

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICT COUNCIL
ERRATUM TO THE REGULATION 22 CONSULTATION STATEMENT

- 1.1. Since the Submission of the Part 2 plan, the Council has been notified by a small number of representors who consider that their representations have been attributed to the incorrect categories in Appendix 3 to the Regulation 22 Statement (**CSD02.1**).
- 1.2. All representations received from the publicity period on the Publication Version of the Part 2 plan were sent to the Inspector in their full entirety alongside the Submission Version of the Part 2 plan. All representations are also available to view and access on the Council's Examination Library¹.
- 1.3. The Council has also identified a small number of representations which have been omitted from Appendix 3 to the Regulation 22 Statement (**CSD02.1**). Whilst the comments identified have been taken into account and the Inspector has receipt of all the Regulation 19 responses in full, this erratum corrects the omission by reference to Appendix 1 attached.

¹ Folder 018 REP Reg 19 Consultation Responses of the Examination Library, available at: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/LPP2examination

APPENDIX 1: A SUMMARY OF THE REPRESENTATIONS OMMITTED FROM APPENDIX 3 OF THE REGULATION 22 STATEMENT

Core Policy 8a: Additional Sites Allocations within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area

| Person ID | Full Name | Company / Organisation | Agent ID | Agent's Full Name | Agent Company / Organisation | Plan Soundness | Comment Category | Comment Summary | Officer Response |
|-----------|-----------|------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | J A Pye (Oxford) Ltd | | Ashley Maltman | West Waddy ADP | Yes | Comments from site promoter | <p>Several comments were made by the Site Promoter, J A Pye (Oxford) Ltd for the proposed allocation at North of East Hanney. Comments state that East Hanney is a suitable and sustainable location for additional housing growth due to its designation as a larger village.</p> <p>The site is located to the north of the centre of the village in an accessible location to a range of services and facilities and is supported by excellent access to public transport links.</p> <p>The Site Promoter has prepared a number of technical reports and assessments including a Transport Statement, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy, Heritage Statement, Ecological Appraisal and a Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>J A Pye Homes (Oxford) Ltd can confirm that they controls the entirety of the allocation and there are no ownership constraints to development and therefore the site is fully deliverable. J A Pye Homes (Oxford) Ltd fully support the allocation of land to the north of East Hanney to deliver dwellings to meet the objectively assessed housing need.</p> | The Council acknowledge the comments made by the Site Promoter and will continue to work with them on the proposed allocation at North of East Hanney |

Core Policy 15a: Additional Site Allocations within the South-East Vale Sub-Area

| Person ID | Full Name | Company / Organisation | Agent ID | Agent's Full Name | Agent Company / Organisation | Plan Soundness | Comment Category | Comment Summary | Officer Response |
|-----------|---------------|------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|
| | David Molland | FCC Environment | | Martin Pollard | Axis | No | Alternative site – East of Sutton Courtenay | <p>A number of representations identify alternatives sites within the South East Vale Sub-Area for consideration for allocation within the Part 2 plan. These includes sites at: East Hendred, Chilton, East Challow, Milton Heights, Grove east of A338, South of Harwell Campus and Sutton Courtenay. The submissions variously describe the sites as being sustainable locations for development. Comments highlight the importance of providing sufficient sites to provide flexibility, to support housing delivery, and to contribute to significantly boosting the supply of housing within the district. A number of the comments refer to many of the alternatives lying outside the AONB or Oxford Green Belt, therefore providing an opportunity to bring forward development without leading to any impact on these designated areas.</p> | <p>The updated completions and commitments figures, set out in LPP2, mean that the Vale's Objectively Assessed Need (20,560) is already fully planned for, without any need for further allocations within LPP2. Even if the Council's proposed amendment to the windfall allowance was not supported by the Inspector, and without any site allocations in LPP2, supply would still exceed 21,000. It is important to note that the completions and commitments include around 22 percent (around 1300 dwellings) made up of smaller sites (less than 200 dwelling sites); and so the requirement envisaged in LPP1 for small site allocations has been more than adequately met. This is true for the district as a whole, and for each Sub-Area individually. The Council have prepared a short addendum to the Housing Topic Paper to illustrate this point more clearly.</p> |

| Person ID | Full Name | Company / Organisation | Agent ID | Agent's Full Name | Agent Company / Organisation | Plan Soundness | Comment Category | Comment Summary | Officer Response |
|-----------|-----------|------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | <p>Within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, the Part 1 plan identified a need for the Part 2 plan to allocate 56 dwellings; the Part 2 plan actually allocates 1400 dwellings. The housing requirement for this Sub-Area is 12,150 dwellings, the actual proposed supply is 13,362 dwellings.</p> <p>The Sub-Area housing requirement is updated in-line with changes to the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area to reflect the residual necessary to meet the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford to be addressed within the Vale. The adjustment is based on a pro-rata basis across each of the three Sub-Areas.</p> <p>On this basis, the Council is content the housing requirement figures for the Sub-Area, the Windfall allowance and the proposed site allocations are appropriate, robust and consistent with national policy. The Council is content that its approach to site assessment is sufficiently robust. This approach, and the alternatives considered, are set out within the Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>The Council are seeking to ensure that the agreed quantum of unmet housing need for Oxford, to be addressed within the Vale, is met within the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area and that at least 2,200 homes are demonstrably close and accessible to Oxford.</p> <p>Although the Council are proposing two additional site allocations within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, these are for site specific reasons. One of the two sites (North West Grove) is not expected to deliver until later in the plan period.</p> <p>Overall, the Council is content that the proposed supply set out in the Part 1 and Part 2 plans are deliverable. However, the plan already provides flexibility within the South-East Vale Sub-Area, in the event that some sites deliver more slowly, as provided by Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring Fence. This approach was found to be soundly based through the Part 1 plan examination.</p> |

Chapter 3: Housing

| Person ID | Full Name | Company / Organisation | Agent ID | Agent's Full Name | Agent Company / Organisation | Plan Soundness | Comment Category | Comment Summary | |
|-----------|-------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | Ken Dijkman | Dijkman Planning (UK) LLP | | | | No | DP1: Self and Custom Build | <p>The policy does nothing to give self-build any special status, it confers no planning advantage to self-build and no special right or ability to obtain permission. I therefore fail to see the benefit of the policy other than in relation to large development sites.</p> <p>The policy should allow small numbers of self-build plots in all settlements.</p> | <p>The Self build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016), places a duty on local planning authorities to keep a register of those interested in Self and Custom build. This register is used to recognise a local need for Self and Custom build.</p> <p>The Self and Custom Build register within Vale currently demonstrates a need within the district to encourage and support self and custom build. The Joint Housing Strategy also highlights a need for the Council to consider the provision of a policy for self and Custom Build.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance states that councils should consider how they can best support self-build and custom housebuilding in their area, including developing policies in their Local Plan for self-build and custom housebuilding.</p> |
| | Ken Dijkman | Dijkman Planning (UK) LLP | | | | No | DP2: Space Standards | <p>This policy should be deleted as it is unnecessary and is a matter covered by Building Regulations. The policy imposes non-planning standards through planning.</p> | <p>The Council has prepared evidence to support this policy which is presented within the Housing Strategy. The Viability Statement supports the inclusion of the policy and ensures that the inclusion of the Nationally Described Space Standards will have minimal impact on the viability of the development. This being said, the Nationally Described Space Standards will be subject to viability testing through the planning application process with an open book approach between the Council and the developer.</p> |