

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	Anne Churchill Stone
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: STRAT 9

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.

Legal Compliance:

It is not legally compliant because STRAT 9 does not comply with national policy regarding the protection of the Green Belt which only allows for land to be removed from Green Belt restrictions in "exceptional circumstances". I cannot see that there are any circumstances which are exceptional in this case and nor can our MP John Howell, Councillor Sue Lawson, the CPRE or legal advisors who have been consulted. The reasons given by SODC cannot be considered exceptional however positive they may be.

These reasons are that 'the additional land provides an opportunity to deliver housing adjacent to one of the major employers in southern Oxfordshire' and that 'development in this location is at the heart of Science Vale and supports the delivery of much needed significant strategic infrastructure'.

It seems that the creation of new jobs at Culham Science Centre may amount to 600 or so posts which cannot warrant the building of 3,500 new houses. As to the emphasis on the Science Vale, you would think there was no other business but science - what about the multiple hospitals and the many workers, existing and future, who need affordable housing nearer to their workplace? It does not seem that there is any guarantee that the housing will be affordable to local people beyond a token small percentage. Current developments of executive homes around Oxfordshire are already struggling to find buyers. Where do SODC think the people are who will buy these homes that will come with traffic issues ready-made and an inadequate rail service for over 5,000 additional commuters? Culham railway station has a Grade II listed building on it and only 2 tracks - it is not able to meet the demands of a new town, even if Great Western Railways timetable were able to adapt (which seems unlikely). The Plan uses out of date and exaggerated figures from 2014 (SHMA) to calculate housing need instead of revised figures from 2016 which show an annual need for South Oxfordshire of 556 new houses. The figures used to support the Local Plan are 775 which have been further inflated by a minimum of 5690 overall??!! The 3,500 homes planned in STRAT 9 are excessive and thus no exceptional circumstances exist to remove the land from Green Belt status.

"Sound"-ness of plan:

Removing this area (STRAT 9) from the Green Belt would significantly reduce the protection of the countryside in this area and the proposed development goes against the purpose of the creation of Green Belt status to prevent "ribbon" development in that it would link Culham village to Clifton Hampden village.

The future needs of this area and the whole country regarding land use (i.e. removing prime agricultural land, grades 2a and 3) have not been fully considered and this does not comply with Government Policy.

STRAT 9 contradicts STRAT 1 of the plan itself which includes reference to protecting and enhancing the countryside.

The Plan increases the number of houses needed to alleviate Oxford City's unmet need from 3750 to 4950 yet Oxford City's own draft plan states 3750. The Local Plan even states that there is "significant uncertainty" about the 4950 figure which demonstrates that the Plan is unsound.

The current road infrastructure cannot support this huge development. The A415 is already over capacity at peak times. Such an influx of residents as the development would bring would surely result in stand-still traffic. Even if a new river crossing were to be built the traffic would still have to come onto and get off from the A415 resulting in higher toxic emissions and harm to the environment and those intrepid cyclists trying to beat the traffic queues.

Page 55 of the Plan states that the number of houses that can be built before the planned infrastructure is built "needs to be informed by further evidence" - surely this demonstrates that the Plan as it stands is not based upon robust or credible evidence?

Duty of Cooperation:

It seems to me that Abingdon Town Council have not experienced sufficient co-operation. The Plan will affect the town adversely and contribute to its air quality problems.

In October 2017 many people made representation to SODC objecting to the Culham Site. These objections are not being considered now even though reference is made in the Sustainability Appraisal to responses to a 2016 survey - "support for delivering housing adjacent to Culham Science Centre....and respondents suggested that this could go further than just allocating Culham No 1 site." This seems to fly in the face of democratic procedure especially since in 2016 building on Culham No 1 site was discounted due to it having Green Belt status and not meeting the council's preferred criteria.

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.

to remove STRAT 9 entirely
to remove any reference to using Green Belt land for housing developments.

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