

## Objections/alterations to SODC LocalPlan 2011-2034

I have many concerns about chapter 4 and most of the STRAT policies.

**STRAT1** Please remove or edit 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point. There are far too many sites. It doesn't take account of STRAT5 with its increased densities which should imply that either fewer sites are needed or the sites can be smaller or a combination of these. But there is no evidence of this.

**STRAT2** The numbers of houses are too big and based on out of date data.

The committed components of housing supply numbering 15,726 (= completions April 2011 – March 2018 plus commitments as at 30 September 2018 of 11,362) well exceeds the standard method as per NPPF. So there is an argument for saying that none of the strategic sites listed in STRAT1 are needed.

The SHMA figures used are now more than 5 years old and so probably out of date. Indeed the figures derived from the updated SHMA commissioned by Oxford City for their Local Plan are considerably lower than those being used in SODC's Local Plan for Oxford's unmet need. At the very least, inclusion of sites in the Green Belt around Oxford should be conditional upon having up to date figures for Oxford's unmet need.

**STRAT6** Green Belt - Where is point 2?

Point 3 should either be removed altogether or at least edited to remove references to STRAT12, STRAT13 & STRAT14 (dependent upon having up to date figures for Oxford's unmet need.

It is interesting to note that "amendments to the Green Belt made by the Wheatley Neighbourhood Development Plan must be in compliance with the requirements of the NPPF". Why shouldn't the amendments to the Green Belt advocated in the SODC Local Plan also comply with the NPPF?

Very scant justification is provided for the removal of so many large areas from the Green Belt. I think it is very dangerous to advocate such major alterations to the Green Belt here with such poor evidence of need.

I suggest adding another point advocating providing new green belt land to compensate if any is removed.

Remove **STRAT7**. Land at Chalgrove Airfield is **Non-deliverable**. Martin Baker don't want to go and will resist compulsory purchase. At the very least this causes a timing issue and it is quite likely that it won't happen. SODC shouldn't displace a good exporting firm. Shouldn't we keep some airfields in southern England?

Chalgrove is a very unsustainable location. There are no railways, no cycle routes and very poor roads (apart from the one which it is proposed to remove as it passes through the proposed site!) When the NPPF urges taking note of climate change it does not make sense to build a new town without a railway. Maybe the site could be connected to the rail system by a new route joining the track at Chinnor and from there to Princes Risborough and hence to London?

The site is visible from AONB. (We need to protect setting of AONB – development will be contrary to NPPF 170a,172?)

**STRAT9** Culham - Modify. It is sensible to have housing near these important employment sites & a railway station but the area to be removed from the Green Belt is much too big. Maybe leave out land north of Thame Lane? Certainly all land bordering the Thames should be left in the Green Belt.

**STRAT10** Berinsfield. We have been lead to believe that the residents of Berinsfield are happy with the extra development providing they get a number of other benefits. But the area identified with STRAT10 should be modified.

Leave out land in the parish of Drayton St Leonard (unless they are happy with it being removed from the Green Belt in which case it probably makes sense to alter the parish boundary)

Add in an extra strip of land around the north west to accommodate a road (and a strip of development to pay for it!) joining the new site to the A4074.

Boundaries with the Green Belt should be discernible physical features as per the NPPF (not just field boundaries)

STRAT11 Grenoble Road if it is retained must have a condition requiring passenger services on the Cowley rail line. It is a large site and with the densities specified in STRAT5 should have room for more homes than stated if Oxford's needs demand it.

STRAT12 & STRAT13 Remove. Not needed for housing. Protection of Green Belt very important here. STRAT13 particularly bad from flooding & ecological points of view. Sites not particularly well connected to Oxford City because of need to cross the ring road. And I am sure you will receive many more detailed reasons from local residents as to why these areas should not be developed.

In STRAT14 it is not necessary to remove the site from Green Belt. Oxford Brookes site can be redeveloped as brownfield land without its removal. No convincing reasons are given for removal. Safer to leave it in!