

Comment

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Consultee | Mr John Platts (872102) |
| Email Address | [REDACTED] |
| Address | 8 Norfolk Close Radley Abingdon OX14 3BH |
| Event Name | Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication |
| Comment by | Mr John Platts |
| Comment ID | LPPub2462 |
| Response Date | 16/12/14 21:50 |
| Consultation Point | Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (View) |
| Status | Submitted |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.2 |

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? Yes

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.

Core Policy 4:

This policy sets out the housing target based on the Oxfordshire strategic housing market assessment (SHMA). There are two possible objections here.

1. The SHMA is based on wildly optimistic employment forecasts. These have not been challenged or scrutinised by the Vale Council. 2. The SHMA itself states that it should only be a starting point for the determination of housing need and that environmental, social and infrastructure constraints should be taken into account. This has not occurred. Any comments relating to the earlier consultation process should also be attached to **core policy 4**. There are again two issues to consider.

1 In the region of 500 residents from Radley responded in April using our standard letter. These were all considered as one objection, despite assurances from Council Leader Matthew Barber on 4th April that they would be considered individually. How can this possibly democratic to disregard at a stroke this level of objection.

The Vale now admit that there were problems with their website. We can't know if any comments were lost as a result but an extension was granted to key landowner Radley College, whose response is dated 11/04/2014 a full week after the close. No such extension was offered to the public. Again, how is this democratic?

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.

I consider that this whole process fundamentally fails in the duty to co-operate, it is undemocratic and fails to allow the community to object as follows:

- 1 the timescale to complete this form, being in the run up to Christmas, makes it difficult to complete given the demands on people's time at this time of year;
- 2 the issues are expressed by the Vale in a complex form that makes it inaccessible to a significant proportion of our community;
- 3 the registration process before even filling in this form will exclude many in the community;
- 4 this form is difficult to use and requires a detailed knowledge of the local plan - this will again exclude many;
- 5 the paper copy states that it should be delivered to Planning Policy at the District Council at their office in Wallingford. This is no good if you live in Radley and wish to have a receipt!
- 6 the manner in which the first round of the consultation was undertaken and the means employed to disregard the views of hundreds of people in Radley gives little faith that the same will not happen again.

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, Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the 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:

The process undertaken is, to date, fundamentally flawed (as covered above) and has been managed in such a way by the Vale that there has not yet been a genuine opportunity for the community to be heard. Therefore I would like the opportunity to participate.