

2013 ✓ SUMMARISE=0 Policy SP28

View Response

Response Details

From Peter Haarer

Date Started: 13 Dec 2018 16:42. Last modified: 13 Dec 2018 16:42

Status Complete

Response ID #672709

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address

[REDACTED]

Postal Address 19 Purcell Road,

[REDACTED]

Postcode OX3 0EZ

Gender

[REDACTED]

What is your age?

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

What is your ethnic
group?

[REDACTED]

Your ethnic group (if
you answered other)

Are you disabled?

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest

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)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Paragraph | <input type="radio"/> Policies Map |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Policy Number | <input type="radio"/> Sustainability Appraisal |

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

293.1
1.861
172442

Policy 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 type="radio"/> |
| (b) is sound? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| (c) complies with the duty to co-operate? | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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.

Policy SP28: Park Farm seems inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 27 March 2012 Section 9 Protecting Green Belt Land Paragraphs 79 to 92. In my view Park Farm forms an essential portion of Green Belt Land that serves very well the main purposes of such land and in particular the prevention of unrestricted sprawl, the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment and the preservation of the setting and special character of the city of Oxford on its eastern flank facing Marston. In addition, the access road to Park Farm is an essential route used heavily by pedestrians to gain access to the rural footpaths which cross fields in this area and lead towards formal parkland or playing fields; therefore widening this road to take construction traffic and, subsequently, its use by residential traffic, would diminish the accessibility of adjacent Green Belt Land. Further, development of Park Farm for housing would erode the integrity of adjacent Green Belt Land (in particular adjoining sports fields) rendering these liable to similar infilling at a later date and removing the break between neighbouring areas of housing. Finally, I see no guarantees that housing built on Park Farm will contribute to local community needs rather than adding to housing stock for those who live in Oxford and commute to jobs elsewhere.

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.

Park Farm should be removed from consideration for development as housing and should be retained as Green Belt Land.