

Comment

Consultee	Mr Robert Jacobs (869058)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	27 HAnson Road Abingdon OX14 1YL
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Robert Jacobs
Comment ID	LPPub38
Response Date	03/12/14 01:25
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
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 West 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.	I believe that the Vale Local Plan 2031 is unsound because the developments concentrated to the North of Abingdon do not reflect a clear strategic approach to housing in the area. the developments

for the A34 interchange are given the same status as a South Abingdon bypass, which would generate much greater traffic relief, link up the areas of the Science Vale (Culham, Milton Park and Harwell) and enable greater expansion of Abingdon in a more radial manner. The issues around pinch points in traffic are already very clear at the Wooton Road roundabout, and this is not likely to be relieved.

Beyond this I see the removal of Green Belt land for this purpose to be outside of the principles of Green Belt in removing access to Green Spaces for current and future residences of Abingdon, with the need to cross the A34 to access green land from North Abingdon, (a risk fro Children). There is a clear infringement on the natural borders of Green Belt/Abingdon as laid our by the current peripheral road.

Overall the claiming of Green belt land for the purpose of this development is unjustified, and the process unsound as does reflect easy options rather than a broader strategic approach to Abingdon's future development.

Q5 Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate 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.

Further investigation of a South Abingdon bypass and additional Thams crossing needs to be investigated further, as this provides much greater opportunity to generate strategically located future development, will alleviate significant traffic problems (which development in North Abingdon, even with a Lodge Hill A34 diamond interchange, will compound), and ensure a true potential to bring the various sites of the Science Vale in easy communication. This is where the jobs created seem to be likely to be located, and this is where the future development and growth needs to be located. If the Local Plan had provided any evidence as to why the South Abingdon bypass should not take place this would be helpful, except the only comment is the Ock Street crossing and double roundabouts on the Drayton Road are a pinch point (this would be alleviated hugely by a South Abingdon bypass), however the pinch point of the Wooton Road Road about (currently unbearably bad) will not be alleviated by a Lodge Hill A34 diamond interchange. Indeed there is no guarantee this would be developed, so adding 1,000 additional homes to Norther Abingdon (both North and North-West) plus the additional homes in Radley will force even more traffic onto the already clogged infrastructure, with no clear plans to mitigate against this. Indeed preparatory work on the Wooton Road roundabout already undertaken have created a much worse sitution.

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, Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the 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:

The question is do I wish to participate at the oral examination, I do not state that this is necessary, only that I wish to participate.