

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 Miss
Full name Cathy Earle
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: STRAT7

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 do not support STRAT7 development at Chalgrove airfield for a number of important reasons:

- Land at Chalgrove airfield is not currently available for development. The current tenant, Martin-Baker Ltd, have expressed their desire to remain on the site to continue their internationally important ejector seat business and would be forced to move if the development goes ahead. Chalgrove Airfield is an active airfield and is not a brownfield site, and consists of 95% grassland which is used for grazing sheep
- The cost of infrastructure is excessive and higher than other sites in the plan with comparable levels of housing numbers. This is not best use of public monies
- The distance to employment locations from Chalgrove will result in a car-based community which will itself result in increased car emissions and, due to the nature of the rural roads in and around Chalgrove, will result in increased traffic problems. The proposal to move the B480 to run through the centre of the new development at 20mph removes the bypass for Chalgrove, at the same time as providing bypasses for neighbouring villages, causing even more vehicles to route through the existing village. There is little or no public transport, with the nearest rail link being 12 miles from Chalgrove. The rural roads in and around Chalgrove are not safe or suitable for cycling or walking
- Sites close to existing employment and infrastructure are better placed to accommodate the unmet housing need in Oxford and the objective to focus housing development in the Science Vale and with the cost of infrastructure being significantly less than Chalgrove developing these sites meets the plan objectives and is better use of public monies.
- Chalgrove Airfield is higher than Chalgrove village and rain run off caused by tarmac and paving will increase the risk of flooding to the existing community
- The Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted and supported by the community at referendum. It includes allocations of 320 homes, this is a sustainable level of development which takes into account the existing setting and character of Chalgrove, which STRAT7 does not.

Q8. 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.

Remove Strat 7 from the Local Plan

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

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:

Policy ENV3: Biodiversity – Non-Designated Sites, Habitats and Species 1

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 support the aim that Development will conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity in the district, that all development should provide a net gain in biodiversity where possible. As a minimum, there should be no net loss of biodiversity. All proposals should be supported by evidence to demonstrate a biodiversity net gain using a recognised biodiversity accounting metric.

STRAT 7 does not apply as the development of 3,000 homes on a site which is currently 95% grassland will result in a negative loss of biodiversity. There is currently a diverse habitat for wildlife on the airfield, including: hare, deer, badgers, foxes and a multitude of birds including bullfinch, yellow hammer, skylark, owls, linnets and many more besides. There is also evidence of bats and otter present in Chalgrove

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.

Remove STRAT7 from the local plan

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?

No