

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	stuart kenneth howard
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: Policy STRAT 13: Land North of Bayswater Brook

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 Consider the LP to be legally compliant with NPPF guidelines as it was rushed using Section 19 (6wks) rather than the expected Section 18 which I am aware gives the public a longer period of time to evaluate and comment on the assessment to the site at Bayswater Brook. This site was added to the LP late in 2018 with NO site specific assessments and has not been through full consultation (Section 18) and therefore again does not comply with the guidelines set out in NPPF. NO consultation whatsoever was offered and hearing about this just 2 weeks ago sets off alarms! WHY take more Green Belt?

This is the only house we have lived in and made our home for nearly a 1/4 century. We bought it for the no thru road aspect, reputation, safety, countryside to enjoy with the family and we have already lost green belt with the Terrett Avenue development.

I believe there is insufficient evidence in your plan to justify creating a rat run, increase an already busy entrance to the estate due to the school traffic and further polluting our air quality when you are considering removing more green belt from us and our community.

The councils are FAILING in its obligations to avoid these unnecessary developments in respect to safeguarding the importance of Green Belt land. (Minister for Housing)

Without the required assessments how do the council believe they are being" legally compliant?"

No information has been offered on TYPES of housing, #'s, DENSITY, SCHOOLING, GPS, INFRASTRUCTURE, ECOLOGY or DELIVERABILITY & by failing to offer the latter the council have reduced the usefulness of the statutory consultation process for this allocation and potential threat to GREEN BELT.

"Without the above assessments the council can not demonstrate the deliverability of LNBB" as stated by the Chief Planner in the Scrutiny Committee in December 2018.

Head of SODC Planning stated 13/12/18 that "there was more need for evidence on Ecology. There is significant RISK about the ability to demonstrate the deliverability of strategic allocation

Sandhills residents have the right to enjoy what little countryside there is remaining in our community for our well being and quality of life. The Ecology and ancient remains discovered in this area of natural beauty are of some heritage value to Oxford. There would be significant and irreversible harm to biodiversity in Conservation Target Area too

Neither SODC or OCC have considered the combined effects of how new roads needed might effect Sandhills residents or those in neighbouring wards with an already aggravated and congested amount of traffic and damaged roads. Has the council approached bus and rail networks to see if this LP is attainable and manageable?

No proposals have been offered in plan for mitigating these negative impacts either on LNB nor nearby communities.

SODC has not gathered sufficient quantity or quality of evidence of assessments to justify and support the selection of this site as being a strategic location to develop. Surely this site is also a flood risk and detrimental to wildlife too. If houses and roads are developed on this Bayswater Brook site will that have an impact on the residents in the lower part of Sandhills with raised flooding after completion and insurance risks raised?

No I do not believe that proposed development of Bayswater Brook is:-
Legally Compliant, Sound or Compliant with the Duty to Cooperate!

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 would like to see the LP2034 and the Bayswater Brook option to be removed completely from your plan and if you insist on continuing to develop at the foot of our community then please propose a separate timetable and Local Development Scheme to present with full pledge to cooperate with neighbouring local authorities, which has NOT taken place to date and therefore is another Failure from SODC to comply with the Statement of Community.

According to SHMA calculations the LP shows 6000 excess homes extra so is Bayswater Brook necessary?

Has the Council considered other brown belt sites or sustainable areas which might already have infrastructure in place to cope?

Rescind the Bayswater Brook Plan to develop and keep Residents' including me, very happy to not have our neighbourhood or community spoilt so we can thrive and grow old in the environment we love with our Green Belt and family.

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