

Comment

Consultee	mr bob evans (866592)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	45 sunningwell abingdon OX13 6RD
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	mr bob evans
Comment ID	LPPub15
Response Date	18/11/14 12:32
Consultation Point	5.40 Paragraph (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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 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've really no idea what 'legally compliant' means in these circs. But you require some answer to that qu.

The issue is whether some parcels of land 'no longer meet the purposes of the G[reen] B[elt]'. But your local review involves a circular argument. The land is deemed not to meet these purposes, because you want it to serve other purposes. The GB was set up to prevent 'urban sprawl' and to protect the most vulnerable natural environments, above all the spaces between existing (large) settlements. That's why land in the Oxford GB, lying directly between Oxford and Abingdon, serves its original purpose today at least as much as it ever did.