

From: [REDACTED]
To: <planning_policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk>
CC: [REDACTED]
Date: 24/12/2014 16:28
Subject: Local plan critique by Harbour and Harbour: corrections

Please accept the following corrections as discussed in our message of today's date at 1200 hrs.

Corrections

Para 1.6) Line 2: replace "have and extensive knowledge of" with "have an extensive knowledge of"

End of para 1.7) I appear to have accidentally deleted the final sentences: "Indeed the impression gained from attending the meeting was that the planning officers seemed to be speaking like Conservative Councillors except they demonstrated greater knowledge of their subject. I attempted to publicise the need to challenge the plan and the lack of public information thereto on the Tuesday before the submission limit of 19th December by being interviewed on BBC Radio Oxford on the 8.30 am broadcast and explaining to the public the most important point that the A34 frequently gets diverted into Abingdon and that if, as had happened on the previous day (Monday), the diversion should occur on top of the planned and foreseen housing development envisaged in the Local Plan, there would be totally inadequate capacity to deal with the overflow from the A34. People had claimed thirty minute delays on the Dunmore Road on account of the diversion onto that road, on the Monday, but in future, should the plan be put into effect, the delay would become very much longer due to the ensuing gridlock, which would also feed back upstream onto the A34."

para 2) replace "identity should me the plan go forward as proposed." with "identity should the plan go forward as proposed."

Para 2.1) replace "unsuitably" with "unsuitable"

Heading between paras 2.1 and 2.2) should be in bold, viz.

"Regarding Core Policy 13 Oxford Green Belt, Core Policy 8 - spatial strategy for Abingdon and Oxford fringe sub-area and also Core Policy 15 - Spatial Strategy for the SE Vale sub area"

para 2.3) towards the end. between the sentence ending "stretch the edges of the string still more." and that beginning "The point I am trying to make...", there appears to have been a deleted sentence (deleted when I hunted for the paragraph references and was working using an iPad, which I still find very difficult, but I can write with it while lying on my back!) which should read:

"Then in the space between Abingdon and Oxford, instead of adopting the "sensible understanding of the man in the street" that if the intention is to preserve the Green Belt between the two towns on the basis of the Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the five key purposes of the Green Belt (please refer to Paras 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 below), so the surviving part of the Green Belt should be retained in its entirety, the strange ideas of the planners is that each hamlet is treated as a centre of growth and each town is treated as an entity that can be expanded into the Green Belt at its edge, regardless of previous such expansions: the net effect being that the space between Oxford and Abingdon can be virtually closed by expanding Abingdon, Oxford, Kennington, Radley, even Radley College, Sunningwell, and so on, without paying due regard to the overall picture as viewed by the "sensible understanding of the man in the street"; the planners merely seem to consider line of sight clearances and (in the case of the Oxford Planning Department) use the very narrow gap between Abingdon and Radley as a tare, being a distance of separation that development must not be allowed to reduce."

para 2.3.4) Omitted was a reference to para 1.4 containing current government policy with regard to development in the Green Belt. This should read:

"Para 1.4) above refers to current government policy with regard to development in the Green Belt. I had intended to develop themes based upon that reference but time and health have prevented that, so will offer to do so at the Examination in public if requested to do so." Again the omission was in transferring from notes to iPad whilst lying prone!

Para 2.3.5) apart from a couple of obvious spelling errors near the start, the following correction should be made: for "developers building speculatively ate the West End of the town" please read "developers building speculatively at the West End of the town".

Para "2.3.6) Looking in more detail at he proposed..." should read: "2.3.7) Looking in more detail at the proposed ..."

And further on in the same para. "and as far as I can tell the height reached will be ten metres below the top. a sketch with the hill contours and the hose heights and locations or a study with a little trigonometry will rapidly show that the tip of the hill will be obscured. once that is appreciated when the building is completed, there will be nothing to stop further..." should read "And, as far as I can tell, the height reached will be ten metres below the top. A sketch with the hill contours and the house heights and locations or a study with a little trigonometry will rapidly show that the top of the hill will be obscured. Once that is appreciated when the building is completed, there will be nothing to stop further ..." And here I have made multiple very small corrections too trivial to itemise. I was typing too quickly when tired at this point: sorry!

"2.3.7) Further aspects of the site include" should be replaced by "2.3.8) Further aspects of the site include".

And in the same paragraph, now numbered 2.3.8 there are several subheadings which should be in bold, being

- flooding
- noise and air pollution
- ancient woodland
- access

Also in the same paragraph, a clarification is needed where "flooding - This area is a major collector of water feeding the springs that lead to relocation of the houses in the Long Furlong Area and which will affect the ecology of all of the area below it. If construction occurs there..."

should have two words added in parenthesis as follows: "flooding - This area is a major collector of water feeding the springs that lead to relocation of the houses (during construction) in the Long Furlong Area and which will affect the ecology of all of the area below it. If construction occurs there..."

And again in the same paragraph, the last sentence under "- noise and air pollution" should be revised to read "... but that my contribution is essentially distinguishable from theirs due to lack of time in preparing my story."

And again in the same paragraph, replace "H&S" by "has" in the forts bit under "ancient woodland"

And finally in the same paragraph on the first line of the section "access" for constructin" please read "construction".

At end of para 2.4 please replace " this has not been decided upon nor is it planned within the existing foreseeable budgets. There will be chaos if allowed to go ahead as planned Nd there will be major coat and upheaval and serious alteration of the nature of Abingdon if the traffic is dealt with as needed. I would like to amplify that point and many others contained herein in the Examination in Public. I believe I have established that the Plan as it stands is ineffective and unsound." with "This has not been decided upon nor is it planned within the existing foreseeable budgets. There will be chaos if allowed to go ahead as planned, and there will be major cost and upheaval and serious alteration of the nature of Abingdon if the traffic is dealt with as needed. I would like to amplify that point and many others contained herein in the Examination in Public. I believe I have established that the Plan as it stands is ineffective and unsound."

Corrections to the end, please replace

"Re core Policy 4

Consultation has been poor. I have already established this in my submission under the heading of legality in section one above. I will not repeat it here, but on the basis of what was said therein the Plan seems to be not positively prepared.

Consequently I request much lower housing figures and removal of all sites in the Green Belt and also by inference in the North Wessex Downs.

In conclusion this has to be submitted within minutes so I sign off by saying that I will proof read this after submission and correct any howlers but I will not add anything thereto. This submission is jointly by me and my wife, who shares the same details as me, above, but her name is Mrs Gunilla Harbour

Submitted by Dr Peter Harbour at 11.58 on 24 December by special permission"

with

"Re core Policy 4 (this line in bold)

2.5) Consultation has been poor. I have already established this in my submission under the heading of legality in section one above. I will not repeat it here, but on the basis of what was said therein the Plan seems to be not positively prepared.

2.6) Consequently I request much lower housing figures and removal of all sites in the Green Belt and also by inference in the North Wessex Downs.

In conclusion this has to be submitted within minutes so I sign off by saying that I will proof read this after submission and correct any howlers but I will not add anything thereto. This submission is jointly by me and my wife, who shares the same details as me, above, but her name is Mrs Gunilla Harbour

Submitted by Dr Peter Harbour at 1200 hrs on 24 December by special permission.

And this correction has been supplied before 1630 hrs on 24 December, so I hope it meets the extended deadline."

Post script, I will insert these corrections "as is" into the previous version but am too tired to complete it today. However I believe that the improved readability will save time for the inspector, so I hope that my corrections will be accepted post hoc, but without any change whatsoever from those indicated above.

Sent from my iPad