

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	Ms
Full name	Michelle de la Motte
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: SODC LOCAL PLAN 2034 - 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.

STRAT 9, throughout its points, appraisals and 'summary of findings' acts in complete contradiction to itself on numbers of levels.

It is already accepted at SODC level, and in numerous reports that development of infrastructure in the area will be detrimental to not only the existing infrastructure, ecosystem and sustainability.

The area is already under severe lack of finance and council maintenance, with pot holes, flooding, badly maintained verges, broken street lighting, congestion, dangerous cycle paths and speeding cars (when not in traffic jam conditions).

The Abingdon road has already claimed numerous lives due to its bad design and blind spots and increasing the traffic load will exponentially increase the danger to road users, cyclists and pedestrians.

The green belt issue remains of paramount concern, and despite being illegal to develop on, has been investigated to be home to wildlife and flora/fauna that exists on the protected list and/or subject to conservation. Coupled with the fact there is more than adequate brown site locations identified for development, it beggars belief why areas of natural beauty and ecological sanctuary need to be recklessly destroyed to make way for dwellings and residents that will not gain much in place or position. Coupled with the fact the increase in road traffic, pressure on already struggling rail networks, inadequate public transport and a necessity for cars, would detrimentally increase the pollution levels.

Previous investigations and consultations have already shown the results of the STRAT 9 proposal to be unviable, unnecessary and ecologically unsound, yet it returns for another airing - it would appear this policy is designed to line someone(s) pocket, or to placate an agreement that has been made unjustly and as such is being pushed through in order to make good on an agreement that isn't in the public or environmental interests - we'd like to know who benefits from this STRAT 9 policy, and why previous and past independent investigations and rulings are constantly being ignored and pushed to the side so new and repetitive proposals can be submitted - all of which fail to acknowledge the issues and petitions and valid concerns (none of which have changed - as no new mitigating factors have been proposed) have raised.

There is nothing about STRAT 9 that makes sense - it contradicts itself, it proposes damaging results and it guarantees the infrastructure in the area is detrimentally affected as no viable road, rail or public transport mechanism is proposed to placate it. It will overwhelm the existing areas with traffic congestion, pollution and overstretch resources currently already at critical mass.

Investment in the existing area and the infrastructure should be the primary call to action - not building wantonly without due diligence and understanding the negative impact this shortsighted proposal entails - the irony is that these shortcomings are already identified and acknowledged by SODC, yet they continue to ignore their own evidence and plough on trying to plough up Oxfordshire.

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