

Comment

Consultee	Mr Neil Wells (870205)
Email Address	
Address	Field Cottage Upper Common Uffington SN7 7RU
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Neil Wells
Comment ID	LPPub64
Response Date	08/12/14 08:15
Consultation Point	Core Policy 3: Settlement Hierarchy (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? Yes

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.

Information in Core Policy 3 is inconsistent with Figure 4.2. Specifically, in Core Policy 3 relevant to the Western Vale Sub-Area, East Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield are all described as 'Local Service Centres'. This cannot possibly be correct; in all previous plans these have been described as Large Villages. To now put these on the same footing as Botley or Grove (the Local Service Centres identified for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Sub-Fringe Area and the South East Vale Sub-Area respectively) is manifestly in error.

The plan at Figure 4.2, which is also included in the Executive Summary and was reproduced on the consultation leaflet properly shows East Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield as Large Villages and not as Local Service Centres.

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.

Correct the reference to show East Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield as Large Villages and NOT as Local Service Centres in Core Policy 3.

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, Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the 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:

Unless this suggestion is accepted as a drafting error and will be suitably amended as such, then I would wish to be heard on the reasons why it is incorrect to consider that East Challow, Shrivenham, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Uffington and Watchfield are Local Service Centres and should be considered as Large Villages.