

# 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:

<b>Title</b>	Mr
<b>Full name</b>	William Gordon
<b>Business / Organisation name (if relevant)</b>	-
<b>Job title (if relevant)</b>	-
<b>Address line 1</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Address line 2</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Address line 3</b>	-
<b>Postal town</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Postcode</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Telephone number</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email address</b>	[REDACTED]

## 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: 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.**

I strongly disagree with this plan for a multitude of reasons. The overarching reason being the entire process reeks of corruption. It is a £1 billion project (for the developers) which is being forced through with vastly exaggerated housing need figures, shortened consultation times, a massive lack of infrastructure and inadequate representation. SODC should be challenged for their absolute disregard for due process and transparency.

**Green Belt-** This plan does not constitute exceptional circumstances for building on green belt. We have a duty to our future generations to preserve our arable land. Our elected government has clearly stated in their manifesto that they are committed to preserving green belt and stand by the original reasons for it being protected. Not to mention the National Policy Planning Framework, published as recently as July 2018, which devotes a whole chapter to green belt protection. The proposed plan will merge two historic villages, and I suspect brings us all closer to the merging of Didcot and Abingdon. Our proximity to London (and train links) lend the potential for it to become a housing estate servicing commuters to central London rather than the fabricated 'Science Vale'. In turn, this will further inflate house prices rather than providing a much needed source of affordable housing. Very few of the recent developments in Oxfordshire have fulfilled their commitments to providing affordable housing by using viability assessments.

**Sustainability-** The land is adjacent to a Heron breeding ground that must be protected at all costs. The proposed plan would submit the breeding pairs to unforetold disruption to their habitat for the foreseeable future. The IPPR published a report today describing the UK as 'one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world'. That alone should make us rethink our senseless encroachment on greenbelt land.

**Infrastructure-** The A415 is at grid lock for much of the day heading in both directions. I strongly suggest the roadways are inspected during term time rather than the SODC's predictable proposal of summer holidays. The development could potentially add up to 6,000 cars to the already substantial problem. SODC have 'linked' this proposal to a further plan to build new bridges and roads, but in actual fact they are two very separate projects that require different funding and approval. Lets see whether the roads and bridges materialise before we throw 3500 more houses (and their inhabitants) at the problem.

**Housing need figures-** the plan clearly states that there is 'significant uncertainty regarding the precise level of unmet need which Oxford City may find'. Enough said- considering all the other objections.

**Inadequate representation-** SODC have not fulfilled their duty to cooperate as they have had very little contact with Culham Parish Council or Abingdon Town Council. The Conservate Council have even gone far as to suspend the Councillors who voted against the plan. It is abhorrent to think that anyone who objects is silenced. Again, I will say that the entire process is corrupt. I would go as far as to recommend that their entire Local Plan should be scrapped and recommissioned.

**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.**

I do not have the resources available to provide a full list of modifications, but I think that STRAT 9 should be removed from the plan and an alternative location sought.

**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

I would like to be added to the database to receive planning policy updates for Vale of White Horse