

Comment

Consultee	Chilton Garden Centre (874676)
Address	3 Pioneer Court Chivers Way Cambridge CB24 9PT
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Chilton Garden Centre
Comment ID	LPPub3604
Response Date	22/01/15 15:21
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Files	Chilton GC Vale of White Horse LP March 2014.doc_redacted.doc Chilton GC Vale of White Horse LP Nov 2014 1.doc_redacted.doc

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? Yes

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.

See Attachment.

Q5 Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

At present Core Policy 8 is unsound in the context of paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Redrow Homes would note that its anticipated trajectory is not the same as the Housing Delivery Trajectory at Appendix 3 of the Topic Paper 4. Accordingly, Redrow considers that the publication version should be modified to incorporate a more positive delivery trajectory for the South of Kenington location identified at Core Policy 8.

Redrow Homes would also suggest that the last part of the first paragraph of Core Policy 8 be rephrased to read "to minimise pressure on the highway network whilst maintaining the strategic purposes of the Oxford Green Belt.

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

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Q7 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The Local Plan raises the importance of delivering the City Deal. Redrow Homes is a key stakeholder in this process and feels that it is of vital importance that we participate in the examination hearings to explain and explore the critical strategic issue of housing delivery. By participating in examination hearings Redrow Homes can provide up to date and robust evidence on the delivery of the South Kenington allocation in the context of the housing delivery trajectory.