

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011-2034: January 2019

Name: Mrs Louisa Kippin	Address: [REDACTED]
Telephone No: [REDACTED]	Email: [REDACTED]
Dated: 17.2.2019	

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

<p>Document you are commenting on; with the paragraph number, Strat, or policy to which your comment relates: <i>(use a different row for each paragraph or policy you are commenting on; and add more rows as necessary).</i></p>	<p>I am Objecting / Supporting / or Commenting</p>	<p>My Comments</p>
<p>Policy STRAT 7 Land at Chalgrove Airfield</p>	<p>I do not support STRAT 7 Land at Chalgrove Airfield for a number of reasons</p>	<p>I have lived in Chalgrove for over 20 years and moved to the village due to the fact that I wished to live in a rural, quiet area. Everybody I have spoken to in the village is very worried about how the character of the village will change and I believe that many people would choose to move, in the event of development at Chalgrove Airfield. The change of character is in direct conflict with the following SODC Strategic Objectives:</p> <p>OBJ 1.2 Support rural communities and their way of life, recognising that this is what attracts people to the district.</p> <p>The change of character, for the people of Chalgrove is therefore in direct conflict with the Vision for 2034:</p> <p>“South Oxfordshire will remain a beautiful and prosperous place to live. It will be an attractive place for people to work and spend their leisure time” (Para 3.3) The majority of the residents of Chalgrove commute to other areas to work in order to live in a rural setting. There are no significant jobs in the area itself and Monument Business Park only caters for minor businesses and offices and is not suitable for development for more major work.</p> <p>“Growth will support employment opportunities and deliver regeneration and infrastructure with a focus on delivering housing and employment at Science Vale” (Para 3.5). “The Creative, Cultural, Heritage and Tourism Investment Plan” states that Oxford, Bicester and Science Vale to the south of the county are major growth points for</p>

