

From: "Lynda" [REDACTED]
To: <planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk>
Date: 25/11/2014 20:26
Subject: Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1

I wish to comment on the Vale of White Horse Council's Local Plan as follows:

1. The decision to accept the SHMA figures on which you base the plans for the future of our communities without obtaining further and better particulars as to how the figures are calculated and thus, the justification to increase in the size of my Village, Radley, by a disproportionate amount.
2. It is clear that local businesses who occupy leasehold land have already been given notice that their tenure is not going to continue, except on a very short annual lease, thus preventing those businesses from investing in infrastructure, or benefitting from Infrastructure they have already installed believing they were secure. There are two businesses to my knowledge in Radley – a market garden operation which started up at Lodge Hill and subsequently closed because it could not obtain security of tenure – and Homewood Partners who have been given notice to quit on farmland which they cultivate, thus reducing the viability of their business.
3. The need for housing is recognised, but not the volumes that the Vale is proposing. I object to Radley becoming a Dormitory Settlement for people who work in London. I object to the fact that Government Ministers believe it is perfectly acceptable to dump London Housing shortages on to the areas where there is a railway station in the misguided belief that it is perfectly alright to take 1 hour to get to work by train.
4. I object to the fact that your plan contains a woeful paragraph about the Health Service as if some yet to be appointed Quango will magically extend our over stretched hospitals and their hard-pressed staff to cope with the influx of people into this area. Oxfordshire Health Service is already 25% light on its staff; some say it is because the staff can't afford to live here, and all the new houses will help the skills shortage at our local hospitals – but there is already legislation for this purpose – so that knocks that argument into touch. Oxford City Council continues to allow the Universities to extend their housing stock for students, in turn pushing more people who work in the city out in to the environs. These accommodations are used by foreign students in out of term time, because they bring in extra revenue and add to the strain on the local resources which are on offer.
5. I object to your plan on the basis the you propose a Levy on development, yet developers will get round this with all the small plots of land they already have in their land bank, which will not be sufficiently scaled to allow any worthwhile benefits to be passed to the public, yet the amount of value that landowners will have from their agricultural land increasing in value will not find its way into local coffers – the only beneficiaries will be the people who own the land. It is a certainty that Government, seeing the CIL income in the areas under development, will reduce any central government support, leaving the County with only the increased Council Tax to pay for the much heavier demand on its services.
6. Any Community Benefit obtained by the huge increase in housing stock is theoretical and will only go to the coffers of the County Council from whence they will dole it out to support the shortfalls from Central Government who will see the County's income increased and reduce any subsidies that might be on offer. Meanwhile, our roads get more potholes, our hospital waiting lists get longer, an urgent appointment with our GP becomes an impossibility, and those in work will face huge volumes of extra traffic on roads which were already crowded 20 years ago.
7. I object to the removal of the Oxford Green Belt without a full review county wide.
8. I object to the plan being a vehicle for money making and favouring big business. I do not agree that the plan will fulfil the needs of the existing population of Oxfordshire. It is clearly intended to extend the suburbs of London into the Countryside, so that the Metropolitan Housing Stock can be sold at inflated prices, and the people who live in rented accommodation in London will be pushed further out and become our problem rather than that of Greater London.
9. Houses in Great Western Park, Didcot, remain on plan and a decade to complete seems to be the estimated time for delivery of this project. If this is true, why are more houses being proposed when houses remain unsold at this location? The answer is simple – houses in the Green Belt command a premium and sell quicker than those which are not. The green belt has protected us from Oxford's expansion for decades and the Vale of White Horse has managed within very short order to bow to the will of property developers and ignore the public at large.
10. The only winners in this are the Developers and as usual the Public are being ignored.

Yours faithfully
Lynda Pasquire Crowley
3 Shaws Copse
Radley
OX14 3GZ