

## Comment

Consultee	Mr John Clements (872347)
Email Address	
Address	19 Raleigh Park Road Oxford OX2 9AZ
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr John Clements
Comment ID	LPPub908
Response Date	18/12/14 20:45
Consultation Point	Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

**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?** Yes

**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 37 is too vaguely worded to ensure that good design prevails over developers' commercial considerations. It has no strength as currently written

**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 should be re-phrased to say that developments **must** be of high quality design. Why should we settle for less?

**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?** No - I do not wish to participate at the oral examination