

Comment

Consultee	Mr Paul Spencer (872575)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	46 Appleton Rd Cumnor Oxford OX29QH
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Paul Spencer
Comment ID	LPPub1070
Response Date	19/12/14 12:18
Consultation Point	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? No

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

If you think your comment relates to the DtC, this is about how we have worked with the Duty to Cooperate bodies (such as neighbouring planning authorities)

Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate? No

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.

The Vales figures are based upon incomplete studies of the SHMA report, not the final report. Infrastructure considerations have been overlooked. This includes the road network, which is

already failing, the provision of schooling and NHS facilities eg GP Surgery. The Vales plans appear to fly in the face of the Governments own pronouncements on the Green Belt.

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.

The SHMA study needs reexamination.

The issues with the road network and in particular the A34 need to be dealt with, the proposed 50 million upgrade will not achieve this. The NHS needs to be consulted as to how it will cope with the increased workload as it is already at breaking point. The Vale must make predictions based upon reliable studies, crucially independent impartial expert advice should be sought. The SHMA figure is 2.5 times that of the government !

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, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? No - I do not wish to participate at the oral examination