

Policy SP28 198

SUMMARISED

View Response

Response Details

From Daniel Bulte

Date Started: 25 Nov 2018 15:31. Last modified: 25 Nov 2018 15:31

Status Complete

Response ID #665531

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [REDACTED]

Postal Address

Postcode OX [REDACTED]

Gender

What is your age?

If you are under 16,
what is your date of
birth?

What is your ethnic
group?

Your ethnic group (if
you answered other)

Are you disabled?

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest Housing, Planning and Regeneration, Transport and Parking

Survey Types

1

Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number in the comment box below)

- Paragraph Policies Map
 Policy Number Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

198.1
859

SP28: Park Farm

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| (a) is legally compliant? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| (b) is sound? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| (c) complies with the duty to co-operate? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

3

Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

(a) positively prepared?

(c) effective?

(b) justified?

(d) consistent with national policy?

4

Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

The damage to the green belt is not justified. The impact on the flood risk to surrounding areas served by 19th century sewer systems is not adequately considered. The impact of climate change on the flood zoning of the area is inadequate. The risk to the nearby SSSI is too great to justify the development. The risk of raw sewerage flooding into the SSSI is currently substantial, further development, pushing flood water towards the SSSI will essentially guarantee its destruction. The increased risk from flood damage to existing houses in the area is not adequately considered. The field has been known to flood completely, multiple times in recent years, indicating that the current flood zone rating is incorrect. The impact to the natural environment through the removal of hedgerows and culverts is not justified. The impact on the safety of the cycle path that links Marston to the city centre is too great. At present a cyclist or pedestrian can travel from Rippington drive all the way to the Radcliffe Science Library without having to cross a public road. The increase in traffic along Edgeway road which is the marked cycle route to the John Radcliffe Hospital would be an increased risk to vulnerable road users. The increase in traffic past nearby schools would endanger children, and worsen existing congestion issues.

5

What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

The Park Farm site is simply not suitable for development. and planning permission should not be granted.