

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	Caroline Lister
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: STRAT 13

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.

STRAT 13.

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the inclusion of the site Land North of Bayswater Brook as an allocation for 1100 houses in the draft SODC Local Plan.

Firstly the housing is not needed. STRAT 2 states that the need for housing is 22,775 over the plan period. Table 5c shows that the plan delivers 28,465. A similar picture of over building is shown in the trajectory in appendix 8 right through the plan versus the target. Instead of over allocating land SODC should be restraining house building to fit within environmental limits. Moreover the need for housing has been grossly inflated by the Oxfordshire Growth Board's totally unrealistic growth plan – this takes no account of the much changed economic prospects for our country and is therefore hopelessly out of date.

Secondly this is the green belt. Only in exceptional circumstances should it be used for houses. The plan says that it needs the land because there is not enough non-green belt land to meet the housing need. The plan is allocating more land than is needed because it is based on an inflated estimate of unmet housing need.

Thirdly this is a very special piece of landscape. For all the time I have lived in Elsfield I have enjoyed the views over these fields to Oxford and beyond. It is true that the development will not be on the direct line of sight towards the dome of Radcliffe Camera but it will be clearly visible and obtrusive totally interfering with the unspoiled effect of green fields running into the edge of the city. This will be worse from the footpaths to the east of Elsfield. This is terrible incursion of housing into what is countryside. Until recently the northern bye-pass has been a natural boundary between the urban and rural environments. That was mistakenly breached with the approval for Barton Park the new development extending Barton. That is no reason to extend it further.

Finally the roads both through Elsfield and through Marston simply cannot take any more traffic. There is gridlock at rush hour. To say there will be travel plans is to ignore that many future residents will drive to whatever their destination including shops and schools.

For these reasons please take this strategic allocation out of the plan – it is damaging and is not needed.

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