

[Redacted]

From: Mike Rowley [Redacted]
Sent: 11 October 2020 18:27
To: [Redacted]; Planning Policy Vale
Subject: Re: Planning Objection

Dear South & Vale planning team,

I write once again to draw your attention to an objection made by a local resident to the proposed development of "Strat 13" in the context of the South Oxon Local Plan Main Modifications.

I'm sure you're seeing the strength of local objection to this proposal, and I would be grateful if you could ensure that these important points are taken fully into account.

With best wishes,

Mike Rowley

Councillor Mike Rowley (Labour)
Representing Barton, Sandhills and North-East Headington
Portfolio Holder for Housing
Tel [Redacted]; Email [Redacted]

From: [Redacted] >
Sent: 11 October 2020 16:58
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Planning Objection

Lisa Lawrence

[Redacted Signature]

8 October 2020

Re: Land North of Bayswater Brook (Policy STRAT 13)
South Oxfordshire District Council.

Dear all,

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 Estate in the strongest possible terms. Firstly but quite importantly this development will come under the jurisdiction of SODC when Sandhills Estate comes under the jurisdiction of Oxford City Council. Why should residents, who pay Council Tax to Oxford City Council, have the extra wear and tear on their roads due to the failure of these plans to provide adequate provision for access? This application should be thrown out on that alone as access into Sandhills Estate – one way in and one way out – serving so many residents and properties would be a disaster waiting to happen. Sandhills was built with one entrance and one exit as it served very few properties, and over the years with Oxford City Council selling off former School land for development, the road infrastructure is

already set to bursting and causes problems serving those that live in Sandhills. Putting this aside this development will totally destroy precious Green Belt, the only Green Belt left on the Estate for residents to enjoy, since the previous development on the green land of the former school. Plans for this development should never have progressed this far. Sandhills Estate has seen its share of over development and lost precious green land and further development would be disastrous.

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 permitted to build a development without providing such green space so how can this development be under consideration? This development will affect so many lives and this seemingly total disregard for the lives of the residents is unacceptable.
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. This queue of traffic extends past the first houses in Sandhills during rush hours and those residents cannot have their windows open without breathing in car fumes. You need to consider what a further, potentially 300 cars will cause. 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. That in addition to any negative effects on the health of residents.
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 are considering this plan. 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. This as I stress again is not what the Government want in terms of providing new homes. At yet again I stress that Sandhills is over populated for the facilities (which are none) it has to offer as a residential estate.
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 or a pint of milk must get in a car and drive to a shop as Sandhills has no shops. 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 intended at the detriment of existing communities. We all agree more housing is needed, however, housing is not needed at any cost. Sandhills accepted the addition of a huge new development and that is enough and all that residents should be expected to contend with. The environment is crucial the Government – they want people out of cars and onto public transport. This will be the opposite with this proposed development. More cars, more pollution and for what? For a developer to make money – as clearly submitting these plans, they have no consideration for the wellbeing of the residents. Sites need to be sourced that are sustainable and not in areas with no existing facilities and with no road infrastructure to support a site. This application should be thrown out as ill thought through and unsafe. I cannot believe that this application has progressed this far. There is nothing positive to say about this development other than it provides housing. The negatives far outweigh the benefits 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 proposed development until it was brought to my attention by a flyer from 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

Lisa Lawrence

--

This email was Malware checked by UTM 9. <http://www.sophos.com>

--

This email was Malware checked by UTM 9. <http://www.sophos.com>

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. All communications sent to or from Oxford City Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. if you have received this email in error please notify the author by return email.