

LPP2 Preferred Options Consultation

St Helen Without Parish Council Response

Introduction

The St Helen Without Parish Council has taken the Draft LPP2 Preferred Options consultation process very seriously and initiated its own residents 'Open Day', which took place on Sunday the 23rd April 2017, to further inform and gather feedback on how to respond (including residents from Whitecross).

As a consequence, the Parish Council's response on behalf of its residents is evidence-based, i.e. in the form of completed questionnaires and open-ended written comments from 121 residents. This information is being securely stored by an independent market research company, under the Data Protection Act 1998, for future reference.

Key Findings from the Residents Survey

- It is clear that both residents and the Parish Council recognise the need for the District Council to facilitate new homes in the area via the LPP2 mechanism.
 - Some 67% of residents polled agreed that new and affordable housing was needed.
- In addition, there was also agreement that the Dalton Barracks site is a suitable site for development once the MoD vacates the site.
 - However, critically, it is also clear that the vast majority of residents (97%) believe that it is unnecessary nor appropriate to develop the entire operational area of the Dalton Barracks site (including associated MoD housing sites and other MoD land) and areas into and alongside Shippon and Whitecross. This is especially the case when the requirement for this site, in the Draft LPP2 Preferred Options consultation (up to 2031), is for only 1,200 dwellings.
 - It should be noted though that some 73% of residents recognise that it would be appropriate to develop on some areas of the site, i.e. on the brownfield operational area of the site only.
- Despite this, residents are generally concerned about the impact of this proposed development.
 - Some 46% of residents perceive that there will likely be negative impacts associated with this development upon the local community, e.g. increased traffic, no guarantee that sufficient improved infrastructure and services would be provided, the detrimental effects to the existing habitat and natural ecosystems, etc.

- Regardless, it is also important to note that pragmatically some 45% of residents do recognise that there would likely be both positive and negative impacts.
- The top issues identified from the open-ended, written comments were:
 1. Traffic concerns
 2. Lack of and/or strain on infrastructure
 3. Concern over encroachment
 4. Urban sprawl
 5. Need for specific services, e.g. Schools, GP surgeries, fire services, etc.
- Another key issue, for both residents of Shippon and Whitecross, is the fear of coalescence of their settlements around the new development. The VWHDC stated that this new development would be based on 'Garden Village principles' – this implies that coalescence would not occur.
 - The use of 'Garden Village principles' is very important to residents because some 88% of them do not want coalescence of Shippon with the new development.
 - This was mirrored Whitecross residents; some 90% of responses indicated that residents did not want Whitecross to coalesce with the new development.
- Finally, residents are concerned about the VWHDC's proposal to remove Shippon, Whitecross and all the operational areas of the Dalton Barracks site (and associated MoD housing and land) from the Green Belt.
 - Some 65% of residents do not want any sections of land in this area removed from the Green Belt.
 - However, this is balanced by the fact that some 33% of residents do think it is appropriate to remove parcels of land from the Green Belt, but only from the brownfield sections of previously developed land.
 - The wholesale removal of the villages of Shippon and Whitecross is rejected.

Parish Council Conclusions

To conclude, on the evidence gathered from residents:

- The Parish Council accepts the concept of new housing developments in the parish.
- It also accepts its responsibility to accommodate some 1,200 homes as part of the unmet housing need for Oxford in the plan period.

However, the attempt in the Draft LPP2 Preferred Options consultation to take huge swaths of the parish, including Shippon (and Whitecross) out of the Oxford Green Belt is unnecessary and inappropriate in this plan period. Indeed, there are no exceptional reasons for doing so and it would result in encroachment into the countryside, which is against Purpose 3 of the Oxford Green Belt.

It is not necessary to take some 200 hectares from the Dalton Barracks site (excluding the 88 hectares for the proposed County Park) out of the Oxford Green Belt to develop some 1,200

homes. This would equate to a potential housing density of 6 homes per hectare! Indeed, the brownfield sites at Dalton Barracks could be legitimately redeveloped without removing them from the Oxford Green Belt.

In addition, the Draft LPP2 Preferred Options consultation wants to take further land out of the Oxford Green Belt across all of Shippon (and Whitecross); this is totally unnecessary and there are no exceptional reasons for doing so.

The issue of village coalescence is also important. Garden village principles suggest that this should not happen. Residents do not want this to happen.

