

**South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011-2034: January 2019**

<b>Name:</b> Ben Gooding	<b>Address:</b> [REDACTED]
<b>Telephone No:</b> [REDACTED]	<b>Email:</b> [REDACTED]
<b>Dated:</b> 18 Feb 2018	

Due to the plan-making process including an independent examination, a name and contact details are required for your comments to be considered.

**Do you consider the Local Plan and supporting documents:**

1. are legally compliant      Yes       No       Don't know
2. are sound      Yes       No       Don't know
3. comply with the Duty to Cooperate      Yes       No       Don't know

<b>Document you are commenting on; with the paragraph number, Strat, or policy to which your comment relates:</b> <i>(use a different row for each paragraph or policy you are commenting on; and add more rows as necessary).</i>	<b>I am Objecting / Supporting / or Commenting</b>	<b>My Comments</b>
STRAT 1: Clause 4.14 The Overall Strategy	Supporting	The UK has a housing shortage, Oxford need to be able to expand to accommodate this need. Oxford has good transport infrastructure. Most jobs are found within cities so it makes sense that new building projects are situated in or very close to Oxford to reduce commuter journeys. Planning for future traffic and transport issues must be top priority. Shorter journeys to work makes for happier people, it's better for the environment and

		<p>makes business sense.</p> <p>There was a fallacy put about at the last Chalgrove airfield planning proposal, that the internet allows more and more jobs to be done from home. I work in the IT sector and I think this is only partly true, companies allow some home working, but expect employees to travel to work for the majority of the time. Quite a few job adverts now stipulate that home working is not allowed. So, building houses near employment is a must.</p>
<p>STRAT 6 The Green Belt</p>	<p>Supporting</p>	<p>The Green Belt was originally put in place to stop urban sprawl. I don't see expanding Oxford as "sprawl" if it is a well planned development. City living is green due to shorter journeys for work/shopping/leisure activities, especially with existing transport infrastructure such as buses; trains and cycle paths. Building houses a distance from the city means building more roads and having more people commute further distances, which is simply not green. The green belt pushes city house prices up. I like the idea of the green belt in principle, we shouldn't just build everywhere, but in reality these areas, just outside cities aren't always lush forests teeming with nature. A well developed housing project can bring green spaces into the city. Expanding cities means we are less likely to want to build on the wider countryside.</p>
<p>STRAT7 Land at Chalgrove Airfield</p>	<p><b>Objecting</b></p>	<p>The proposal here really is "<i>urban sprawl</i>", turning a small rural village into a mid-size commuter town, albeit with no transport infrastructure. Chalgrove, does not have railway station, it has poor bus links and is connected to neighbouring towns and villages with winding country B-roads. The B-roads that feed our village and surrounding beautiful villages like Cuxham will be heavily congested, even with the handful of extra small bypass roads that have been proposed. (The B4009 running through Watlington is already a bottleneck). An extra 3000 houses means at least an extra 6000 more cars and the new residents will almost certainly be commuters. There will also be a increase in traffic heading into Chalgrove: teachers driving in to the new schools, supermarket and Amazon delivery drivers. It is naïve to think that the new Chalgrove town will be a self-</p>

	<p>contained community with everyone walking or cycling to work or working from home (as the last design proposal implied). The reality is that in an isolated rural setting like Chalgrove, the car is essential. Oxford currently has unmet housing needs, Chalgrove is not well positioned to help meet its demands without additional A-roads connecting it. I'd like to address the issue of <i>"Nimbyism"</i>. The residents of Chalgrove overwhelmingly voted in favour of <i>"The Neighbourhood Plan"</i> which means that an additional 320 houses will be built in Chalgrove. This is a 30% increase to the size of Chalgrove far exceeding the 15% growth that is asked of towns and villages. The proposal to build on Chalgrove airfield would mean that Chalgrove expands by an enormous 300%.</p> <p>I believe that the sum total of all the proposed developments far exceeds the number of houses required by Oxford. This raises the question as to why forcibly remove <i>"Martin Baker"</i>, one of only two companies in the world that make ejector seats. Why needlessly kill off a highly specialized, world-renowned, profitable business? I found the answer questioning one of the project engineers at the last Chalgrove development presentation: <i>"The MOD sold the land to Homes England for a pound"</i>. It's all about money, development would be cheap, there's profit to be made here. It's very short sighted though, talking to military persons at Benson, Chalgrove airfield is still used by the air-force, they land Chinook helicopters in the airfield and the RAF's emergency landing strips in case of an issue at Benson would be Chalgrove.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal for developing on Chalgrove airfield should be rejected: It is not required if other sites are developed; it will have a negative transformative effect on Chalgrove changing its character from a small community village into commuter town; it will require forcibly removing a profitable world-renowned specialised business; it will mean a huge increase in traffic passing through neighbouring towns and villages; I can't see any winners other than those that stand to make a monetary profit.</p>
--	--

--	--	--

<p><b>Please set out any modifications you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to your comments above.</b></p> <p><b>It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested wording of any policy or text as precisely as possible.</b></p>	<p>The plan is good if Chalgrove airfield is removed from the proposal.</p>
---	---

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

Yes  No

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

*(this can be electronic)*

Date: 18-Feb-2019

**Submission Deadline: 5pm on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

Send to SODC Planning Department via email to [planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk) or by post to Planning Policy, SODC, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB.

