## Comment

Consultee Mr R Garrett (831316)

**Email Address** 

**Address** 11 Rose Avenue

> Abingdon Unknown

**Event Name** Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One -

Publication

Comment by Mr R Garrett

**Comment ID** LPPub4163

**Response Date** 26/01/15 11:21

**Consultation Point** Core Policy 34: A34 Strategy ( View )

Submitted Status

**Submission Type Email** 

Version 0.4

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)

If your comment(s) relate to a specific site within a N/A core policy please select this from the drop down list.

No

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 Yes the Duty to Co-operate?

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.

The addition of a diamond junction at Lodge Hill to allow more traffic onto the A34 may aid local traffic a little but given the congestion on the A34 and its vulnerability to complete closure when accidents occur? including just yesterday, demonstrates that the road system is at, or maybe beyond, capacity. The Lodge Hill improvement would need to be in place before any further development in North

Abingdon. The recent government announcement on roads includes only CTV and information signs for the A34 (and minor changes to approach roads to 2 junctions north of Oxford). This will let drivers know how many miles long the queue is but will do nothing to prevent the frequent long queues. This recognises the problems of any further expansion of the A34 itself.

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.

Build housing close to employment to prioritise the need for the A34 to be a major trunk road not a commuter route.

**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, Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the 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:

Whilst not necessary as I am sure the Inspector will consider these submissions, I would value hearing the process and would be willing to answer any additional questions.