

Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2 Examination

Submission by

Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council

and the Fyfield Land Action Group (FLAG)



The Fyfield Elm

In Support of Representation ID: **730255** (Dr Stephen Fraser)

Matter 1: Duty to Co-operate and other legal requirements

Question 1.6: Has the preparation of the LPP2 complied with the Statement of Community Involvement

Fyfield & Tubney Parish Council and FLAG wish to be represented at the Public Examination by:

Mr Julian Mellor ID730255 (Chair, Fyfield & Tubney Parish Council)

Mr. John Watts ID730255 (Fyfield & Tubney Parish Councillor)

Dr. Stephen Fraser ID730255 (Fyfield & Tubney Parish Clerk)

Part 1

Submission in Support of Representation on Community Involvement made by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, November 2017

This submission should be read in conjunction with all sections of the representation on the Publication version of LPP2 made by Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council on the subject of:

Lack of engagement with Fyfield & Tubney Parish Council and the inadequate responses to major issues raised by the local community render the Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031, Part 2 unsound and not legally compliant

To assist in this we have shown a summary of the structure of our previous representation in Part 2 of this submission.

We maintain our position that the Vale of White Horse District Council (VoWHDC) has not complied with its own key documents and processes, including the Statement of Community Involvement, which sets the standard for community engagement during the preparation of Local Plans.

Our position has been substantiated and further reinforced by the Planning Officer's responses to our representation as shown on Pages 222 and 223 of the VoWHDC's document, Regulation 22, Consultation Statement, Appendix 3, Submission Version, February 2018

In this document, the officer's response(s):

- merely re-make statements that have been contested in our representation, thereby ignoring the evidence within the representation
- do not attempt address the points made in our representation (**see section 2 of our representation**)
- state the technical evidence used to inform site selection is prepared by "professional consultants"
 - this implies that the technical evidence prepared by "professional consultants" is the only evidence of any weight and that evidence and concerns raised by parishioners (who are professionals in their own right) carries little or no weight and can be ignored
 - our representation demonstrates that site selection was made in advance of reports from the "professional consultants" which could therefore not have informed the site selection process (**see section 2.2. of our representation**)

- have omitted to address some of the issues raised (**see section 2. of our representation**)
- has misinterpreted the point being made in the representation regarding time allowed for consultation in referring to a different phase of the process (**see section 1.2. last paragraph, of our representation**)

It should be noted that inadequate Planning Officer responses in the Local Plan 2031, Part 2, Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Consultation Statement, Appendix 3, Publication Version, October 2017 was one of the key points made in our previous representation (**see section 2.2. of our representation**).

Additionally, **section 2** of our representation summarises actual community involvement. It should therefore be noted that there was **no** consultation with the Parish Council prior to the publication of the Preferred Options Version of the Local Plan in March 2017.

This can only lead to the conclusion that VoWHDC has failed to engage with the local community during the Preferred Options and Consultation phases, and in its responses to our representation.

Part 2

Summary of Structure, Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council Representation on Community Involvement, Vale of White Horse District Council LPP2 Consultation Phase, November 2017

Section 1: Sets out the key VoWHDC documents that set the standard for community involvement

VoWHDC Local Plan 2031 Part 2, Publicity Period Guidance Note refers to:

1.1. Legal Requirements including consultation in accordance with Statement of Community Involvement (SoCI)

Part 1 – extracts from this part of the SoCI highlight the spirit which the Vale of White Horse District Council **should** adopt to ensure overall community involvement in the planning process.

Part 2 - extracts from this part of the SoCI Part 2 highlight the spirit which the Vale of White Horse District Council **should** adopt to ensure Community Involvement in the preparation of the Local Plan 2031, Part 2.

1.2. Test of soundness in accordance with national policy and guidance

Inclusion of proof that VoWHDC has involved communities and stakeholders and reference to consultation summary report.

Section 2: Sets out what actual community engagement was undertaken and demonstrates lack of involvement

2.1. Briefing session, VoWHDC and F&T PC with representation from KB&S PC on 25/04/17

Description of the meeting and lack of interest to listen/engage from District Council representatives.

2.2. LPP2 Preferred Options consultation, 09/03/17 – 04/05/17

Discussion on various points within:

- Local Plan 2031 Part 2, Detailed Policies and Additional Sites, Consultation Statement, Publication Version October 2017
- Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Detailed Policies and Additional Sites Consultation Statement, Appendix 3, Publication Version, October 2017
- Local Plan 2031, Part 2 Detailed Policies and Additional Sites, Topic Paper 2, Site Selection, Appendix B, 2 October 2017, KBAG_A, pages 46 and 47

2.3. Parish and Town Councillors briefing session, 19/09/17

Description of the meeting and lack of interest to listen/engage from District Council representatives.

2.4. Letter, Chair of F&T PC to Matthew Barber of VoWHDC, 25/09/17

Description of attempts to engage DC through its leader and lack of compliance with DC's Customer Service Standards.

2.5. Attempts by a parishioner of F&Tubney Parish to correspond with Matthew Barber, leader of VoWHDC

Description of a parishioner's attempts to engage with VoWHDC

Section 3: Draws conclusions to support lack of legal compliance and unsoundness.

- The preparation of the Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031, Part 2 is not legally compliant

Bullet points on above

- The Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2031, Part 2 is unsound

Bullet points on above

Part 3

Representations by Other Parties Covering this Topic in Regulation 22, Consultation Statement, Appendix 3, Submission Version, February 2018

Person ID	Full Name	Person ID	Full Name
1094354	Mr Keith Budgen, CBE	1098023	Ms Janine Elton
1143110	Dr Stephen Fraser	1097660	Mr Tim Dougall
1095325	Mr Brian Buchan	1142741	Mr Philip Hatzis
1144596	Mr William Martin	1142765	Claire Cable-Alexander
1097547	Sarah Daley	1144044	Mr Geoff Pritchard
11444069	Mr Matthew Bowman	1144305	Mrs Winifred Cox