


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	Helen Burrows
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 STRAT 13: Land north of Bayswater Brook

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.

My concerns as a resident are the following:

Traffic Issues and Pedestrian safety:

Opening up the bottom of the culdesacs will significantly increase traffic congestion around the estate and especially at the traffic light controlled exit to the estate. This has a pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights which is NOT pelican, puffin, OR zebra: I myself have witnessed a child being knocked over here as motorists attempt to rush the lights. The queue at school times and rush hours is already significant to exit the estate - this will be significantly increased. Exit to the Oxford bound A40 at rush hour is already into a standing queue of traffic so this is another issue that will lead to congestion. Opening up of the culdesacs at the bottom of Delbush and Burdell Avenues will essentially turn these quiet residential streets into MAIN ROADS. The impact on both the residents in terms of noise pollution and also pedestrian safety will be significant - our children play out on these streets all the time!!

Noise and light pollution of the estate:

Increased traffic and pedestrian footfall as well as the lights from a new estate will significantly alter the peaceful atmosphere we have - especially in the evening when children are trying to sleep. I am able to see the stars at night over the field and have taught my children many of these constellations by looking out over the field on which development is proposed. Lights will mean this is lost.

Loss of nature and animal habitat:

I personally walk along the public footpath at the bottom of the culdesacs most days with my dog. I find the view restful and peaceful which is important to me as I have significant mental health issues. I have seen red kites, hares, badgers and deer to name but a few in this field during daylight hours. I have also witnessed bats flying around the field at twilight. Being able to be so close to open countryside is a real attraction of this estate and one of the reasons i relocated here. This loss will not only be a personal blow, but will also reduce the appeal of housebuyers in the area - therefore I worry our house prices will fall.

Impact on Sandhills School and local community:

The school is already oversubscribed by Sandhills and Risinghurst residents. The impact of more children within the school boundary may compromise residents in Risinghurst who have moved there with a few to securing a place at Sandhills School not to mention increased traffic for school pickup /drop off. We consider ourselves a village community which is demonstrated by our annual picnic and annual fireworks display. Most residents within the two estates know each other and we pride ourselves on our village feel. This community will be compromised by the addition of more housing.

Legal Implications:

THE LOCAL PLAN IS NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT:

Local Development scheme & timetable:

The LDS relevant to LP 2034 is not publicly available – only version on SODC's website refers only to the LP 2033. This is not compliant with NPPF guidelines. Furthermore Bayswater Farm (BF) was added to the Local Plan late in 2018 and did not have a site-specific assessment during the planning stage.

Consultation:

- o Residents have not been informed or consulted about the plan, including types & density of housing.
- o Vital questions have not been addressed to the City Council, e.g. opening of the cul de sacs at Burdell and Delbush Avenues.
- o Due to the late addition of BF to the Local Plan, this site has not been through section 18 consultation.
- o No consultation has taken place with the Sandhills parish council or residents before the plan was published on 7th January. This is non-compliant with the SODC's own Statement of Community Involvement (June 2017): "We wish to ensure that people are involved at the early stage of Local Plan preparation and in the consideration of planning applications. We want people to feel that they can make a real difference to the future of the areas in which they live and work."

□ National Policy & Legislation:

- o The building of 160-200 houses at BF represents a 60% increase in housing. This goes against the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework)
- o The 3 reasons used by SODC for releasing Bayswater Farm from the Green Belt are flawed:

1. Proximity to Oxford offers 'a high potential for travel by walking and cycling'. The SODC's own transport consultants say that "the A40 is a major physical barrier to connectivity, particularly in terms of walking and cycling.' BF is further on the outskirts than the rest of LNBB. Hence it's potential must be judged similar to the rejected Thornhill site – see below.
2. Potential to connect to the city's public transport system. The Oxford City Council report, "Evaluation of Transport Impacts January 2019", shows that only 27% of journeys in South Oxfordshire are made by public transport or walking/cycling. A proposed release from the Green Belt for a development at Thornhill was rejected by the Council, although it has closer proximity to public transport than Sandhills.
3. Building on BF is part of Oxford's unmet housing need strategy – not required, see below.

THE LOCAL PLAN IS NOT SOUND

- It is not Positively Prepared: No adequate flood risk assessment has been carried out for Bayswater Farm. The Local Plan states "More evidence on ecology is required". Also "appropriate detailed landscape, visual & heritage impact assessments must still be provided".
- Meeting the housing needs: The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) calculations for housing needs in Oxford are 22,775 new homes. The Local Plan includes 28,465 new homes, hence housing at Bayswater Farm is not required.
- Infrastructure: There are no traffic solutions offered – only suggestions such as "a new road connecting to the A40" or "significant enhancements to junctions", e.g. the "Thornhill Park & Ride Junction". An Oxford City Council study estimates 250+ vehicles on Sandhill's roads at peak times due to the Bayswater Field site alone. However, thousands of cars could come through if Sandhills is connected to LNBB.

It is not justified: The development at Bayswater Farm is not required to meet the unmet housing needs of Oxford City; it would remove the only local amenity that Sandhills currently has – the green space which is vital for the wellbeing and health of residents.

THE LOCAL PLAN DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE DUTY TO CO-OPERATE

As set out in SODC's Statement Of Community Involvement they pledge to Cooperate with neighbouring local authorities such as Oxford city council. This has not taken place - this section of the LP should not be adopted.

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.

Remove Bayswater Field from the proposed LNBB plan.

- If it is to be considered it must be assessed as a stand-alone site. A separate timetable and Local Development Scheme must be presented. A full consultation has to be conducted and adherence to National Policies & Legislation has to be made transparent, including the reasons for its removal from the Greenbelt. Furthermore, the plan has to be presented in a sound manner, positively prepared with all assessment results available. A justification provided for the housing need and clear plans presented how the infrastructure might be affected and which plans are in place to mitigate such risks.

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?

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