

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Sarah Wimborne (871991)
Email Address	
Address	26 Appleton road Oxford Ox2 9qh
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mrs Sarah Wimborne
Comment ID	LPPub412
Response Date	16/12/14 13:29
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

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) 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.

There is a lack of appropriate infrastructure to support the Plan

- 1) The A34 is inadequate already and would need to be the main transport link from Cumnor to the great majority of newly-created jobs in the science area near Harwell.
- 2) Access to 4 out of the 5 sites would be via a single lane one-way route through the centre of the village which runs past the village school and is already deemed dangerous and inadequate at current traffic levels. Proximity of property on either side of this route and the village layout means widening/alternative routes are not viable.
- 3) Doctors facilities are already at capacity at the local Botley centre
- 4) The local primary school has only one class per year and is already at capacity

Consultation Process

- Inadequate time given for people to respond, approx. 6 weeks in total .
- Bad timing, near Christmas when people are busy with other things.
- Very difficult website to navigate will put many respondents off.
- Voluminous information, too much to wade through.
- Language used is too complex and technical.
- Consequences of Green Belt removal not clearly pointed out- i.e. development is the likely outcome.
- Process seems undemocratic and for the reasons above almost underhand .

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