

# 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** Mrs  
**Full name** Nancy Lee  
**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 1/The Overall Strategy/Clause 4.14

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 think the overall strategy of the local plan is OK. The plan talks about the need to focus development near to proposed employment growth which I support.  
I also think the decision to locate strategic development to meet Oxford's unmet housing need close to the city in order to take advantage of existing infrastructure and opportunities for regeneration is a sound.  
If housing locations are close to employment it will help reduce the distances workers have to commute which will in turn help sustain developments.

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?

Yes

## Page 9: Part B - your comments

Q12. 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 1/The Overall Strategy/Clause 4.14

Q13. 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			

Q14. 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 support the aims of STRAT4, particularly in regard to ensuring supporting infrastructure is provided in a timely manner.

Q17. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q18. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

Yes

## Page 11: Part B - your comments

Q19. 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 STRAT6/The Green Belt

Q20. 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			

Q21. 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.

Sustaining a green belt that is actually used and of benefit is obviously very important. However, I think it makes sense that SODC wants to support Oxford's unmet housing need at sites that are adjacent to the city and within a reasonable commuting distance from the main employment centres like hospitals and universities in the city.

Q24. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q25. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

Yes

## Page 13: Part B - your comments

Q26. 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 7/Land at Chalgrove Airfield

Q27. 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			

Q28. 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.

There are a number of reasons why I do not support Policy STRAT 7.

The SODC Objective 1.2 refers to supporting rural communities and their way of life. It is the nature of this type of location that makes it attractive to people who want to move there. I think STRAT 7 is contrary to this objective.

I have been involved in the Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan (NDP) which has been adopted and supported overwhelmingly at a referendum.

The NDP has very carefully defined just how much growth is sustainable for Chalgrove. The Strategic Site does not conform to the stated objectives of the NDP. It is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 12 - 14.

The NDP feels the Strategic Site in STRAT 7 would have a really bad impact on the whole way of life in the village and will destroy the way of life of all the inhabitants.

The SODC Objective 4.2 in STRAT 7 specifies that any development should have sustainable transport with walking and cycling a viable choice for people who want to travel to anywhere else.

Chalgrove is a rural location with very limited existing infrastructure for roads. STRAT 7 is therefore contrary to Objective 4.2. The infrastructure plans are not good enough for sustainable transport.. The proposed road system would be dangerous for cyclists and walkers except within the actual development itself. It certainly wouldn't be practical to walk or cycle to work for people whose place of work is in Oxford.

The distance would make Chalgrove solely dependent on using cars for traveling around as there is minimal public transport. The proposed public transport improvements would just not be enough to make it a viable option for most commuters.

Sustainable transport schemes are limited to proposed additional bus services which cannot be funded by the County Council and the site is served by a single B-road, the B480). This is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 8c, 102c, 104b, 104d, 108a, 108b, 108c, 110a, 110d.

STRAT 7 is contrary to SODC Objective 5.2 which aims to support development that respects the scale and character of our towns and villages,

STRAT 7 will ultimately almost quadruple the size of the existing village of Chalgrove which will have significant negative consequences for the existing community.

STRAT 7 talks about regeneration of Chalgrove. Very few people in Chalgrove feels any such regeneration is needed and this is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 12 - 14.

STRAT 7 is contrary to SODC Objective 6.1. This champions Neighbourhood Planning. Chalgrove's NDP has detailed growth of almost 30% which is already in excess of the 15% that is specified by the Local Plan for larger villages. This equates to 320 houses which I feel will in itself is a sustainable increase in housing which meets the needs of the village and its residents. This strategy is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 12 - 14.

STRAT 7 is in direct opposition to SODC Objective 8.2 which specifies that any development should "minimise carbon emissions and other pollution such as water, air, noise and light, and increase our resilience to the likely impact of climate change, especially flooding".

Commuters in Chalgrove will need to use cars due to the lack of sufficient public transport so that will increase carbon emissions. There is no rail service either and the village is not near anywhere that would be convenient to use trains. This is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 8c, 102c, 104b, 104d, 108a 108b, 108c, 110a and 110d.

STRAT & states that land will be safeguarded for the future operations of the Martin Baker Aircraft Company Ltd. It talks about taking up the existing runways at Chalgrove Airfield and replacing them with a single, far shorter runway. This will inhibit the company operations.

So that means there is an intention to build new houses along with schools, medical facilities and other employment buildings right next to an active runway.

Martin baker also tests the ejector seats it manufactures which causes explosions. Again, this would be right next to all the structures mentioned above.. Anybody living in these proposed houses would undoubtedly make immediate complaints about the noise nuisance.

Any such site causing explosions right next to where people are living would be contrary to NPPF paragraph 91c and 95a.

Th plan also talks about allowing Martin Baker to remain on site. The company is a major defence contractor which would be severely affected in a negative way by the impact of the proposed development on a site which has no such problems at present. This is contrary to NPPF Paragraph 95b.

STRAT 7 talks about land being secured for infrastructure. As far as I am aware, very little such land has been secured for the proposed roads necessary if the plan were to proceed.

Also, the majority of one of the proposed bypasses is is on Flood Zone 3b on the River Thames flood plain.

There will be a big increase in traffic between the M40 and Oxford as a new road will be open for people seeking less congested commuting routes. This is contrary to Paragraph 103.

STRAT 7 then also promises improvements in bus routes which is the only sustainable transport option. However, examination shows that it would be limited to destinations used by fewer than half of the commuters in Chalgrove at present. This is contrary to NPPF Paragraph 103 & 104.

There is a requirement for a Compulsory Purchase Order because of an issue with an existing tenant. This is confirmed in Paragraphs 4.64 and 4.65. This then indicates that there would be no completions expected on the site until 2026 at the earliest. This is contrary top NPPF paragraph 67a as this states that the polices should identify a supply of specific, deliverable sites for years 1 to 5 of the Local Plan period. This site therefore breaches SODC's own definition of Deliverability which talks about delivering houses within 5 years.

There is another issue with deliverability because of the uncertainty about Chalgrove being suitable due to the need of a Compulsory Purchase Order.

I feel the success of such an action is unlikely because to succeed it needs to prove necessity and being in the public interest.

Recent recalculations by the Government about the numbers of new houses needed nationally indicates that the Local Plan is now calling for 5000 more homes than is actually needed.

If this is the case, if Chalgrove built no more new houses than is dictated by the NDP, it wouldn't cause a problem to meeting the need for new houses.

For all the points outlined above I cannot see that the Local Plan is sound whilst Chalgrove is still a part of it.

Q31. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q32. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

No