

Comment

Consultee	Mr Ken Dijksman (404457)
Email Address	dijksman@msn.com
Company / Organisation	Dijkman Planning LLP
Address	35 Berkeley Road Newbury RG14 5JY
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Dijkman Planning LLP (Mr Ken Dijksman)
Comment ID	LPPub2386
Response Date	14/01/15 16:24
Consultation Point	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.10
Files	2748 Concept Layout REV A SK04_1.pdf

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? Yes

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

If you think your comment relates to the DtC, this is about how we have worked with the Duty to Cooperate bodies (such as neighbouring planning authorities)

Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate? No

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.

Re: Representations to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 1 ? Submission Draft

Re: Core Policy 4 (East Challow) Within the consultation draft of February 2014 (Site 23) the attached area of East Challow was identified as appropriate for allocation of 200 dwellings, it was considered to be a sustainable location in this village that has been identified as a Local Service Centre. This proposed allocation has been deleted from the submission version of the Local Plan due to concerns about landscape impact and the consequent conclusion that it could not accommodate 200 dwellings.

This submission includes a draft layout which demonstrates the site area can accommodate 200 dwellings whilst retaining all existing landscape screening, existing trees and hedge planting plus additional areas of open space and structural landscaping. It is therefore being proposed in these representations that this site could and should be allocated through a modification to the plan as an alternative to less sustainable developments proposed in sensitive landscapes.

In view of the fundamental importance of the plan for the social, environmental and economic future of this area it is crucial that the plan as a whole, and by implication specific proposals within it, are in compliance with the soundness tests of Paragraph 182 of the NPPF:

? Positively prepared - the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

? Justified - the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

? Effective - the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

? Consistent with national policy - the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework. (Paragraph 182 NPPF)

Elements of the Current Plan are Unsound It is our belief that there are elements of the proposed plan which are unsound when considered against the tests set out in paragraph 182 of the NPPF. The allocation of the land at E Challow would go some way towards rectifying the problems identified. These concerns relate principally to the requirement of the plan to identify developments which deliver adequate social and environmental infrastructure in sustainable locations and importantly, that are less sensitive than other available more environmentally sensitive alternatives.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q6 If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination