

Malcolm Rivett
c/o Ian Kemp
Programme Officer
16 Cross Furlong
Wychbold, Droitwich Spa
Worcestershire
WR9 7TA

Contact officer:
Emma Wright
planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk
Tel: 01235 422600

Textphone users add 18001 before you dial

10 June 2016

Dear Mr Rivett

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1 Examination – Inspector's Interim Findings (Requested Responses)

Thank you for your letter dated 7 June 2016.

Please find below Vale of White Horse District Council's answers to your requested responses 1 – 4:

Requested response 1: I seek confirmation from the Council that it is content to pursue adoption of the Part 1 plan modified to retain the existing Green Belt boundaries, other than in respect of housing allocation sites 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Vale of White Horse response: Yes

Requested response 2: I seek confirmation from the Council that it is content to pursue adoption of the Part 1 plan modified to delete housing allocation sites 12 and 13.

Vale of White Horse response: Yes

Requested response 3: in order to assist my determination of whether or not this allocation is soundly based I would be grateful if the Council would formally consider if, in the light of a review of current evidence, housing development of the scale envisaged in the plan is appropriate in East Hanney and if the site 6 housing site allocation is deliverable.

Vale of White Horse response:

In light of Appeal Decision (Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/W/16/3142562) the Council is of the view that the strategic site at Land South of East Hanney should be removed from Local Plan 2031: Part 1. Consideration as to whether East Hanney may be an

appropriate location for smaller (non-strategic) development could be considered through preparation of the Local Plan 2031: Part 2.

Requested response 4: in order that I can reach a view on whether or not the policy is soundly based I would be grateful to receive further comments from the Council in respect of policy CP11, having particular regard to:

(a) The lack of any indication in the policy or its supporting text of the amount of retail floorspace which would be required at Botley Central Area to meet the objectively-assessed needs;

(b) The exclusion from the boundary of the Central Area, as defined in Fig 5.3 of the plan, of a bank and a church, given their inclusion within the Botley Centre SPD Site Boundary.

(c) The inclusion of existing residential development within the Fig 5.3-defined Central Area without a policy requirement that it is replaced, noting in particular that part (iii) of the policy does require that the library and Baptist Church also included in the defined area are replaced. Whilst the SPD is not formally before me for consideration I also note that the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the SPD scores housing provision as a significant beneficial effect when neither policy CP11 nor the SPD itself require the provision of housing as part of the scheme.

Vale of White Horse response:

The Council will provide additional information to add clarity to the policy CP11 (Botley Central Area). For example, this will include:

- I. The quantum of retail floor space appropriate at Botley Central Area.
- II. Amending the Botley Central Area to include the bank and Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, to be consistent with the recently adopted Botley Centre SPD.
- III. Amending the policy (CP11) to confirm that any residential development within the defined Botley Central Area will either be retained or replaced.

If there are any questions regarding our comments, please contact Emma Wright on 01235 422600.

Yours sincerely



Adrian Duffield
Head of Planning