

# REPRESENTATIONS STATEMENT

**In respect of:**  
Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2 Examination  
Matter 1.6 & 1.8  
**At:**  
Land at Appleton  
**On behalf of:**  
The Gow Family

## Matter 1.6

William Bruce Gow writes on behalf of the Gow Family (the respondent) to make submissions of the Vale of White Horse (VoWH) Local Plan in respect of its land and development interests on land at Appleton.

### **1.6 Has the Representation on the Local Plan Part 2 complied with the Statement of Community Involvement?**

- 0.1. Community Involvement is not just about making presentations of the proposals being put forward and waiting for feedback – which will often be negative – but it is also about asking the right questions in the first place to help formulate the plan being proposed.
- 0.2. VoWH make much comment about sustainability in different aspects of the plan – yet I am unaware of any communication conducted by VoWH or its consultants with the local parishes regarding establishing what services have been lost in the last 10 to 15 years or are in danger of being lost in the next 10 -15 years. There is no appendix which seems to refer to any research in this area.
- 0.3. For example Appleton lost a pub – converted to a residential dwelling in 2009 and has had the bus service severely reduced in the last couple of years.
- 0.4. It has also lost the mobile library that used to visit because of government cut backs.
- 0.5. Much comment is made that in the new large development proposals that new facilities such as new primary schools or bus services will be provided.
- 0.6. The process of the local plan 2031 started several years ago now and it would not have been so difficult during or at the end of part 1 to do a simple survey with all

the parishes within the VoWH to establish what local services and facilities were under threat and why they might be lost during the lifetime of this current plan.

- 0.7. Such information is vital to understand a local community and where it is appropriate to allocate housing to help ensure continuing viability of existing services.
- 0.8. VoWH and/or its consultants have not established and do not appear to have made any attempt to assess the potential loss of services/facilities, especially in smaller rural communities such as Appleton within the lifetime of the plan and as such it has to be questioned whether VoWH have complied with the statement of community involvement.
- 0.9. Failure to assess the current viability of existing services over the lifetime of the plan undermines the issue of community involvement in the consultation process and therefore proposals being put forward in part 2 are not considering this aspect.
- 0.10. To overcome this issue I would propose that the plan is modified so that the allocation for 90 homes allocated to Marcham village is transferred to the land at Appleton village.

## Matter 1.8

William Bruce Gow writes on behalf of the Gow Family (the respondent) to make submissions of the Vale of White Horse (VoWH) Local Plan in respect of its land and development interests on land at Appleton. I will be away when this matter is discussed in open forum and so make this paper representation.

### **1.8 Have the likely environmental, social, and economic effects of LPP2 been adequately addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal? Does the appraisal test the plan against reasonable alternatives for the spatial strategy of the plan and the distribution of housing?**

- 0.11. VoWH make much comment about sustainability in different aspects of the plan – While the plan makes reference to supporting and maintaining services such as village and local shops, pubs and other community services and local facilities it has not identified ones which are under threat of being lost within the lifetime of the plan.
- 0.12. While there are many influences as to why certain local services / facilities are lost and the VoWH cannot influence all of them it can reduce the likely hood of some of those influences having a more influential impact than others.

- 0.13. The LPP2 sustainability appraisal only focuses on the impact of new development on the existing communities where the new allocation is being proposed.
- 0.14. There is no assessment as to what the affect of “no development” might have on the existing local facilities especially where development has additional restrictions such as communities within the Green Belt.
- 0.15. Our initial representation for LPP2 compared the differences of 3 similar communities as at 2011 UK census – East Hanney and Marcham both outside the Green Belt and Appleton within the Green Belt.
- 0.16. As an example the LPP2 originally allocated 450 homes in Marcham and has reduced this amount to about 90 homes after objection by Oxfordshire County Council – in no small part to the area having a known Air Quality issue yet those same number of homes could be allocated to the Land at Appleton with no Air Quality issue and are very unlikely to create an air quality issue.
- 0.17. The site at Appleton is surely a reasonable alternative to that of Marcham? If Appleton was not within the Green Belt then the land would surely have been allocated in preference to that of Marcham to avoid the air quality limitations of this site.
- 0.18. If the allocation for these houses at Marcham was to be changed to the land at Appleton, then this would not only remove the issue of building even more homes where there is a known air quality issue, but would also provide homes in a similar community that needs more homes to maintain its existing facilities and services.
- 0.19. It appears that Appleton is being discriminated against because it is within the Green Belt when compared to Marcham.
- 0.20. There is a legal requirement that a proportion of CIL contributions are made available to the local community where development occurs to help support/maintain local community facilities. By not allocating development at Appleton, VoWH are actively excluding Appleton from benefiting from this arrangement. This has both a social and economic negative impact on the Appleton community.
- 0.21. I would suggest that this is a very clear example where by the appraisal fails to test the plan against one reasonable alternative for the spatial strategy of the plan and the distribution of housing.

To overcome this issue I would propose that the plan is modified so that the allocation for 90 homes currently allocated to Marcham village is transferred to the land at Appleton village.