

Comment

Consultee	Ms Bev Hindle (874773)
Email Address	Bev.hindle@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Company / Organisation	Oxfordshire County Council
Address	Environment & Economy Speedwell House Oxford OX1 1NE
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Oxfordshire County Council (Ms Bev Hindle)
Comment ID	LPPub3982
Response Date	23/01/15 14:53
Consultation Point	Core Policy 7: Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
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.

Infrastructure and Services

4. The main issue for the county council is the identification, provision, funding and deliverability of infrastructure and services required to support the proposed level of growth.

5. Notwithstanding tight timescales, the county council has worked with the Vale to identify what infrastructure and service enhancements are needed to support the proposed allocations. We will continue to work proactively with the Vale as the plan progresses.

6. Where proposed sites need new or extended schools the county will need to undertake further work to demonstrate solutions are deliverable. Some sites currently may be unviable due to the small scale of housing proposed in the Plan (Radley, John Blandy, St. James in East Hanney, St. Blaise and Stanford in the Vale) and some school expansions are predicated on the need for 3rd party land which has yet to be acquired (Radley, Sutton Courtenay, John Blandy, St. James in East Hanney, St. Blaise, Shrivenham and Stanford in the Vale). Therefore the delivery of these developments is contingent on a solution being found that is deliverable within the required timeframe.

7. There is a significant reliance on third party funding to deliver the transport infrastructure, in particular, required to support the Plan. Some of that funding is already secured, but it is assumed the remainder will come from the Local Growth Fund (LGF) and contributions from developments within SODC. This presents a significant risk, we must have confidence that required supporting infrastructure will be funded and be delivered in time to support the growth planned. It is uncertain that the current approach will be sufficient to convince the Inspector that the significant risk can be mitigated.

8. The Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) is a live document and this must be recognised. It appears to capture the main infrastructure items but not necessarily the full cost of items. It is important that regular updates are made to reflect the changing nature of infrastructure packages needed to support growth. This is especially important when considering the timing of development and speculative planning applications.

9. In general the plan appears well written and considered with well worded Policies related to affordable housing, housing mix, meeting the needs of an aging population. However, the wording proposed in the policy should be strengthened in respect of delivering specialist housing.