

# 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	Professor
Full name	Michael Bowker
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: LP2034

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.**

It is designed to be overly-complicated, long-winded and burdensome for individuals to respond to, but perfect for developers and interest business partners, who have resources (staff) to put to it (hence does not comply with the Duty to Cooperate). Thus I predict a huge response from developers/businesses and relatively little from individuals. Thus, at 240 pages this document is **NOT FIT FOR PURPOSE**.

It is not sound legally because the whole process is **CORRUPTED**. It is corrupted by donations to the government from developers (just one example, but there are lots of them. is the litigious approaches of Gallagher to development in Sonning Common, originally supported, against all opposition and the NDP, by the Sec of State for "Communities"!, no doubt after a word in his ear from the Conservative party treasurer).

There is **ABSOLUTELY NO DOUBT** that developers have had a major say in government housing policy/plans, the same developers who are friends with major Conservative party figures (e.g. Cameron and Gallagher), and to their own benefit. We cannot even believe government housing needs statistics because i) they have been proved to be false and ii) they are influenced by the party donors. As part of this whole process we need **FULL DISCLOSURE** regarding discussions between developers and i) the Treasurer of the Conservative party ii) The treasurer and the sec of state for communities on future donations and related development opportunities and iii) discussions of the Conservative councillors of SODC and developers/top levels of the party. Recent developments at SODC and the Consecrative councillors there already places some distrust in the ability of the chair and councillors to act in an appropriate manner, that is, to represent their constituents rather than their party interests via the developers..

If corruption of the government process is occurring due to massive donations , then clearly the whole framework is illegal, and can probably be proved to be so in court, there is plenty of evidence to support the view that the whole process is corrupted top-down.

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.

A complete revision of the LP is required to make it simpler and accessible to the public (less numbers of big documents to read). The current process CANNOT act in any sense as a proper consultation with the public.

Page 21 OBJ 1.1 and OBJ 1.2 Support the settlement hierarchy.... support rural communities and their way of life, recognising this is what attracts people to the district.

- There is no policy to provide for settlement boundaries. An example would be for larger villages to remain separate from other towns or smaller villages. Larger villages are part of that all-important hierarchy - so they need protection as separate entities. Gaps between settlements are an important aspect of this separation and should be included in either Strategic Objective 1.1 or 1.2. Sonning Common residents do not want to be joined up to Reading or to other villages.

Page 35 STRAT 2 Housing and employment requirements

- The plan promotes excessive numbers of new homes beyond what Government formulae require. Furthermore, SODC's overall housing numbers are far above local needs. Using the Government's preferred housing projections suggests a housing need of 15,000 new homes in South Oxfordshire, not the 22,000 as stated in the plan.

Page 41 STRAT 5 Residential densities

- The proposed housing density figure of 45 homes per hectare (45 dph) for larger villages such as Sonning Common, represents an 80% increase from the current 25 dph under the Core Strategy. Clearly this is dictated by the developers to their minions in the government and down to SODC minions. This is an UNHEALTHY DENSITY SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO MAXIMISE DEVELOPER PROFITS and MUST BE ELIMINATED FROM THE PLAN. Crucially, this higher figure is a minimum and it is inflexible, without respect for the varying characteristics of individual sites, or existing neighbouring densities to determine whether a high or lower density would be appropriate. Put bluntly, it is a one size fits all. To make this legal the plan must return to the original density.

Page 95 H4 A housing requirement of an additional 108 homes is required from Sonning Common

- Our adopted Neighbourhood Plan already allocates 195 new homes plus reserves. Now we are informed by SODC that we need to make room for another 108. How is this justified given that the overall new homes requirement across the district is based on untested assumptions? The roads through Sonning Common (especially WOOD Lane, where the shops are also located) are already becoming impassable at significant times of the day, the bus company has threatened to discontinue services through the village due to difficulties for its drivers and, of course, Oxfordshire Highways, as ever, roll over to have their tummies tickled by the developers and rubber stamp planning applications.

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

