

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034

Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Monday 18 February 2019 to: Planning Policy, South Oxfordshire District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email it to planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk

This form has two parts:

Part A – contact details

Part B – your comments / participation at oral examination

Part A

Are you responding as an: (please tick)

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business or organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> Individual |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|

Due to the plan-making process including an independent examination, a name and contact details are required for your comments to be considered. If you are acting on behalf of another organisation, please provide their details in column one and your company name and contact details in column two.

| | 1. Personal Details | 2. Agent Details (if applicable) |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Title | Mrs | |
| Full Name | Ann Pritchard | |
| Job Title (where relevant) | Parish Council Chairman | |
| Organisation (where relevant) | Chalgrove Parish Council | |
| Address Line 1 | c/o 13 Laurel Close | |
| Address Line 2 | Chalgrove | |
| Address Line 3 | | |
| Postal Town | Oxfordshire | |
| Postcode | OX44 7RE | |
| Telephone Number | 01865 890432 | |
| Email Address | info@chalgrove-parish.org.uk | |

For information on **sharing your details**: please see page 3

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

For comments on the Local Plan, please provide the paragraph or policy to which your comments relates.

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:

Various – please see attached letter from Chalgrove Parish Council.

Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:

(1) are legally compliant

Yes

No

Don't know

(2) are sound

Yes

No

Don't know

(3) comply with the Duty to Cooperate

Yes

No

Don't know

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.

Please see attached letter from Chalgrove Parish Council.

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.

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

Please see attached letter from Chalgrove Parish Council.

Yes

No

* **Please note:** the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the public hearing.

Signature:

(this can be electronic)

Date: 15th February 2019

Sharing your personal details

All comments will be submitted in full to the Secretary of State alongside a submission version of the Local Plan. The Secretary of State will appoint an independent planning inspector, who will carry out an examination of the plan.

Your name, contact details and comments will also be shared with the planning inspector and a programme officer, who will act as a point of contact between the council, inspector and respondents. This means that you will be contacted by the programme officer (and where necessary the council) with updates on the Local Plan. This is required by Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

We have received assurance that the data passed to the planning inspector and programme officer will be kept securely and not used for any other purpose. The inspector and programme officer will retain the data up to six months after the plan has been adopted. South Oxfordshire District Council will hold the data for six years after the plan has been adopted.

Comments submitted by individuals will be published on our website alongside their name only. No other contact details will be published. Comments submitted by businesses and/or organisations will be published on our website including contact details. If you would like to know more about how we use and store your data, please visit www.southoxon.gov.uk/dataprotection

Future contact preferences

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):

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

Further comment: Please use this space to provide further comment on the relevant questions in this form. **You must state which question your comment relates to.**

Please see attached letter from Chalgrove Parish Council.



Chalgrove Parish Council

Friday 15th February 2019

Planning Policy
South Oxfordshire District Council
135 Eastern Avenue
Milton Park
Milton
Abingdon
OX14 4SB

Re: Response to the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034

Dear Sir/Madam,

Foreword

The first draft of the Local Plan has been reviewed due to the uncertainty of the deliverability of Chalgrove Airfield as a strategic site. This has not changed, therefore it would be irresponsible to retain Chalgrove as a prospective strategic site in this version.

Vision and Objectives

We agree that South Oxfordshire should remain a beautiful and prosperous place to live, and that includes the village of Chalgrove.

Strategic Objectives

Objection 1.2 Chalgrove Parish Council support rural communities and their way of life, however Strat 7 will destroy this in the village of Chalgrove.

Objective 1.4 Chalgrove Parish Council agree with the objective and therefore urge that all development is placed closer to the Science Vale, rather than 14-15 miles away and accessed via rural B roads and unclassified lanes.

Objective 2.1 Chalgrove Parish Council welcomes this objective.

Objective 2.2 Chalgrove is a self sustainable and vibrant community with many amenities and is not in need of regeneration.

Objective 2.3 A new town in the centre of green fields does not reflect the special rural character of South Oxfordshire.

Objective 3.1 Development in Chalgrove would close down a major local employer, Martin-Baker Ltd, who would be unable to continue their necessary low altitude ejection seat and explosives testing, and noisy rockets and jets, so close to a town. Please refer to Martin Baker Ltd's response for more clarity.

Objective 4.1 The necessary road infrastructure for this venture would be immense and costly, currently estimated at least £250M, supported by the County Council's response, and is an absolute waste of public money.

Objective 4.2 Encouraging commuting cycling along the narrow lanes and byways, even along the B480 or the A329, is in our opinion dangerously unsafe, especially with the proposed increased traffic.

Objective 5.1 Chalgrove Parish Council agrees that we should build high quality innovative developments in sustainable locations however, Chalgrove is not a sustainable location; we are a vibrant and sustainable community which does not need regeneration.

