

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	Mr (Cllr)
Full name	Bond, Geoffrey Philip
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: H5 & preceding/ succeeding

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.

(1) SODC Planning Policy makers appear NOT to have complied with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), eg. Sections 172 & 11 : "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues." "Strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area"

(3) SODC Planning Policy makers appear NOT to have complied with the moral and perhaps legal Duty to Cooperate, in relation to the Countryside & Rights of Way (CROW) Act, expounded by Defra in "Duties on relevant authorities to have regard to the purposes of National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) etc..." guidance.

The statutory body for the Chilterns AONB, Chilterns Conservation Board, have responded in the strongest possible terms in representations that state good reasons for deletion of Nettlebed allocated site(s) H5 etc. (See reference: Comment to Local Plan 2033 on 29/11/17 by Chiltern Conservation Board (Dr Lucy Murfett – 982031; Comment ID 741, etc, and more recent Representations) [attached] Representations that also weigh heavily are those from Natural England, (See reference: Comment to Local Plan 2031 'refined options' on 27/04/15 by Natural England (Ms Laura Matthey)– Q12; Comment ID LRef2474) [attached] and others about pressures on the rural countryside from CPRE, The Chiltern Society and local service/ infrastructure providers.

Nettlebed has suffered degrading changes in services whilst Development Plans continue; eg. Post Office facilities have been withdrawn. The local Hospice is intending to close/ move. Local NHS GP Doctors are under pressure from non-local patient lists and the future of NHS services is subject to rapid change. The Primary School is said to be full. Bus Service provision is now only on A4130 main road, not serving northern periphery of village, nearly 1km away, a long distance for some residents. It appears that the SODC is failing in its stated duty (per NPPF Section 15. Conserving and Enhancing The Natural Environment) by NOT recognising "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland"; and without taking all due consideration of many previous comments and objections made by local people (who know the local situation best). For example, the local Wildlife Trust has indicated that vulnerable species such as Dormice, Brown Hares and Crested Newts live on and around site H5 and the bird population is observably diverse, including top predators, such as Buzzards, Kites, and Owls.

Moreover, particularly in relation to 'Policy H5', the Plan is not Sound because the document conflicts with a large volume of response to previous local consultation, as well as current and deliberately-removed previous policies of SODC (such as those related to protection of land around villages and in The Chilterns AONB), in order to press-on regardless with 'confirmation bias' and unsustainable plans by distant hired-hand planners for a perceived housing 'want' (not the same as need; other representations will surely address the numbers, which appear too high for a rural district).

(2) The Plan is not Sound and is likely to be undeliverable, as it is not working with local 'stakeholders', as in the following explanations:

The local community has tried to work with this process, all on a voluntary non-professional basis, but original intention to build regardless has been 'qualified' by very subjective words in SOLP about the land in the various assessments, when any development would be out-of-character and -scale, on land designated AONB since the Council last built in Nettlebed; and possibly using land since designated Registered Common Land for Access roads etc.. The Council planning policy seems to continue to think about 'Council Estates', regardless of appropriateness, given the fact that it has, in the interim period, sold off many of the adjacent properties into freehold ownership, which has probably provided some harmonious balance into the community. Yet the mapping continues to indicate Plans for potential urbanisation, or 'ghettoisation' due to disharmonious unbalancing, at a relatively remote edge of the village. Some 'Affordable Housing' needs to part of the plan, but appears to be little consideration and compromise in regard of local needs, including representations made by significant local 'stakeholders', such as the Landowners in cooperation with the Parish Council; with whom District Councils must surely co-operate (not only, as stated with outside bodies per recent duties, but surely also under much older duties to work with local knowledge within its own District). Perhaps SODC is trying too hard to cooperate outwardly, not inwardly! For example, unlike owner-occupiers who choose where they live for the amenities, some local tenants placed by SO Housing Association, would not choose to live in such a remote location, with insufficient facilities and activity for them/ their children. Such disharmony can, and sometimes does, have a detrimental effect, related to crime and anti-social behaviours etc. There is a lack of local employment opportunities.

Note 34 to the NPPF states that 'Entry-level Exception sites should not be permitted in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty'...

As regards potential District 'Science Vale' employment developments it is unlikely that most workers

are going to choose to live so remotely from their workplaces. It may be more likely that more highly-paid 'executives' of any enterprise will seek to live remotely in the Chilterns AONB / Cotswolds AONB; thereby adding to developmental pressures at the upper echelons of the housing market, which can be seen to be disharmonious to a community, too.

Nettlebed Parish Council has, on many past occasions, worked to develop Nettlebed in an appropriate, sensitive and harmonious manner with local knowledge and awareness; to the extent that future 'infill development' may now be constrained because the available sites have already been utilised. The Parish Council has not 'sat on its hands' by leaving such sites 'fallow' in the past. It did however, disagree near the start of this process, with SODC's somewhat arbitrary decision to place a (by their own admission) much smaller village, with some but diminishing facilities and infrastructure, into its 'hierarchy'(!?) as a Larger Village. This has been exacerbated by the similarly arbitrary separation of the village from significant ends of the parish ('Crocker End', 'Huntercombe End', etc). This has caused much vexation in the community, due to overbearing pressure either to produce a 'Neighbourhood Plan' with few resources and options, or to be forced to accept arbitrary 'Allocations' from outside.

There are some potential alternative locations for more harmonious housing development within the Parish. One is the probable availability of the 'Policy H6' site, if and when developed by Sue Ryder Care or successors. There is potential here, if appropriate, for re-inclusion of parts of the historic 'built-form' of Nettlebed village centre, much closer to and on the same side as facilities, such as the School. Local knowledge and old maps show that some dwellings and ways in the street-plan were lost by clearance and estate walling and gating in the early 20th Century, when Joyce Grove was expensively developed. The current Plan for some conversion within the mansion house itself, could perhaps be made more sustainable, harmonious, if the site was considered as part of the community and not separate, gated-off from it. This would be necessary before any development.

For example, see attached letter dated 29/11/17 from Mr Rod Morgan (1146430) Response Comment ID 2089.

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.

Delete allocation Policy H5 etc for Nettlebed in AONB.

Q9. Please upload any supporting documents below:

- File: CCB for AONB vps_2556620072439121133 PC.pdf - [Download](#)
- File: natual england vps_2803382708431677446 NEng.pdf - [Download](#)
- File: vps_2442845150408799444 LV.pdf - [Download](#)

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

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