

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	Mrs
Full name	Alison Gilbert-Smith
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: STRAT9

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 believe the whole plan is unsound and there is no possible way to alter it effectively therefore STRAT 9 Culham should be removed entirely from the Plan. I truly believe this site is unsustainable, due to the hazardous road network at present, new river crossings must take place first, before even one more single car is added to the bulging road system at present. As a [REDACTED] concerned road user I have had to call the police on several occasions when I have seen frustrated drivers jumping out of their cars and entering into very heated conversations with one another when the Culham/ Sutton Courtenay bridge has been blocked and grid lock both ways. Often road users jump the lights at the bridge and then this causes gridlock both ways. Also one single delay on the A34 causes gridlock in our village and neighbouring villages in a 10 mile radius. Please can we reiterate the need that the site needs to be visited in school term time with in school run and commuter times, not after 9.00 and before 2.30pm, nor in the school holidays!

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.

The Governments current policy gives protection of the Green Belt at the highest level. There is evidence of this further in the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) that specifically mentions "Protecting Green Belt".

Under this guidance the Boundaries of the Green Belt can only be changed if there are "exceptional circumstances", fully evidenced and justified" and as the "last resort".

The proposed local plan to be implemented promotes altering the Green Belt in 6 of 7 identified strategic sites. This produces 11,400 houses in the Green Belt. The largest of these being at Culham (STRAT 9), where a new town of 3,500 houses is being proposed. Thus resulting in the largest development in the whole of South Oxfordshire.

Therefore in my view there are "no exceptional circumstances" with this proposal given there are more suitable brown field sites, the policies are contradictory and the evidence shown lacks detailed analysis and research on the actual housing demand with in SODC and the neighbouring Oxford City.

It does not comply with the "duty to co operate" as there has not been adequate contact with Culham Parish Council or Abingdon Town Council. The whole process has been very rushed with key documents not being freely available, it was debated one week before Christmas. As a tiny village community we feel that our voice is not being heard over the bigger establishments, it all feels very badly handled and "steam rolled through" regardless of the communities feelings and comments.

I strongly object at the highest point to the proposed 3,500 houses in Culham on a site which is farmland and removing this land from the Green Belt. The Green Belt is in place to protect towns of special character (Abingdon) and villages (Culham, Clifton Hampden) from merging into one and to protect the countryside for the future generations.

As [REDACTED] Tollgate Road, you must undertake a road study first before commissioning any building works whatsoever. From 7-9 am [REDACTED] road has very heavy traffic and often is in gridlock both ways, sometimes it takes 20 minutes to leave [REDACTED]. This is also the case from 2.30-6pm, trying to get into Abingdon or across Clifton Hampden traffic lights at these peak times is very time consuming and frustrating for all local residents. Often queuing in all directions and now you want to turn Culham into a new town. Swelling the current population of 450 to over 20 times more. Culham is not listed as a Large village within the local plan and falls within the 'Smaller villages' classification. Policy H10 states that a minimum of 500 new homes, will be delivered across all of the smaller villages. The 3,500 proposed at Culham is x7 this suggested minimum target across all Smaller Villages and therefore contradicts the plan. The proposal contradicts the latest National Policy and Housing White Paper. The land is not 'suburban in nature' as quoted in the consultation plan, and at present safeguards the character of Abingdon town, local villages, the countryside and should continue to enjoy protection as Green Belt, with the agricultural land to be preserved and enjoyed for the community and future generations.

The addition of 3,500 new homes would not only cause havoc on the roads but make the area

dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. We are all being encouraged to walk and cycle more and yet this will become an even less attractive option as air quality will become poor with the potential for a further 7,000 more cars on the road (with an average of 2 cars per household). An already busy A415 will become an even more dangerous, noisy and polluted road and this would be irresponsible. Infrastructure is key, another river crossing needs to be implemented first even before a further 100 houses are even built. The bridge following the line of the railway should be built first.

The plans build all around one of our village schools Europa (the old European school). The school catchment covers as far as Oxford and an attractive quality of the school for these children is the rural setting of the school. You are planning to build right up to the school boundary on two sides engulfing it. This area is in the green belt and you will destroy and cause a ribbon effect between villages. Tipping the harmony of the school and village life. Making the school an urban site and making Thame lane a VERY road, for noise and increasing the danger to our children who cross it daily from the car park which is outside of the school parameter.

There is also a huge concern over air and noise pollution caused by the construction of such a development, a new town right up to the parameter of the school. Our poor children will be plagued by the noise and air pollution for many years as they play in the playground and try and learn in their classrooms with the noise right next door.

As an alternative I am in favour of the proposal for the Harrington New Settlement by Junction 7, M40 as it is a very sustainable site, is a green field site, it could take the full housing allocation, has excellent potential transport links to Oxford, High Wycombe and London (Oxford Tube, Wycombe fast train) and would take pressure away from rural network and would not require building in Green Belt and the landowners are willing to build. Harrington could be a proper Town / City and well planned, create an excellent place to live with accessible employment in Oxford, High Wycombe, Marlow. Green Field Sites should be considered before building on designated Green Belt land.

The countryside is key for future generations and we must safeguard historic villages and clean air, once it is gone then we lose it forever. The scale of the plan is out of balance with the whole area and not just Culham. Environmental destruction, further traffic noise and air pollution are the reasons that I oppose this 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?

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