Objective 6.2 Promises of improved travel connections may not be fulfilled.

Objective 7.2 It is in full view of the AONB from Watlington Hill. The area below an AONB is just as important.

Objective 8.2 The increase in traffic, as most will commute by car, will cause air and traffic pollution – similar to the villages surrounding Chalgrove, street lights will cause light pollution, and runoff from gardens and driveways and a town-full of salted roads will pollute the rare chalk stream that is Chalgrove Brook. The development may be resilient to climate change – its effect on Chalgrove, downhill, will not. Whilst Chalgrove Parish Council supports the minimising of carbon emission in building methods, we feel that this reduction is not strong enough and that we should be aiming towards carbon free communities. Chalgrove is a high flood risk area and we were pleased to see that the plan recognised this.

The Strategy

Strat 1 Chalgrove Parish Council support this strategy, in particular its aim to locate housing development close to employment. Oxford's unmet housing need should be satisfied as close to the city boundary as possible. This will mean that deprived members of the community will have access to all of the agencies that they may require, whereas in the rural areas these agencies are very sparse indeed.

Strat 2 The total number of houses, 28,465, put forward seems inflated when only 22,775 homes are required. This leaves the District open to a future 5 year land supply problem, resulting in speculative planning against which we will have no defence. The rate required is over 1000 new homes per years; at present just over 700 are being built annually.

Strat 5 Chalgrove Parish Council agrees with the increased density on the basis that there would be a higher number of smaller and more affordable housing.

Strat 6 Whilst Chalgrove Parish Council recognise the importance of the Green Belt, we are encouraged to see that South Oxford District Council intend to support Oxford's unmet housing need at sites close to the city, which would be good for employment and amenities. We also welcome the expansion of Berinsfield where outstanding infrastructure and amenities are long overdue.

Strat 7 **Chalgrove Parish Council are strongly opposed to STRAT7** as this will completely destroy the vibrant and sustainable village of Chalgrove. We object to development on the Chalgrove Airfield for the following reasons:

- Strat7 is entirely unsound as the land is not currently available for development.

- Martin-Baker Ltd have made it very clear throughout the Local Plan process that, should the development of Chalgrove Airfield go ahead, they will be forced to leave. Martin-Baker Ltd is a major source of local employment and the only company in the UK to provide ejector seats for the world's air forces. The continued operation of Martin-Baker Ltd conflicts with item 3(ii).
- Chalgrove Airfield is an active airfield, used not just by Martin-Baker Ltd but also:
 - the airfield is used by RAF Benson for landing and hovering practice
 - the airfield is the emergency landing site for the area
 - the airfield is used by the NHS for organ transplant distribution
 - the airfield is used for the distribution of explosives to other agencies
- Martin-Baker Ltd has frequent flights in and out of the airfield and has not agreed to the proposed shorter runway.
- Chalgrove Airfield is not a Brownfield site; it is 95% grass land which is still used as farming land for sheep grazing, as it was before the MOD acquired the land for the WW2 efforts.
- To increase Chalgrove from its current population of approx. 3,000 to the proposed population of approx. 12,000 would require extensive highway work at an estimated £250M, this does not include the cost of acquiring the land required.
- Chalgrove cannot be described as Nimbys as we already have approved planning for an extra 320 homes through the Chalgrove NDP. When compared with our current 1100 homes this is a growth of 29%. The proposal is well in excess of the 15% increase as required for larger villages.
- The proposal is environmentally unsustainable as people would have to travel large distances to work. The current industrial areas in Chalgrove have next to no vacancies for employment.
- The phased development will not sustain a new school and would put pressure on schools in the area.
- Chalgrove Airfield is higher in altitude than Chalgrove village and would require immense expenditure to ensure that the surface water would not increase the risk of flooding in Chalgrove which has been affected many times in recent years and in the past. The run off from the airfield site already affects the village and will be worse if the site is developed. Diverting the water to the west of Chalgrove will flood Stadhampton.
- Homes England proposes to build bypasses for Watlington, Cuxham, Stadhampton, Chiselhampton and Benson, but to redirect the B480 through the proposed new town and, in doing so, take away Chalgrove's bypass. This makes absolutely no sense to the people of Chalgrove. You can not build a new town on one rural B road.
- It is futile to expect all traffic moving east-west or west-east to move through the new town at 20mph and commuters will likely use the High Street in Chalgrove causing gridlock.
- Modern times require a rail network link. All other towns are close to a rail network link whereas Chalgrove is at least 10 miles away.

Strat 10 Chalgrove Parish Council fully supports the regeneration of Berinsfield, welcomed by its inhabitants.

