

## Comment

Consultee	Ms Joyce Encer (832011)
Email Address	
Address	unknown unknown unknown
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Ms Joyce Encer
Comment ID	LPPub615
Response Date	17/12/14 11:57
Consultation Point	Core Policy 13: The Oxford Green Belt ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3

**Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant?** No

**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.** N/A

**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.**

The Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework states that a Green Belt boundary may be altered only in exceptional circumstances? Nick Boles? letter to the Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate of 6 March 2014 states that ?we would maintain key protections for the countryside and, in particular, for the Green Belt....Unmet housing need... is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt?, Why then remove five Green Belt sites protecting Cumnor, that is Land Parcels nos 3, 4, 5, 6 and 24 in the village, and a further three in the Parish? It is not legitimate to remove parcels from the Green Belt without first setting out your intentions, and once removed, developers will persist in trying to build on them, ruining a historic village in a beautiful landscape. These five Cumnor parcels include a football

field and a cricket club. Should these parcels be removed from the Green Belt, there would be no land available for playing fields, even though the Government is concerned that the population needs more sports facilities.

Tiny Sunningwell would certainly be destroyed were the suggested 240 houses built there, with an additional 800 houses proposed somewhere vaguely between Sunningwell and Radley.

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment is unsound, being based on very high forecasts of housing need in this controversial and much criticised document. How is it that this Assessment would add an additional 20,000 houses, more than 2 times the Government's household projections? No consideration has been given to the environmental and social constraints. In any event, the necessary infrastructure could not be built in time. And where will the 23,000 new jobs come from?

For all these reasons, I find the proposed Local Plan unsound.