

Comment

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Consultee | Mr Richard Waters (756280) |
| Email Address | |
| Address | Leigh House High Street Harwell OX110ER |
| Event Name | Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication |
| Comment by | Mr Richard Waters |
| Comment ID | LPPub1015 |
| Response Date | 19/12/14 10:17 |
| Consultation Point | Core Policy 6: Meeting Business and Employment Needs (View) |
| Status | Submitted |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.2 |

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.

The policy relates only to the contingency of **not enough land coming forward** to meet the housing needs, and the possibility of allocating additional sites.

There is no contingency or monitoring check for a **slow down in build rate** . Sites may be allocated and have permissions, but if the developer is not building the 5-year housing supply will be under threat

The only contingency outlined for action is the **number of jobs** where *?satisfactory? progress should be made by the end of the first five year, and if not the action is to bring forward employment development*

Successive governments have failed to magic jobs out of nothing. The worry here is that between now and 2031 there?s a good chance of another recession, or maybe a new government pulls out of Europe and all the Space jobs on the Campus go somewhere else.

The Vale will then be left with half-finished estates, in the most damaging* sites, providing dormitory accommodation for people who work elsewhere.

[* damaging in the sense of impact on the landscape and the environment]

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.

Revise the monitoring framework, to provide additional checks (every two years?)

a) if there is a slow down in build rates, or

b) if there is a downward change to the employment forecasts in the SHMA and the supporting evidence base, and hence to provide for a reduction in housing allocations and the removal of strategic sites.

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? No - I do not wish to participate at the oral examination