Strat 11 Chalgrove Parish Council welcomes development at Grenoble Road due to its proximity to the centre and the facilities, amenities, and social support that it offers.

Response to the Sustainability Appraisal

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | <i>"To help to provide existing and future residents with the opportunity to live in a decent home and in a decent environment supported by appropriate levels of infrastructure."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate levels of infrastructure for an isolated new town would be very costly, and an inappropriate use of public money. • The level of infrastructure proposed is inadequate, with some land safeguarded for bypasses, and some bypasses mentioned without any land safeguarded. • Rated in SA as ✓ but should be X |
| 2 | <i>"To help to create safe places for</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no plans mentioned for any police station |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <i>people to use and for businesses to operate, to reduce anti-social behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime."</i> | <p>(nearest in Cowley 10 miles away) or fire station (nearest is a volunteer station in Watlington) and the nearest ambulance station is at the JR Hospital 12 miles away. Two First Responders (unpaid volunteers) can fill the time gap in Chalgrove, but cannot cover a whole town. To add a population this size to such an outlying area is to court danger. Homes England (HE) had not consulted with the emergency services, as at their last visit to Chalgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan discusses 'a safe place' which would be unachievable due to the activities undertaken on the Airfield site with Gloster Meteors flying overhead, ejection seats being operated and the testing of explosives. • Rated in SA as ✓ but should be X |
| 3 | <i>"To improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreation, cultural, and community facilities and services."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are inadequate public transport connections and limited commitment from HE to provide anything but convenience stores. • The Commissioning Group report that the Chalgrove Surgery would have to close to pay for new Health Centre in the new town. This would be a considerable uphill walk for those without their own transport, especially for the elderly and the sick. • We have been informed that any new health centre would not be built until later in the development which means that the current facility would be overloaded. • Rated in SA as ✓✓ but should be 0 |
| 4 | <i>"To maintain and improve people's health, well-being, and community cohesion and support voluntary, community, and faith groups."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above, there is no advantage to health, and the village of Chalgrove is to be subsumed into the new town on the HE plans. • The Chalgrove volunteer hospital transport group, already stretched, would be bogged down in Health Centre shuttle services, which would be unsustainable. The group is needed for transporting people to Hospitals in Oxford and elsewhere. There are no social services or agencies available in rural villages which may be required for the Oxford overflow. • Rated in SA as ✓✓ but should be 0 |
| 5 | <i>"To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds especially water, air, soil and noise pollution."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to isolated nature of the proposed site, Strat 7 would increase traffic pollution, water contamination, noise pollution, and light pollution in a dark area. Neighbouring villages of Watlington and Little Milton already have air quality monitoring; this would soon apply to Chalgrove as well. • A new town full of salted roads will pollute the rare chalk stream that is Chalgrove Brook. • Rated in SA as X but should be XX |
| 6 | <i>"To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need to travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to travel by car would unlikely be overcome by a sparse, rural bus service. • Many residents would be London or Heathrow commuters seeking cheaper housing, thus increasing |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | <p>the length of the commute. The length of the commute to Oxford for the unmet need is considerable, through country lanes. The cost of added infrastructure has already risen to over £200M. The country lanes can not support extra usage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rated in SA as ✓ but should be X |
| 7 | <i>“To conserve and enhance biodiversity.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is much wildlife on the proposed site and within Chalgrove. We have evidence of otters, which have not been taken into consideration. • This has insufficient data to be rated. Similarly Little Milton Nature Reserve has been omitted from Appendix 9. |
| 8 | <i>“To improve efficiency in land use and to conserve and enhance the district’s open spaces and countryside in particular those areas designated for their landscape importance, minerals, biodiversity and soil quality.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SA description is erroneous. The proposed site is not flat, low-lying land. The ground is a hump, draining downhill South to Chalgrove and North to Haseley, and it lies above the ancient village of Chalgrove. • Much of the security fencing is out of sight behind hedging or beyond fields. The sheds are in one corner near the Business Park. • It is rated x x/✓✓ but no mention is made of the fact that it is central to the view from the top of Watlington Hill in the AONB, and what is generally perceived on passing the occasional ground level view is the sheep peacefully grazing. It should be rated xx for the loss of view from AONB and perhaps ✓ for the small brown field area which is the fully practical emergency runway and peri-track for emergency vehicles, all to be dug up. We see no peri-track for emergency vehicles on HE’s plan. |
| 9 | <i>“To conserve and enhance the district’s historic environment including archaeological resources and to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and reinforces local distinctiveness.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aside from the matter of the Battlefield, which is thoroughly dealt with by the statutory authority elsewhere, the ancient Village of Chalgrove will be subsumed by the town, with no separating bypass remaining, and the heart undoubtedly cut out of the village as Post Office, shops, surgery, and pharmacy are removed in due course, robbing the village of its local distinctiveness. • Rated in SA as x x/? but there is no way that this development would do anything but destroy the local distinctiveness, therefore should be rated xx / xx |
