

[REDACTED]

Sent: 04 November 2020 10:45
Subject: FW: SODC Local Plan Responses
Attachments: MMs responses.docx

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 October 2020 19:11
To: Planning Policy South <Planning.Policy@southoxon.gov.uk>
Cc: Jana Bek [REDACTED]
Subject: SODC Local Plan Responses

Dear SODC

Please find attached a list of the points that concern us with respect to the Main Modifications to the SODC Local Plan.

Thank you

Jana Bek and Michael March

MM8

Changes have been made on page 41, pars 1-5 to allow for higher density housing and the creation of 'new character' (what like Barton Park?) rather than respect the existing local character. Such changes should not be made without agreement of local people prior to masterplanning. We urge you to revert to the original policies of Local Plan 2034.

MM9

Additions made on page 43, par 2 refer to 'compensatory improvements' for green belt alterations. The loss of Bayswater Farm Field, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which has three times in the past resisted development precisely because it is an AONB, cannot be easily compensated for. BFF, which is south of Bayswater Brook. was incorporated into Strat 13 (Land North of Bayswater Brook) without having its own Section 18 consultation. Please remove BFF from your development plans

MM17

Pars 2(vi), 3(iii) and 4, pages 71, 72 and 69 respectively do nothing to address heavy traffic congestion

Please retain the original wording of LP 2034, maintaining policy links with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the obligation on the developer to contribute £70 million towards highway infrastructure to alleviate traffic congestion

Par 3(iii) implies that the consent of the County Council, as highways authority, is no longer required for the masterplanning of the site. Please restore this safeguard of adequate transport infrastructure and restore the original wording:

The masterplan must be prepared in collaboration and agreed with the Local Planning Authority, Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council.

Par3 (ix), page 72 refers to 'higher density development (45 dph at least)' is too high if the character of the site is really to be respected and 'densities will reduce towards the western edge' is too vague to be reassuring. To preserve the character of these sites density should nowhere be more than 40 dph. We urge you to make this change.

Provisions in Par 4.111, page 69 for protecting Sidlings Copse and College Pond SSSI are inadequate. What is needed, prior to masterplanning, is a properly independent ecological impact assessment – not just one conducted by the Council – that fully complies with SEA regulations in order to ascertain the true effects of development on the SSI and whatever recommendations are made by the SEA should be incorporated into any masterplan. This alone will adequately protect these fragile sites and we urge you to do it.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to present our views on the Main Modifications.