

From: Andrew Allen & Sharon Allen  
8 Eldridge Close  
Abingdon  
OX14 1YQ

Objection to the draft Local Plan Part One 2013 (Vale of White Horse)

**Re: Core Policy 4 and all others that flow from it, in particular, Core Policies 8,13,15,& 20.**

1. The SHMA is unsound and unstainable and should not be relied upon. We feel the proposed number of developments is exaggerated and the forecast by SHMA is over estimated and has been criticised by many professional organisations, the public and politicians. CPRE expert / consultant estimates the proposed number of dwellings is more than double what is required. The number of proposed dwellings is more than the governments estimates and proposed needs.

The SHMA seems to exploit figures and to us have "fiddled" the figures.

Their figures suggest 85,000 jobs will be created. This figure has not been fully examined or subjected to scrutiny by experts and rather optimistic in the current and proposed economic situation of the country.

It appears that the council have not checked and questioned the figures proposed by the SHMA.

Also, many of the jobs would not be in the Abingdon and other locations and therefore should the figures be anywhere near accurate, a vast increase of traffic would be on local roads, which would not cope.

2. The Vale District Council has failed to give proper consideration to the environmental and social constraints within the District.

The local plan needs to be investigated further prior to the plan being fully adopted. The Vale Council should have assessed the SHMA findings in relation to environmental and social considerations.

**Re: Core Policy 13 Oxford Green Belt, Core Policy 8 - Special Strategy for Abingdon and Oxford fringe Sub Area and Core Policy 15 - Special Strategy for SE Vale Sub Areas.**

3. By the Vale accepting the SHMA figures without questioning them, has led to areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and areas of Green Belt being allocated for development. 1510 dwellings are proposed within existing Green Belt and 1400 dwellings in AONB - this will change the rural landscape of the area and destroy the environment for generations to come. Once gone is gone, and what is the point of additional housing if you do not have the environment around you? How can one criticise other countries for environmental destruction when we are doing the same?

Also, additional areas are being proposed for removal from the Green Belt. This will leave them open for future unrestricted development.

**Green Belt and AONB**

The proposal Plan is not in line with Government guidelines on the protection of the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it very clear that a Green Belt boundary can be changed only in exceptional circumstances. Housing requirements does not justify destruction of the Green Belt - as detailed in recent guidelines. The Government guidelines aim to keep the urban sprawl under control and the need of unmet housing need is not justification to develop on Green Belt.

In Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty the Council has a statutory duty to have regard for the purposes for which the North Wessex Downs were designated an AONB - that is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the landscape. AONB are regarded as the highest categories of landscape protection and affords them great weight in the decision making process. AONB are one location where restrictions should apply to developments and planning permission should be refused unless exceptional reasons exist or development is in the public interest, for which we feel the draft plan is not.

**Re: Core Policy 7 - Providing Supporting Infrastructure.**

There is a definite lack of any supporting infrastructure in regards to the proposed Local Plan and number of proposed dwellings.

We cannot see how local services including roads, health services, schools etc will be able to cope with the planned developemt and number of new residents.

**We do not believe that the District will be able to cope with this level of growth. Also, we are concerned with the impact on the environment and countryside. We therefore feel the proposal is both ineffective and unsound.**

**Re: Core Policy 4**

We feel the consultation process has been poor. The report to the Council about the consultation process ignores important procedural and policy challenges and seriously understates opposition to the proposals voiced in the thousands of written comments recieved and the public meetings convened to discuss the plan. **We therefore believe the Plan has not been positively prepared. The Plan is therefore unsound because that is not justified by robust evidence.**

**We therefore request much lower housing figures based more on the Governments figures should be used by the Vale in its Local Plan and the inspector strikes from the plan all sites within the Green Belt and AONB. More use of brown field sites to be encouraged.**

Yours faithfully and best regards,

Andrew Simon Allen

Sharon Ann Allen

Amber Holly Allen

Etienne Alix Allen