| 10 | <i>“To seek to address the causes and effects of climate change by: e) securing sustainable building practices which conserve energy, water resources and materials; f) protecting, enhancing and improving our water supply where possible g) maximizing the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources; and h) ensuring that the design and location of new</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the plans of HE, three years so far in the making, there is no mention of renewable energy sources on site; Chalgrove has two solar farms that are hidden away out of view. See flooding section for potential dangers caused by flooding from this inappropriate location due to increasingly violent rainfall resulting from climate change. • SA rates it at ✓ , but it is a negative on location X. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <i>development is resilient to the effects of climate change.”</i> | |
| 11 | <i>“To reduce the risk of, and damage from, flooding.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only run-off is mentioned in the commentary, which will be much increased by concreting over the vast expanse of meadow, and if it were to be able to be diverted away from Chalgrove, it would only go downstream and flood Rofford, possibly Haseley, and Stadhampton, which is already threatened by plans to build a bypass over its water-meadows thereby exacerbating its flooding. • No mention is made of the airfield’s springs and underground culverts installed during the war, or of how all this water is also to be diverted away from Chalgrove and into other villages. • Rated in SA as ✓✓/XX but as the natural state of the land is not known, due to wartime drainage, the potential is less certain so should only be rated as ✓/XX at best. |
| 12 | <i>“To seek to minimise waste generation and encourage the reuse of waste through recycling, compost, or energy recovery.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount of contaminated waste land that will have to be extracted from an untreated war-time American base will considerably add to the bulk of waste to be disposed of. • Rated in SA as ✓✓ but should be X . |
| 13 | <i>“To assist in the development of: e) high and stable levels of employment and facilitating inward investment; b)a strong, innovative and knowledge-based economy that deliver high-value-added, sustainable, low-impact activities; c)small firms, particularly those that maintain and enhance the rural economy; and d) thriving economies in our towns and villages.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin-Baker Ltd’s written and spoken statements have made it clear that should this development be permitted, a major local employer, and highly respected, hi-tech, innovative company of international importance will be forced to leave. • There is not only the noise of the Meteor jets, and clients’ aircraft mentioned in the commentary, but also the explosive tests, and the actual air-born ejections. It is not practical or safe to have these in close proximity to a densely populated town. • Rated in SA as 0 but should be XX . |
| 14 | <i>“To support the development of Science Vale as an internationally recognised innovation and enterprise zone.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctly rated at 0 since it has no connection with the Science Vale, or any of the policies related thereto. |
| 15 | <i>“To assist in the development of a skilled workforce to support the long term competitiveness of the district by raising education achievement levels and encouraging the development of the skills needed for everyone to find and remain in work.”</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village primary school will be overwhelmed by the 320 extra homes that have been permitted in Chalgrove through the Chalgrove NDP, and will not be able to support the early years of this development until it is big enough to support a primary school. • The population increase proposed should generate a great number of people seeking technical/trade training for which there is no provision and for whom there will be inadequate public transport to relevant training centres. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rated in SA as 0 but should be X as the multiple disruptions to children's education in the early years will be damaging. |
| 16 | <i>"To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the old village of Chalgrove, HE are determined to turn the High Street, where most of the listed houses are, into a rat-run, including the Conservation Area, by removing the bypass (B480) which protects the listed cottages from the shaking of the HGVs that currently avoid the village by using this route. Tourists will take no pleasure in standing back to look at the thatched cottages with HGVs squeezing past the narrow pavements. The Grade 1 listed Manor House, and the Grade 2 listed Mill are opposite each other on a narrow lane which is to be the most direct route to the Science Vale, should any new resident or business choose that destination. Rated in SA as 0 but should be X at best. |
| 17 | <i>"Support community involvement in decisions affecting them and enable communities to provide local services and solutions."</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A long and costly 'consultation' process with HE has already been totally ignored. There is no point in supporting involvement if plans are already determined. Local solutions generally require volunteers, and already we are suffering from volunteer fatigue – so much must be done by so few, and mostly the retired. |

In total, negative points in the commentary are ignored in the scoring, and some facts not entered, all of which serve to skew the scores, as required by SODC to get STRAT 7 through. It is still peppered with inaccuracies, though not as gross as the invented bus services etc. in the previous iteration – for example Chalgrove has no gross shortage of allotments. The Sustainability Appraisal is supposed to be the objective data collection upon which the Plan is based. It is flawed when assessing the Chalgrove Airfield site.

Yours faithfully,



Cllr. Ann Pritchard

Chairman

Chalgrove Parish Council