

Comment

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Consultee | Mr Woodford David (871677) |
| Email Address | [REDACTED] |
| Address | 57 Appleton Road Oxford OX14 2QS |
| Event Name | Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication |
| Comment by | Mr Woodford David |
| Comment ID | LPPub897 |
| Response Date | 18/12/14 17:11 |
| Consultation Point | Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt (View) |
| Status | Submitted |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.1 |

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? Yes

Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound (positively prepared, effective and Justified) No

If your comment(s) relate to a specific site within a core policy please select this from the drop down list. North of Abingdon-on-Thames

If you think your comment relates to the DtC, this is about how we have worked with the Duty to Cooperate bodies (such as neighbouring planning authorities)

Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate? No

Q4 Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Cumnor North of Abingdon

- 1 The NPPF has stated that the 'Green Belt' should only be altered on exceptional circumstances, so why is the Vale not looking at Brown site and regenerating other sites
 - 2 Nick Boles guidance to councils on protection of the Green Belt stated that 'We are re-affirming green belt protection, and followed by saying that unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development
 - 3 The plan breaches the five purposes of the green belt.
 - a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
 - b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
 - c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
 - d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
 - e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 4) by releasing the five green belt sites around Cumnor for building the size of the village would easily be doubled and go against all the five statements above, and this historic rural village would be lost forever, furthermore our PM David Cameron has stated that our rural villages should be preserved as they are an important part of our tourist attraction for overseas visitors.
- 5) Inconsistent treatment of the five Green Belt site located around Cumnor, with no reasons or explanation as to why this is necessary
- a) The South Cumnor sites (6 & 24) have already been withdrawn from the local plan as being unsuitable for housing so why are they now being removed from the green belt if not for the purpose of future building, totally Inconsistent and unjustified and again with out any explanation which is all very underhand.
 - b) The Green Belt review deemed sites 4 & 5 inappropriate as they are in the Cumnor Conservation Area, so WHY are they now being removed from the Green Belt as this would serve now purpose, again no explanation given. This all goes the same way, no explanation, no consultation WHY !!!
 - c) There are several recreational areas within the proposed areas for removal, the football field which is the core for the youth team and holds many events, plus the exercise area only recently installed by the Parish Council. Also the extremely successful Cricket Club and grounds. Removing these parcels contradicts VWHDC own comments on strategic site 8 (Botley) in its green belt review of Spring 2014 stating that 'This site incorporates playing fields, which the council would not support for redevelopment unless alternative provision was made' Why therefore should Cumnors playing fields that lie within the green belt be any different if all the available land was released for development there would be no alternatives for playing fields.

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? No - I do not wish to participate at the oral examination