

Comment

Consultee	Hazel Oliver (832467)
Email Address	
Address	33 Selwyn Crescent Radley OX14 3AL
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Hazel Oliver
Comment ID	LPPub2658
Response Date	20/01/15 14:12
Consultation Point	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Files	DRAFT Objection letter to the Vale 1 April 2014.docx
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

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 consultation process has been poor. The report to the Council about the consultation process ignores important procedural and policy challenges, and seriously understates opposition to the proposals voiced both in the several thousand written comments received and at the public meetings convened to discuss the plan. I therefore believe the Plan has not been positively prepared.

For the above reasons, I consider the Plan to be unsound because it is not justified by robust evidence. Consequently I request that much lower housing figures, based more closely on the Government's

own household projections, should be used by the Vale in its Local Plan, and that the Inspector dismisses all site allocations in the Green Belt and North Wessex Downs from the Local Plan.

I also attach a copy of my comments dated 2 April 2014 made on the earlier public consultation as about 500 Radley residents responded to the consultation in April using a standard letter prepared by Radley Parish Council. But these letters were considered as one objection despite assurances from Matthew Barber, Council Leader on 4 April that they would be considered individually.