

Comment

Consultee	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley (831022)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Dair and Vicki Farrar-Hockley
Comment ID	LPPub1239
Response Date	22/12/14 11:37
Consultation Point	Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
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 your comment(s) relate to a specific site within a core policy please select this from the drop down list.	N/A

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.

POLICY 3 SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

Objection based on Policy 3 being unsound, due to a conflict with national planning policies supporting sustainable development by focusing on development within or adjacent major settlements with the widest range of jobs, shops and facilities, and greatest opportunities for travel by foot, cycling and public transport, rather than being dependent on the private car.

The latest Vale Annual Monitoring Report shows that in the Vale between 2001-2011:

72% of new dwellings were located in Towns 15% of new dwellings were in Larger Villages 10% of new dwellings were in Smaller Villages

Policy 3 proposes only c.3,000 dwellings in Market Towns, with greatly increased housing in Larger and Smaller Villages than the current Local Plan.

Policy 3 would therefore significantly increase the % of new development in Larger and Smaller Villages, contrary to the principles of sustainable development.

Developments of over 50 dwellings in Larger and Smaller Villages with under 500 dwellings is likely to affect the character, appearance and countryside setting, esp. in AONB, of existing settlements.

The proposed amendment would add development west of Didcot, and at Grove, to the category of Towns as Didcot has a population of 25,000 pop.

The amendment would delete Harwell Campus, Rowstock and Milton Heights from the categories of Larger and Smaller Villages, as they do not have the characteristics of Villages.