

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation :

3. To which part of the Core Strategy does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the DPD is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>

Please mark as appropriate.

5. 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.

(continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

6. 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 at 5 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.

Map P33 Part 1 Appendices

I cannot find any core policy on Rights of Way in the Local Plan.

Therefore I draw the Inspectors attention to the map ("Milton Heights, Milton Parish west of the A34") that starts at its top, a line in purple marking Footpath 10.

The Inspector will note that this line is already broken – and the footpath and the footpath is indeed dangerous by the A4130. It will be totally unusable if the road is doubled in width.

However, what I am concerned about – as my employer Mr Mockler owns Footpath 10 – is the fact that our tractors already find it dangerous to use the 'old' track to new farm; and will find it impossibly dangerous in the future.

Therefore, I propose that to some Core Policy (on Transport) be added a clause insisting on an underpass at least 8 feet high – which would accommodate both pedestrians and farm vehicles. All linked up (as obviously needs to be the case) to both sections of footpath 10.

I consider the Plan fundamentally unsound due to the lack of any policy (a) analysing and (b) safeguarding Agricultural land in the Vale.

I therefore request a new and additional strategic, district wide Core Policy headed "Safeguarding Agricultural Land in the Vale" to safeguard the best and secure better agricultural land for future generations.