

Comment

Agent	Mr Philip Rawle (879101)
Email Address	philip.rawle@prp-consultants.com
Company / Organisation	PRP Consultants
Address	Unit 2B, The Tack Room Worcester Road Worcester WR6 6NH
Consultee	Greenlight Developments Greenlight Developments (879102)
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Greenlight Developments Greenlight Developments
Comment ID	LPPub3369
Response Date	22/01/15 11:07
Consultation Point	Core Policy 15: Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.8
Files	APPENDIX 1 (Greenlight Developments).pdf
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.

Greenlight Developments? land interest at Challow Park in East Challow, Wantage sits on the edge of both the South East Vale and Western Vale Sub-Areas.

In terms of the South East Vale Sub-Area, the key point to make here is that there seems to be an overreliance on strategic developments in the shape of sustainable urban extensions, particularly at Wantage, Harwell and Grove. This seems to be to the detriment of further development in the villages. Although East Challow itself is located in the Western Vale Sub-Area, the Challow Park site sits right on the boundary and would relate to and serve both Sub-Areas.

When one looks at the Western Vale Sub-Area, East Challow even though it is a Local Service Centre, is not allocated any strategic housing development in Part One of the Local Plan despite its Local Centre status. This approach clearly disregards the settlement classifications set out under Core Policy 3, showing a clear inconsistency between the development strategy for the District and its settlement hierarchy.

In the case of the Western Vale Sub-Area there are less sustainable settlements in the settlement hierarchy, notably the larger villages of Great Coxwell, Shrivenham and Stanford-in-the-Vale, which are receiving an astonishing 1,100 new houses between them, yet East Challow, which sits above them in the settlement hierarchy, as a Local Service Centre, is receiving no houses. This is a fundamental flaw in the Plan, as the explanatory text under Core Policy 3 makes it clear that the larger villages should only be accommodating 'local need', clearly 1,100 new houses goes way beyond local needs and is accounting for District-wide needs, a role that Local Service Centres are sustainable enough to accommodate, and our comments on Core Policy 3 above have asked for this point to be specifically emphasised.

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.

It is very much apparent that as a Local Service Centre, East Challow needs to be attributed some level of strategic growth in Part One of the Local Plan. We therefore advance Challow Park as an appropriate location for some level of growth for East Challow, as this site comprises a rare brownfield site in a sustainable location with direct access to both East Challow and Wantage (adjacent market town). Details of the proposed site are contained at Appendix 1 of these Representations.

There are therefore clear inconsistencies within the Local Plan itself between the development strategy and the settlement hierarchy, which clearly undermines the development strategy being advanced, making the Plan unsound.

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:

The nature of our representations is strategic and has key implications.