McLOUGHLIN
PLANNING

Examination in Public Statement Stage 1 – Matters and Questions

In respect of:

Matter 4 – Unmet Housing Needs

On behalf of:

The Gow Family

1.0 Introduction

1.1. McLoughlin Planning is instructed by The Gow Family (hereafter referred to as the respondents) to make written representations to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Examination in respect of its land and development interests in the village of Appleton.

1.2. This document sets out the respondents' position in respect of the Stage 1 questions posed by the Inspector for Matter 4, Questions 4.3 and 4.4 only.

Question 4.3

1.3. The Council's Cabinet Report dated 7 August 2015 set out a need for between 8,000 to 16,000 new homes to be accommodated across Oxfordshire in response to meeting Oxford City's unmet housing needs. According to the minutes, whilst the Cabinet is minded to ensues the approach that it will have to take a share of the additional dwellings required, this will be the subject of a Scrutiny Committee meeting on 20 August and individual Cabinet member decision.

1.4. Against this context, there will be a need for the plan to accommodate additional housing in the District. In terms of the Spatial strategy adopted, the respondents remain neutral on the strategy and policies, regarding general direction of growth. However, they are critical that the Plan as drafted does not make the necessary allocations to accommodate all of the housing required for the District, let alone accommodating additional development resulting from Oxford City's unmet housing needs. This, therefore, puts considerable pressure on the Plan to make additional allocations and undermines the Part 1 and Part 2 approach adopted by the Council so far to the production of the Plan.

1.5. Paragraph 157 of the Framework and Local Plan paragraph 002 of the PPG make it clear that there is a "crucial" requirement to allocate sites to promote development (framework) and make it clear (i.e. not indicative) as to what, where, when and how development will be delivered (PPG). The need to deal with Oxford's unmet needs clearly places pressure on the Plan to meet these guidance requirements. In line with other representations, the respondents consider that whilst a two-part Local Plan is consistent with the LDS, the evidence to support that decision is not available.

Question 4.4

1.6. Whilst the respondents are aware of the tests of soundness and the legal requirements for the Plan to meet, the concern is that such delays could result in the respondents' land interests being prejudiced by developments outside of its control. As a result, it is recommended that should the Inspector conclude that CP2 is

unsound in general, then a series of modifications are proposed. It is considered that the need to backload housing allocation arising out of the Oxford City unmet housing need figure into Part 2 of the Plan is unrealistic and contrary to the guidance in both the Framework and PPG. Instead, it is recommended that additional allocations are made in the Plan to address the shortfall, which should include (albeit not exclusively limited to) non-strategic development sites. One such proposal would be to bringing the respondents land forward at Appleton as an allocation in Part 1 of the Plan as opposed to Part 2.

McLoughlin Planning
North Warehouse
Gloucester Docks
Gloucester
GL1 2FB
01452 835 614
www.mplanning.co.uk