

## Comment

Consultee	Dr Kathryn Davies (871866)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	5 Third Acre Rise Oxford OX2 9DA
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Dr Kathryn Davies
Comment ID	LPPub1180
Response Date	19/12/14 14:36
Consultation Point	Core Policy 11: Botley Central Area ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
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.**

In Chapter 4, there is some ambiguity as to what a service centre is and what a local service centre is, which has repercussions throughout the local plan. This lack of clarity becomes almost contradictory in chapter 5 where The Oxford Fringe sub area is considered as a highly sustainable location for growth and the

overarching priority is to maintain Botley as a service and employment centre. Para 5.29 refers to the Nathaniel Lichfield retail study and it appears that the policy for Botley is based on findings in this report. The report, however, discusses Botley as a much wider area, taking in the large retail parks which line the Botley Rd. This area is not part of Botley, neither currently nor historically and it forms no part of the community of Botley. It is erroneous to assess local needs on the basis of this report.

The comparison with Faringdon illustrates this. Faringdon is a historic market town bearing no resemblance to Botley, functionally or physically.

The boundary of the central area has changed from the 2011 local plan and now includes the age-restricted housing of Field House and Vale House, only completed about 25 years ago and the Vicarage. There is no explanation or justification for this put forward and there is major local objection to this. There would also be major opposition to the demolition of the much-loved and much-used local heritage asset of Elm's Parade. It is this 1930s shopping parade which defines the character of the area and it serves its purpose very well. Selective redevelopment within the original boundary would, therefore, be more appropriate.

**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 am completely in favour of some redevelopment of the centre of Botley, but this should reflect local needs and be of a scale proportionate to the character of the area. This is not the right location for a major comprehensive redevelopment of the heart of the community to create a drive-to retail destination or district centre.

I therefore strongly object to the wording of Core Policy 11 and suggest the following amendments: ? The Botley Central Area should be redefined on the Adopted Policies Map to exclude Field House, Vale House, the Vicarage and Elms Parade ? Para (i) is fine ? para (ii) is meaningless and should be excluded ? para (iii) is fine ? para (iv) should be more positive and state that proposals should enhance the character and appearance of the local area. ? Para (v) should include reference to working with the community and key stakeholders to achieve a masterplan for the area. ? Para (vi) should be excluded and Elm's Parade should be retained

**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:**

I would like to point out the lack of clarity, many ambiguities and contradictions in the status of Botley and which policies are meant to apply