

Comments on chapters 7-11

Generally speaking I do not disagree with the sentiments behind the policies in these chapters. However, **noting the requirement for compliance with the NPPF**, in particular for these chapters its stance on sustainability and the need reduce climate change, I do feel that that some of the policies could be more strongly worded. The plan is “full of nice words but with no teeth.”

For example, TRANS2, promoting sustainable transport and accessibility should certainly be a priority. So in i) bus and rail services *should* be promoted and strengthened rather than *can be*. And in ii) planning positively for rail improvements is all very well but we need delivery. If the Grenable Road and Northfield sites are developed it is essential that the railway line is re-activated for passenger traffic. And development at Chalgrove makes no sense with regard to NPPF paragraph 102 without some form of rail transport (maybe an electric tramway into Oxford or a rail route to Lewknor and hence Chinnor, Princes Risborough and London?) And provision of safe walking and cycling routes most definitely needs a step change to improve. Much of South Oxfordshire away from the Chilterns is relatively flat and is ideal for cycling as a form of transport. But some people won't cycle unless they think it is safe to do so. Improved cycling provision so that more people cycle to work should improve our air quality. TRANS3 is very road focussed. What about water transport? Why not dredge Moor Ditch from the Thames into Didcot to provide a navigable canal? The towpath would make an ideal cycle route. Developers could recoup any investment in contributing towards this work from the added value to houses along the route from being beside water. A canal would provide good drainage for the area. The route is fairly flat so probably only 1 lock at the entry to the Thames in Long Wittenham would be needed.

TRANS5 has many good points. I just hope it is strictly enforced. Can the wording be strengthened in any way?

And I would suggest that all of the STRAT policies are assessed in terms of their compliance with the TRANS policies and with the NPPF because Chalgrove (STRAT7) certainly isn't.

INF2 is to be welcomed.

Shouldn't INF4 on water resources require consideration and use where possible of rainwater harvesting/grey water systems?

Again, I would suggest that all of the STRAT policies are assessed in terms of their compliance with the ENV policies (particularly 1-4) as STRAT13 certainly seems to fall short.

To facilitate ENV8 it would be useful if SODC could resume its programme of carrying out Conservation Area Character Appraisals.

In EP3 I would like an additional point :

1.iv) where garden space of more than x square metres is planned, composting facilities of a suitable size should be provided.

Take advice from WRAP on the value of x. In its simplest form a compost bin of a sensible size could be provided in each back garden.

In EP4 it would be better if the Environment Agency's flood maps were of a more credible standard.

In EP5 have another point:

3. When minerals are to be extracted, consideration should be given to their onward transport by rail or water rather than by road.

(It is also worth saying that if people don't like gravel extraction then they shouldn't use gravel for paths and drives!)

The DES policies need to be much more cognizant of the NPPF requirements on climate change.

So DES3 should have another point:

2. . a description and any relevant calculations on its attempt to build to whole life zero carbon standards. (or words to that effect)

and DES4 should have another point:

vii) Climate Change considerations have been incorporated. (We should for example be requiring that as many buildings as possible have south facing roofs and that these have solar panels on them)

DES* 1.i) needs updating on densities.

DES9 should be strengthened and remove the reference to "nationally adopted standards as these are usually rather tardy in coming forward. We should be ahead of the game not hanging on behind!

DES10 should also require that schemes for renewable & low carbon energy generation make efficient use of the land put forward. So, for example, if there are to be fields of solar panels or wind turbines, are these sufficiently clear of the ground that animals could graze underneath them? Or would the solar panels be more usefully put on the roof of a storage facility or some other building?

I am pleased to see CF1 which I hope will safeguard our community facilities. Hopefully we shall see fewer Pubcos putting incompetent

managers into their pubs with the intention of running them down to make a case for non-viability!

CF3 should also include the wordsbe accessible on foot and by bike.

CF5 should also make provision for safe access by pedestrians and cyclists.