q354. 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) below:

I would like to be added to the database to receive planning policy updates for South Oxfordshire

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