



**Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part One:  
Strategic Sites and Policies**  
Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For official  
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan

Response form for the Vale of White Horse strategic planning policy document, the Local Plan Part one. Please return to Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, Wallingford, OX10 8ED or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) no later than Friday 19 December 2014 by 4.30 pm precisely.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

## Part A

### 1. Personal Details\*

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

### 2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title

Dr

First Name

Alex

Last Name

Money

Job Title

(where relevant)

Organisation

(where relevant)

Address Line 1

2 High Street

Line 2

Cumnor

Line 3

Oxford

Line 4

Post Code

OX2 9PE

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

(where relevant)

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : ALEX MONEY

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan 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" value="X"/>
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.

I am not a NIMBY. This is not an objection to more housing per se, nor in principle to the idea that new housing may go up in close proximity to where I live. Instead, what I object to are:

1. The presumption of sustained development in the areas in question, and the implications made on housing demand in the area as a result. The projections implicit in the SHMA for Oxfordshire have not been tested and cannot be regarded as objective or sound.
2. The Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), on which I understand the SHMA is based, has not been scrutinised independently. It is at the very least possible that an alternative outcome can be envisaged. Wishing that something turns out a certain way is not the same as having a strong evidential base that something will turn out a certain way. That is the problem with the SEP and the SHMA
3. The long term irreversibility of decisions made for expedience and at haste, with the social, economic and environmental consequences that they carry. It is fashionable to talk about removing parts of the Green Belt to alleviate housing pressure. But the creep of suburbanisation brings with it new problems that may only become fully evident in 5 or 10 years from now. These deserve much more than the at best token consideration that the Plan gives them

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.

I would like to see the following:

1. That the projections implicit in the SHMA are tested for objectivity and soundness, and that the process applied to do this is transparent and accessible to all stakeholders, including residents in the Vale, such as myself
2. That the scenarios on which the SEP is based are evaluated probabilistically, and where alternative outcomes are identified, these are given appropriate consideration within the SHMA. Aspiration should not replace an evidential base
3. That the long term consequences of changes to the Green Belt are evaluated openly, objectively and transparently. These are huge, one-way bets that are being placed on the future. They will affect my children, and their children, much more than they affect me. It is my duty – and the Planners’ – to take our obligations to future generations with the seriousness it deserves.

**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.**

7. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☒

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

☐

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

**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.

Signature:

Date:

19/12/2014

