



**Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part One:  
Strategic Sites and Policies**  
Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For official  
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan

Response form for the Vale of White Horse strategic planning policy document, the Local Plan Part one. Please return to Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, Wallingford, OX10 8ED or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) no later than Friday 19 December 2014 by 4.30 pm precisely.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

## Part A

### 1. Personal Details\*

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

### 2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	Mrs	
First Name	Julia	
Last Name	Hammett	
Job Title (where relevant)	N/A	
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	69 Hurst Rise Road	
Line 2	Cumnor Hill	
Line 3	Oxford	
Line 4		
Post Code	OX2 9HE	
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address (where relevant)		

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Julia Hammett

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph

5.28

Policy

CP11

Proposals Map

Botley Central Area

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant

Yes

☐

No

☐

4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)

Yes

☐

No

No

4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes

☐

No

☐

*Please mark as appropriate.*

5. 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 designation of Botley is ambiguous and this lack of clarity brings into question conclusions reached for its future development. In Chapter 4 it is unclear what is meant by a 'service centre and 'local service centre'. In Chapter 5 'the priority is to maintain Botley as a service and employment centre' Botley is not functioning as a district centre of Oxford City centre like Headington and Summertown. It is incorrectly compared to the historic town of Faringdon which is a major retail centre for a large rural area. The retail report on which policy is based incorrectly considers Botley as an area which includes retail units along the Botley Road.

Botley already provides a range of shops and facilities are available in nearby Oxford thus making any development beyond the present use unsuitable and unsustainable for local needs. There is no evidence provided for a superstore.

Any development should be kept to the present retail area( Phase i0 and not Phase 1& 2 which would include the rectory and a residential home for the elderly built just 25 years ago.

6. 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 at 5 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.

Botley functioning as a district centre of Oxford city centre and as Botley is similar to Faringdon should both be removed

5.29 Refers to a retail study on which policy for the area is based but it is flawed as it refers to Botley as a much wider area than it is and takes in the retail parks along the Botley Road. Evidence produced by the study should not be included

Add: Botley already provides a range of shops and facilities available in nearby Oxford, make development beyond the current level unsuitable and unsustainable for local needs. There is no evidence provided that a food superstore is needed.

5.31 is incorrect as any development should be based on Phase 1 and not the wider area which includes the residential home and the vicarage, so this should be omitted and the plan corrected to show this

**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.**

7. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

☐ No

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

☐

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

**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.

Signature:

Date:

18.12.2014