



**Vale
of White Horse**
District Council

Local Plan 2031 Part 2

Publication Version Representation Form

Ref:

(For official
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Vale of White Horse
Local Plan 2031 Part 2

Please return by 5pm on Wednesday 22 November 2017 to: Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

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.

Title

MR.

First Name

DAVID

Last Name

SCOPES

Job Title (where relevant)

Organisation representing
(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Postal Town

Post Code

Telephone Number

Email Address

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Sharing your details: please see page 3

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or organisation:

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

Paragraph

255, 274

Policy

9a

Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: *(Please tick as appropriate)*

4. (1) Legally compliant

Yes

☐

No

☐

4. (2) Sound

Yes

☐

No

☒

4. (3) Complies with the Duty to Cooperate

Yes

☐

No

☐

5. Please provide details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate. 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 Cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Please see page 4

(Continue on page 4 /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 matter you have identified at 5 above. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate 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.

Site should be removed

(Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary)

Further comment: Please use this space to provide further comment on the relevant questions in this form. **You must state which question your comment relates to.**

Not consistent with NPPF on grounds of Unsustainability

The NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development:

Economic – *'the timely delivery of sufficient land in the right locations to support growth and....coordinating development requirements such as the provision of infrastructure';*

Social – *'supporting vibrant communities through the provision of housing, the creation of high quality living and working environments and accessible local services;*

Environmental – *'protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, using resources prudently...'*

These criteria are reflected in the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 ('LPP1') by these Strategic Objectives:

SO 3: Direct growth to the most sustainable locations in the district, ensuring development is integrated with and respects the built and natural heritage and creates attractive places in which people will want to live, as well as being supported by a sufficient range of services and facilities.

SO 8: Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport.

SO 9: Seek to ensure new development is accompanied by appropriate and timely infrastructure delivery to secure effective sustainable transport choices for new residents and businesses.

The proposals will result in the following adverse effects:

Creeping urbanisation in a rural setting

A commuter dormitory not in the right location

A 'red flag' on 5 out of 7 metrics according to Oxfordshire Growth Board as there will be very few local jobs

The A420 at Fyfield is an accepted bottleneck and will get worse

(N.B. The new roundabout on the A420, proposed to divert traffic from KBS, would cause additional delays – and, we understand, had earlier been opposed by OCC highways officials for that reason)

The roundabout will add to noise and light pollution

The new houses will be distant from the Science Vale

The new housing will not be a vibrant community

In summary, the proposal fails to meet the NPPF's economic and social dimensions of sustainability or the requirements of the District Council's Objectives SO 3 and SO 9 quoted above. Housing people in a sterile development unsympathetic to its rural environment, lacking proper infrastructure, distant from work opportunities

