

# South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034

## Page 3: Part A - contact details

Q1. Are you responding as an:

Business / Organisation

## Page 6: Business / organisation contact details

Q4. Due to the plan-making process including an independent examination, a name and means of contact is required for your comments to be considered:

**Business / organisation name** Little Milton Parish Council

**Contact name** Raymond Fergusson

**Address line 1** [REDACTED]

**Address line 2** [REDACTED]

**Address line 3** -

**Postal town** [REDACTED]

**Postcode** [REDACTED]

**Telephone number** [REDACTED]

**Email address** [REDACTED]

## 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:** STRAT7

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 7 is unsound in that it does not require management of the downstream flood risk arising from sewage treatment works clean water discharge. The watercourses draining the area are already subject to winter flooding. Additional water flow from new or uprated sewage treatment plants will only exacerbate the flooding downstream from the site.

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.

Add new sub-para to STRAT7 after (xi):

A scheme that delivers specific mitigation and management of sewage treatment works clean water discharge into local watercourses such that the flood risk downstream from the discharge point is not increased.

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 INF4

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.

INF4 is unsound in that it does not require management of the downstream flood risk arising from sewage treatment works clean water discharge. Many parts of South Oxfordshire are already subject to seasonal flooding. Additional water flow from new or uprated sewage treatment plants will only exacerbate the flooding.

Q15. 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.

Add new sub-para to INF4:

The developer must also demonstrate mitigation and management of sewage treatment works clean water discharge into local watercourses such that the flood risk downstream from the discharge point is not increased.

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 STRAT5

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.

STRAT5 is unsound as it specifies a housing density for smaller villages of 40dph which experience has shown leaves insufficient space for adequate parking provision. Cars will be a reality in smaller villages for the next 15 years, particularly as most bus services have been withdrawn. Developments with high housing densities just lead to unsociable and unsightly car parking, detrimental to the character of the village.

Also high housing densities in smaller villages are out of character with the built environment and are contrary to Policy DES2 which calls for design which responds positively to the site and its surroundings and which reinforces place-identity by enhancing local character.

Q22. 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.

Amend STRAT5 for Smaller Villages to 30dph.

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 STRAT7 (ix)

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.

If Chalgrove Airfield is retained in the Local Plan as a strategic site, then STRAT7(ix) is fundamentally unsound as the Chalgrove Airfield site will, even if this policy is fully implemented, still be fed by just a B road plus inadequate minor roads. The proposal to build bypasses or edge streets around certain local villages is an inadequate sticking plaster solution to the traffic problems which this development would generate. Also the proposal to bypass the B480 around local villages but route it right through the centre of the Chalgrove Airfield development is illogical.

The fact that the Chalgrove Airfield development is judged to require traffic mitigation measures in at least 8 other local settlements indicates that the underlying infrastructure proposals are totally inadequate.

Q29. 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.

Reword STRAT7(ix)(b) to provide a strategic solution to the roads infrastructure required to support this site, including at least one route of A road quality leading directly to the site.

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?

Yes

## Page 15: Part B - your comments

Q33. 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: STRAT7

Q34. 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			

**Q35. 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 7 fundamentally fails to support a significant number of SODC's Strategic Objectives stated in Chapter 3 of the plan:

OBJ 1.2: SODC have stated a clear objective that it must "support rural communities and "their way of life", recognising that this is what attracts people to the district" -yet this development would more than triple the size of the Chalgrove community and totally destroy the rural community in that village today.

OBJ 1.4: SODC have stated an objective to "focus growth in the Science Vale" - yet this development would be some distance from the Science Vale with very poor transportation links, making it unsuitable for people working in the Science Vale.

OBJ 4.2: SODC have stated an objective to "make sustainable transport, walking and cycling an attractive and viable choice for people" - yet, even with some growth of employment opportunities in Chalgrove, the vast majority of people living in this new town would be forced to drive to work, due both to the remoteness from the main centres of employment (Science Vale, Oxford, Reading) and poor public transportation facilities. With regards the public transportation, it is very unlikely that this could ever become a practical proposition for people at this location.

OBJ 5.2: SODC have stated an objective to "support development that respects the scale and character of our towns and villages, enhancing the special character of our historical settlements and surrounding countryside" - yet this development would more than triple the size of the community, will create an environment that is fundamentally different to the current environment and attract people whose motivation for living there would be fundamentally different to the people currently living in this quiet rural community.

OBJ 6.1: SODC have stated an objective to "champion neighbourhood planning, empowering local communities to direct development within their area and provide support to ensure Neighbourhood Development Plans are deliverable, achievable and sustainable" - yet this development contradicts the Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, the site is not supported by the current leaseholders at Chalgrove airfield (Martin Baker, a strategically important Defence business and the main employer at the site,) and the development is therefore likely to be non-deliverable.

OBJ 8.2: SODC have stated an objective to "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: - yet this this development would create significantly more carbon emissions than the developments closer to the main areas of employment due to increased road traffic, and is likely to exacerbate and already difficult flooding issue in Chalgrove today.

Finally, In addition to the all of the above negatives, in the event that a Compulsory Purchase Order was placed on the Martin Baker Organisation and was successful, the proposed development at Chalgrove airfield would incur huge costs that would make it uneconomic compared with the other strategic developments: These would include:

The cost of moving the main runway  
The costs of major changes to the road-transport infrastructure in and around the area including bypassing several local villages;  
The cost of massive works to resolve the flooding issues.

**Q36. 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.**

Policy STRAT7 should be removed from the plan. This has no further implications to the overall Plan as other developments proposed by SODC meet the stated actual housing requirement.

Q38. Would you like to participate at the oral part of the examination, which takes place as part of the examination process?

No

Q39. Would you like to comment on another policy or paragraph?

No