

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	Mr
Full name	Roger Bernard Derbyshire
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: Local Plan STRAT6

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.

I strongly support the proposals to include Culham, Berinsfield, Grenoble Road, Northfield, Wheatley and Bayswater Brook as Allocated sites for development to achieve OBJ1. It seems very sensible to provide housing close to the point of need (Oxford City and Science Vale).

Although development in these areas will have an impact on Green Belt I am convinced that the broader aspects of OBJ7 are delivered better by minimising development in existing countryside outside the Green Belt and maximising development close to existing travel and other supporting infrastructure, thereby helping to achieve OBJ3 by reducing commuting distances in particular.

I remain to be convinced that inclusion of Chalgrove as an Allocated site helps achieving OBJ3 and I think it would actually be contrary to OBJ7 with the sole exception of not requiring Green Belt land.

In summary, I believe that there are indeed special circumstances to support the alteration of the Green Belt as proposed in the Plan in order to deliver the Plan's broader objectives. In particular I believe a compromise to OBJ7 delivers better overall with respect to OBJ3.

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?

Yes

Page 9: Part B - your comments

Q12. 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: Local Plan STRAT7

Q13. 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		

Q14. 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.

I object strongly to the inclusion of STRAT7 in the Plan primarily because it lacks all the necessary travel infrastructure required to justify its inclusion in the Plan - i.e. to deliver unmet housing need for Oxford City and the Science Vale. In addition I believe that STRAT7 is contrary to a number of other objectives in summary:

OBJ 1.2 Supporting rural communities

OBJ 1.4 Supporting the Science Vale

OBJ 3.2 Minimising commuter distances

OBJ 4.2 Sustainable transport

OBJ 5.2 Respecting scale and character of towns and villages

OBJ 6.1 Respecting Neighbourhood Plan

OBJ 8.2 Minimising carbon emissions

I have a major concern over the ability to provide the road network to support this site - despite some land being allocated for bypasses I note that such land has yet to be identified for the pinch points of Stadhampton/Chislehampton and Cuxham. This contravenes OBJ 4.2.

Q15. 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.

I suggest that STRAT7 is removed from the Plan as the site is not fit for the purpose implicit in its Allocation.

Q17. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q18. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

Yes

Page 11: Part B - your comments

Q19. 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: Local Plan STRAT11

Q20. 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			

Q21. 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.

I am encouraged by the inclusion of Grenoble Road as an Allocated site as it seems an obvious site for development to provide for the unmet housing need for Oxford City and has already got transport links to help provide housing need for the Science Vale. It thereby satisfies OBJ 1.3 and 1.4 and OBJ 4.2.

I accept that in using Green Belt land at first sight this appears contrary to OBJ 7.1 but I strongly believe that the bigger picture has to be taken into account here and that more countryside will be saved from development by maximising use of sites such as Grenoble Road where the transport infrastructure is already in place. I would argue that the inclusion of Grenoble Road as an Allocated site actually helps achieve OBJ7.

Q22. 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.

n/a

Q24. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q25. 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