		<p>research and high tech development.” It states that around 100,000 new homes are needed by 2031. However, it then continues by saying that houses will “need to be developed in locations which provide good access, particularly by public transport, to employment sites in Oxford, and to town centres. It shows Figure 2, a map of the main areas for growth throughout Oxfordshire. It is incredible that 3000 houses have been designated to be built in Chalgrove, since Chalgrove is not within this region and it is difficult to envisage how any change in infrastructure (whilst maintaining a rural community) will be able to support access to this region.</p> <p>At the moment, although proposals have been made for a possible bypass and bypasses around neighbouring villages, these sites have not been secured and it is difficult to understand how any development of infrastructure can possibly link to the major areas of growth outlined i.e. Oxford and the Science Value, without congestion; this is due to the network of villages that surround Chalgrove. Major roads will completely ruin the rural aspect of the whole area. Why spend a huge amount of money digging up the landscape to create major roads, when major roads exist near to the Science Vale and Oxford?</p> <p>OBJ 4.1 Ensure that essential infrastructure is delivered to support our existing residents and services as well as growth.</p> <p>Despite the above objective, there has been no satisfactory proposals for Chalgrove; in fact the removal of the B480 bypass will force all traffic in the area to travel through the new town centre, which will create a rat run through the existing High Street, or the centre of the new town centre, therefore causing all the traffic that currently bypasses the village, to pass directly through it. How can the removal of a bypass do anything but cause huge traffic issues? This is in direct conflict to bypass strategies seen essential for neighbouring villages. Chalgrove is certainly nowhere near proposed transport developments. At the moment, the people of Chalgrove have to deal with significant traffic issues, in order to live in this rural community. Bypasses around neighbouring villages, although necessary, would then ruin the environment around Chalgrove. There would need to be a huge amount of new road infrastructure which would ruin the rural community and not just for the residents of Chalgrove, but for those of other villages also; this could mean a huge number of people all around the area choosing to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>move away. Significant investment (which has not been secured) will be required to even consider this option. This is in direct conflict with:</p> <p>OBJ 3.3 Ensure economic and housing growth are balanced and facilitate sustainable journeys to work.</p> <p>It is ridiculous that the major hubs for work development quoted in the document are so far away from Chalgrove and so inaccessible (due to them being largely accessible only via narrow country lanes) if more residents choose to live in the Chalgrove area. Towns and cities in all directions will be difficult to access, including Oxford, Reading, Didcot, Wallingford, Henley and the Science Vale. Locating overflow houses for Oxford City (and for these other areas) does not support sustainable journeys to work. Even considering Chalgrove as an overflow for housing in the city of Oxford, greater access to the M40 would significantly affect the villages and land between Chalgrove and the M40 and road access surrounding Chalgrove would need to be developed significantly. At the moment, during commuter times and shift change times at the BMW plant, the road is at an absolute standstill at Cowley and journey times are currently horrendous.</p> <p>OBJ 5.2 Support development that respects the scale and character of our towns and villages, enhancing the special character of our historic settlements and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The amount of new houses proposed for Chalgrove, is in direct conflict with the above objective. How does the doubling of the population in Chalgrove support this? The character of Chalgrove is also affected since it is an area of historical and cultural significance, due to the Civil War sites and the Shakespeare Way (LDWA Path); this is also in direct conflict with:</p> <p>OBJ 7.2 Conserve and enhance our rich and varied historic assets and their settings, celebrating these as some of our strongest attributes.</p> <p>The Shakespeare Way does not appear to have been mentioned in documentation, but is used by many who wish to follow ‘a journey of imagination’ (see website); the beautiful landscape will be significantly affected by new developments in Chalgrove.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>It is hard to believe that Chalgrove is still a strategic development site, with the significant flooding problems that the village has encountered over the past few years; any improvements have a great risk of failing under further infrastructure. Development north of the village would significantly increase the water table and significant investment would be required in the Chalgrove Sewerage System, in order to prevent flooding and destruction of properties in the current Chalgrove village. Even following work in Chalgrove to reduce the flooding risk, as a resident in the north part of Chalgrove, I know that we have to continually face significant flooding in our gardens, even with extra 'soak aways' dug. With an increased water table, I expect that water to be coming into houses.</p> <p>In light of the focused emphasis on the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine and the development of infrastructure in this area, the development of housing should surely take place in this area. Considering the emphasis on development of infrastructure in the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine, less funding will be available for roads linking from Chalgrove and for this reason, development should alternatively occur near to existing major roads, which are being developed, such as the A40. Areas that are close to these and the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine (sites 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7) should therefore be the sites that will be used by the people seeking employment in these areas. In fact, a large proportion of people who live in Chalgrove at the moment choose to work away from these areas, towards Buckinghamshire or areas elsewhere along the M40 corridor (including both my husband and I who work in Buckinghamshire!).</p> <p>Building on the site of the airfield used by Martin-Baker is not feasible. The company has stated that they cannot relocate to another suitable airfield and that any housing on this site would not be compatible with their business. It is clear, also, that it is completely dangerous to build houses next to an active runway and explosive handling area. How many people would actually wish to live there? Has this been taken into consideration? In any event, Martin-Baker is a valuable company for UK Prosperity and has no wish to find another area, since its current environment is very suitable for its needs. Why should they be made to find a new area, which, in this current climate, may prove to be impossible?</p> <p>I have not met one person in Chalgrove who is happy at all for further development in Chalgrove to occur. The community of Chalgrove accepted the housing developments already begun, as agreed in the NDP, but any further development changes the community entirely.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The needs of people who choose to live in this rural environment will not be met by the doubling of the community and development of amenities; this is not what they wanted when they moved to the area. The village life will no longer exist; the site will be a town, which does not support the villagers' way of life at all.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Please set out any modifications you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to your comments above.</p> <p>It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested wording of any policy or text as precisely as possible.</p>	<p>See above comments. The SODC needs to take into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The fact that Martin Baker has stated it cannot relocate to another suitable airfield and that housing would not be compatible with their business and will affect the National Security Objective to promote our prosperity; it will also be dangerous to build houses next to the runway. How can a Compulsory Purchase order of the site be deemed a 'necessity' and of 'public interest'? Homes England has not been 'working with' Martin-Baker. - No satisfactory proposals for a change of infrastructure have been made that consider the rural community, as it stands (a new town is built, rather than a village). - The change of infrastructure proposed with increase congestion, rather than decrease congestion and no routes have yet been secured to and from the major areas highlighted for an increase in workforce i.e. Oxford and the Science Vale. Indeed, any change of infrastructure will considerably damage the rural environment and community and will require significant investment. - Local change of infrastructure through Chalgrove will increase congestion. Removal of the B480-bypass is a backward step.
---	--

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

Yes No

Signature [REDACTED] _____

Date: 17.2.2019 _____

(this can be electronic)

Submission Deadline: 5pm on Monday 18th February 2019

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