

From: jane wilson <jane.wilson20@btinternet.com>
Sent: 18 December 2018 13:36
To: Culliford, Steve <steve.culliford@southandvale.gov.uk>
Subject: Letter submitted to tonight's Cabinet Meeting

4 Boults Close Oxford OX3

OPP

18.12.18

Steve.culliford@southandvale.gov.uk

Cc Councillors Jane Murphy, Felix Bloomfield,
Anna Badcock, Kevin Bulmer,
David Dodds, Paul Harrison,
Lynn Lloyd, Caroline Newton, Bill Service

Dear Mr Culliford,

Could this please be included in comments to be considered by the Cabinet meeting tonight (18.12.18 at 6p.m.) with reference to Agenda Item 8, SODC Draft Local Plan.

I write as myself and also on behalf of a group of 30+ residents of Old Marston (POME = Protect Old Marston & Elsfield).

By definition, it seems to us, Land North of Bayswater Brook should not be included in even a draft local plan as it has been previously rejected, not now correctly consulted upon (particularly with reference to environmental consultations) and only by redefining the nature of 'exceptional circumstances' (as defined in the recently-published National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018, Section 13) can it even be considered. In particular, Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states:

'Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.....whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in....locations well-served by public transport...'

SODC is in a rush. It has examined many other reasonable options, some cursorily, but they certainly haven't been rejected and it seems clear that Bayswater is included in the draft SODC Local Plan not because it is a satisfactory or realistic site but partly as a make-weight and partly because of pressure from the landowners and their developers. What is the point of including Bayswater when, by its own admission, SODC has not conducted legally-required environmental analysis? and, as the Berkshire, Buckingham & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust has said, in evidence to the recent meeting of SODC's Scrutiny Committee:

'The Council's own Sustainability Appraisal provided as part of the LP consultations in 2017 dismissed both Wick Farm and Elsfield allocations (now combined into one larger 'Land

North of Bayswater Brook' allocation) on the basis that they are both in the Greenbelt, and they could cause significant adverse effects on biodiversity. It is unclear how and why this position has changed as no additional evidence has been made available and this site allocation is still against policy.'

The point about density: The proposal is for a housing density of 9.6 dwellings per hectare – precisely because of anxieties about the environmental impact of building on this land. Yet the SODC Core Strategy Policy is of a minimum density of 25 dwellings per hectare. So the proposed Bayswater build contradicts an SODC Core Strategy Policy, and the National Planning Policy Framework. It is an expensive and unsatisfactory proposal which would destroy a unique natural resource for low housing gain.

Your officers also suggest that the low housing gain be supported by expensive, cumbersome and damaging road connections - schemes such as connecting via the A40 Northern Bypass through a huge new junction that will involve access to Marsh Lane (which is currently one long traffic jam with consequent air pollution) or across countryside (to be bought at huge expense, both financial and environmental?) towards Thornhill Park & Ride. Or possibly a road through Barton Park, where it was assured no road would be permitted.

I appreciate that SODC is being leant on by both Oxford City, which sees itself as an employment hub, and by the current Government, but to threaten to abandon even precious and good Green Belt sites is something that future generations will regret deeply.

We urge Cabinet to exclude the 'Bayswater' site.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Wilson

Protect Old Marston & Elsfield