

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	Dr
Full name	Jane Alison Cunningham
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

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.

1. Legally compliant

-I understand that councils considering a new strategic allocation of more than 500 buildings have to provide up to date detailed and site-specific assessments on the effects of the development on flood risk (very high, judging by the present state of Bayswater Brook after an unusually dry summer); on trees, views and landscape (being sited on the side of a hill, the development would be visible and oppressive from across the ring road); on air quality (already beside the ring road, plus the extra traffic for 1100 new houses) and thus on human health; heritage and archaeology, (Wick Farm, the Roman Road through Barton, to name but a few; and finally, on transport, in an already overused road network - already a safety hazard for pedestrians and cyclists. Just try getting across the Headington roundabout - by car, cycle or on foot. These required assessments haven't been carried out by SODC - apparently they propose to leave them to the developers - hardly impartial or objective. The proposed link road will soon become a ratrun to avoid the roundabout.

-regarding biodiversity, the removal of green belt status from the areas close to the SSSIs at College Pond and Sydlings Copse is very worrying. In the last consideration of development proposals at Wick Farm and N of Bayswater Brook, the SODC's own ecologists said a detailed assessment should be prepared, and the Council, at that stage, took the recommendations to heart, rejecting the proposal. Leaving it to the developers is an inadequate response, considering the fate of the badgers and their setts in the vicinity of Barton West.

-Regarding the new site, Bayswater Farm north of Sandhills, no flood assessment has ever been made, and in any case the proposal to develop it is too last-minute to have been included in this plan.

SODC's proposals should have been based on proper assessments of the above risks. They have not been carried out and the proposals are therefore non-compliant with, e.g. NPPF para 170

I resent the potential destruction of an environment which gives enormous pleasure to all those who use it, and who derive spiritual refreshment from the fen and the priceless meadowland with its rare orchids in the SSSIs, and the unspoilt agricultural landscape. I regularly walk my dog in the fields - though never in the SSSIs - and would bitterly mourn their loss.

2. Soundness

The proposal is a warning of the destructive nature of the rush for growth that is apparent in the government's and the councils' thinking. The erosion of the Green Belt will enhance Oxford City's desire for expansion - eventually the villages of Beckley, Elsfeld, Stanton St John and Sandhills - and even Shotover and Wheatley, will become part of the city. I can't understand why SODC is lending its support to this plan. Why on earth should it take on the city's 'un-met housing need', when Oxford itself has brownfield sites that it stubbornly refuses to use for housing. Well, I do see why. The government has starved them of money for the last 9 years and in desperation the City Council can only see ££££ signs in business rates. This is dreadfully short-term thinking which, if condoned, will be condemned by future generations. But the figures being used are dishonest. Sometimes it the SHMA assessment of 2014 that is used, and sometimes its more recent adjustment, with lower numbers, and the whole is completely distorted by the ARC proposals, with the unspeakable demand for a million new houses by 2050. GROWTH IS NOT NECESSARILY GOOD, and this idea is utterly mindless. Its impact would be irreversible - it would utterly overwhelm the landscape, communities, infrastructure and services. What has Oxfordshire done to deserve this more than doubling of its housing - currently 280,000, with the unwanted addition of 300,000 houses - except be beyond the M25 and thus not contributing to London's pollution? Nearly a third of these houses are proposed for the Oxfordshire Green Belt. I thought that national planning policy requires councils to release Green Belt for needed housing only after all other options have been explored and if no other land is available on which need could be met. The ARC proposals and those of SODC are speculative. The evidence I have seen so far is unconvincing, and has been undemocratically arrived at. It's not good enough.

The above paragraph shows my opinion of SODC's attempts to comply with the Duty to Cooperate. It is difficult for a layperson to understand the principle underlying this. With whom or what is SODC required to cooperate? With us, the people, in which case I complain about the lack of information about planning proposals, and its lack of transparency? Or with its neighbours, Oxford City Council, for example, in which case it has almost tripped over itself in the rush to do the City's bidding. And in the background hovers the controller of the moneybags, the government, which is unashamed in its bullying and bribery of money-starved local councils. I see why we've got to this dreadful situation. We must prevent it.

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