

# View Response

## Response Details

From Dr Peter Williams

Date Started: 24 Dec 2018 17:00. Last modified: 24 Dec 2018 17:00

Status Complete

Response ID #674745

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [REDACTED]

Postal Address [REDACTED] Oxford Rd  
[REDACTED]

Postcode OX30PQ

Gender [REDACTED]

What is your age? [REDACTED]

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 Environment, Housing, Transport and Parking, Community  
Issues

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

200-1-861  
9.157, 9.159 / SP26

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

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

I believe it is unsound because it fails to address adequately access and setting. Mill Lane is narrow and incorporates an S-bend, the site of frequent 'near misses'. as an access route it is totally inadequate and does not have the potential for widening, necessary for safety reasons.

Being adjacent to a conservation area it is difficult to see how the development would in any way 'enhance' this; it could only detract, even if it was a low density development

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.

To make the document sound further consideration needs to be given to access and setting. Additionally, in my view, using Green Belt land for this purpose cannot be justified.

# View Response

## Response Details

From Dr Peter Williams

Date Started: 24 Dec 2018 17:13. Last modified: 24 Dec 2018 17:13

Status Complete

Response ID #674749

---

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [REDACTED]

Postal Address [REDACTED] Oxford Rd  
[REDACTED]

Postcode OX30PQ

Gender [REDACTED]

What is your age? [REDACTED]

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 Environment, Housing, Transport and Parking, Community  
Issues

Survey Types

1

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

- Paragraph  Policies Map  
 Policy Number  Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

9.161, 9.162, 9.164 /SP27

200.2  
- 298  
- 862

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

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

3

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

- (a) positively prepared?

- (b) justified?
- (c) effective?
- (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 positioning of this development adversely affects Old Marston village in terms of additional traffic (already congested), safety (Mill Lane is narrow with concealed turns and does not allow vehicles passing in opposite directions in stretches). It is also unsound insofar as it intrudes into the Green Belt, an essential feature of the area, forming a natural boundary and setting for the village conservation area.

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.

'Improvements' to Mill Lane would fail to address safety concerns and the proposal would detract from the Village Conservation Area to a degree which makes it unsound and undesirable