

Comment

Consultee	Mr Bill Falkenau (748066)
Email Address	
Company / Organisation	Wantage Joint Economic Forum
Address	Wantage Town Council Offices Portway Wantage OX12 9BX
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Wantage Joint Economic Forum (Mr Bill Falkenau)
Comment ID	LPPub3055
Response Date	21/01/15 13:23
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
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?	Yes

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.

Changes have been made in the final version of the Local Plan that have not been subject to adequate/proper public consultation. The acceptance of such changes renders the consultation process as a token exercise.

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.

The site allocation should revert to the land east of East Hanney proposed in the public consultation in February 2014. No notice has been given prior to the publication of the latest version in November 2014 that such a change would be made. Consultation on this change has been non-existent and fails to meet the requirement for soundness. If such a major change was to be made, a further round of consultation should have been conducted prior to preparing the draft for referral to the Planning Inspectorate. It should be noted that in the

February consultation document, the proposed development was deemed to be part of the South Vale Sub Area. It has now been migrated to being part of Abingdon on Thames, and Oxford Fringe Sub Area and yet moved further away from these areas. Reverting to the site proposed in February 2014 would remove the claim that consultation has been inadequate. The change in the location of the East Hanney site allocation creates new conflicts with NPPF policies that have not been adequately considered.

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? Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination

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.

Q7 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I have no confidence in the planning officers to give regard to the points raised and feel it necessary to directly participate in the oral examination. The change in the location of the East Hanney site allocation creates new conflicts with NPPF policies that have not been adequately considered.