

Lisa Lawrence



SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

31st January 2019

Re: Policy Strategy 13

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the plans to develop over 160 houses by South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) on the site of Green Belt land at the bottom of Sandhills in the strongest possible terms.

Firstly but quite importantly this development will come under the jurisdiction of SODC when Sandhills is under Oxford City Council. SODC should provide their own access roads in their own jurisdiction if they wish to develop land they own. This development should not rely on access through Oxford City Council owned land.

There are so many negatives to this development that they really cannot be ignored and neither will I let them be ignored; so for the ease of reference and clarity I am listing those that I consider the most important:

1. Sandhills is a small community on a small estate. Sandhills has already been over developed (in my opinion) when land from the former Primary School was sold to developers and built upon. This development took away the communities green fields and land, thus making the existing Green Belt land more important than ever before. To suggest taking away ALL of our Green Belt with a second development is unacceptable.
2. Sandhills has no amenities (no shops, no bus service, and no post office) and this Green Belt area is the **one** area where members of our community can meet, walk, breath in fresh air, enjoy the surroundings and enjoy life. It is essential to have areas like this for good mental health and in an era where mental health is being thought about more than ever before this cannot be ignored. We have NO alternative in Sandhills, nowhere else to walk, nowhere else we can go to relieve the stress and strains of our busy lives. There is absolutely no way that any new commercial developer would be able to build a development without providing such space but SODC want to do this with total disregard for the lives they will affect?

3. Access arrangements for this Development are unacceptable bordering on insane. With no additional access to the first Sandhills School Development cars are queued getting out at the traffic lights in the mornings and afternoons. The pollution is diabolical as cars are stationary at the lights with engines running. You cannot claim that residents could use public transport as Sandhills has none. It takes even someone with no common sense to see that these additional properties are going to have cars and queues to get in and out of Sandhills lights will be unbearable. Again putting strain on existing residents trying to leave the estate to get to work, to appointments, to go shopping etc.

4. Burdell and Delbush Avenues are residential roads and getting up and down them in a car can sometimes be an issue. Existing residents park their vehicles on either side of the road and this makes driving up and down quite problematic. Vehicles are already parking on bends and around corners at the bottom of both roads as there is not enough parking. At the bottom of Burdell Avenue you have to go on the wrong side of the road to turn left back down Merewood Avenue as cars are parked blocking the left side of the road right around the corner. You end up with cars driving on the same side of the road in both directions head on facing. There have been accidents already but luckily none involving personal injury that I am aware of. Now surely this tells you that Sandhills is at maximum development capacity? Emergency vehicles have been known to struggle to get through these roads so how on earth do you expect construction vehicles to go up and down these roads all day, day in and day out? This would cause not only additional unacceptable pollution from exhaust fumes but unacceptable noise pollution to people living in this area but a serious hazard and unacceptable risk of an accident involving other vehicles or even worse involving pedestrians. You cannot allow building to an area without seriously considering the consequences of access.

5. The bridleway at the bottom on Sandhills is protected. It is unacceptable to take away part of the history of Sandhills just to build in an area that does not have the infrastructure to cope. The threat to wildlife and biodiversity that this area offers must be taken seriously. This is the only area, as I have already pointed out, that residents can enjoy. It is beyond belief that SODC think that this is acceptable. Everyone has a right to some shared green space and nature has a place in society; SODC have no right to take away the only feature important to the residents of Sandhills.

6. What will all these additional residents do? They will not be able to enjoy the Green Belt like us existing residents do as their properties will be built on it. Boredom will set in and social problems are known to occur in areas that have no facilities. Everyone wanting a loaf of bread must get in a car and drive to a shop as

Sandhills has nothing to offer. The only thing Sandhills has is our green space, our much loved Green Belt land to enjoy. Taking this away will have a negative and detrimental effect on so many lives and this is not something that can be taken lightly.

7. The Government plans for more housing is not at the detriment of existing communities. We all agree more housing is needed but this is not the site and the application should be thrown out as ill thought through and unsafe. I cannot believe that this application has got to this late stage, progressing this far. There is nothing positive to say about this development other than it provides housing. The benefits are far outweighed by the negatives and serious safety concerns including the mental health of existing residents just cannot be ignored and brushed under the carpet.

Why with such an important issue is it in the final stages of consultation? I knew nothing about this issue until it was brought to my attention by the Risinghurst and Sandhills Parish Council and I would like it noted that I firmly object to this development in the strongest possible terms.



Lisa Lawrence