As a result, the Parish Council argues that:

- There is no need to change the Green Belt status of any of the land at Dalton Barracks.
- Any new development on the Dalton Barracks site should be discrete and have its own footprint and identity.
- The land between the proposed 'Garden Village' development and Shippon should be protected to avoid the possibility of coalescence, i.e. by retaining the Oxford Green Belt.
 - This is the same principle that the Inspector identified in LPP1 in regard to the retention of the Oxford Green Belt between Abingdon and Shippon; and, Shippon and Wootton.
- Shippon's status within the Oxford Green Belt should be retained.

St Helen Without Parish Council

2nd May 2017

Comment

Consultee	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald (1096052)
Email Address	
Address	
Event Name	LPP2 Publicity Period Oct - Nov 2017
Comment by	Mr Geoff Fitzgerald
Comment ID	338
Response Date	21/11/17 22:41
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Files	LPP2 Consultation - Key Findings from the Residents Survey
Q1 To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? Please state the paragraph or policy or policies map.	Core Policy 8b: Dalton Barracks Comprehensive Development Framework
Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant?	Yes
Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound?	Yes
Q4 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes

Q6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at 5 above. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

I would like to comment that, in principle, I agree with the need for a new housing development at Dalton Barracks; and, the need to utilize this for the proposed 1,200 homes as part of the unmet housing need for Oxford. This should provide an appropriate brownfield site for development and, I suggest, makes total sense.

However, I have some major reservations about LPP2:

1. The LPP2 wants to remove Shippon from the Oxford Green Belt (not required); and, much of the Dalton Barracks site to the north and west, i.e. the open spaces on the airfield. This is not an appropriate use of this land.

- This is especially true when this open, Green Belt land to the north and west of this site lies adjacent to the brownfield sites to the east of the Dalton Barrack site.
- Specifically, I question the huge amount of land that the Vale of the White Horse DC is proposing to take out of the Green Belt (200 hectares) within the Dalton Barracks site. This is not proportional to the need for some 1,200 homes. Indeed, if there was a need for >6,000 homes within this plan period then there could be a justification for this, but there is not this need.
- As a consequence, this would appear to be totally unnecessary and inappropriate and goes against Purpose 3 of the Oxford Green Belt which is designed to avoid any encroachment into the countryside.

2. The issue of village coalescence is also important. Garden village principles suggest that this should not happen, but the Vale of the White Horse DC talks about this site as being a Garden Village exemplar standard.

- Residents of Shippon, a small, historic village, do not want coalescence (as evidenced in a recent survey by the Parish Council, St. Helen Without). With comments from over 120 residents, 88% of these did not want coalescence of Shippon with the new development.
- Any new Garden Village development on the Dalton Barracks site should be discrete and have its own footprint and identity. The land between the proposed 'Garden Village' development and Shippon should be protected.

3. I would also argue that the Vale of the White Horse DC has been far from transparent in how this development will emerge. It talks about a comprehensive development framework, a site masterplan and the Supplementary Planning Document "when adopted", but there is no documentation to show where development will start, how many houses will initially be developed and the planned schedule for the remaining development of homes. It does not document planned infrastructure or the provision/siting of new facilities. We have to put blind faith in the ability of the District Council to deliver on this.

- I would like to see the Inspector challenge this and to ask for evidence from the Vale of the White Horse DC, i.e. to provide tangible plans that can be properly scrutinised.
- The LPP2 (page 37) states that "Proposals for development at Dalton Barracks must demonstrate how they contribute towards a comprehensive approach to development". The Vale of the White Horse has not been able to present any comprehensive framework to local residents and this is troubling.

In conclusion, I trust that the Vale of the White Horse and the Inspector will look at these concerns and address them fully to the satisfaction of local residents.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q6 If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Q7 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

As the author of the St Helen Without Parish Council 'Open Day' survey (April 2017) I would like to share important opinions from residents with the Inspector. This will document valuable statistics around resident concerns regarding the coalescence of Shippon village and the new Dalton Barracks development that have, to date, been ignored by the Vale of the White Horse DC.

Would you like to hear from us in the future?

- . I would like to be kept informed about the progress of the Local Plan
- . I would like to be added to the database to receive general planning updates

Please upload any supporting information

LPP2 Consultation - Key Findings from the Residents Survey
LPP2 Consultation - Key Findings from the Residents Survey