



**Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part One:  
Strategic Sites and Policies**  
Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For official  
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan

Response form for the Vale of White Horse strategic planning policy document, the Local Plan Part one. Please return to Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, Wallingford, OX10 8ED or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) no later than Friday 19 December 2014 by 4.30 pm precisely.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

## Part A

### 1. Personal Details\*

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

Title

First Name

Last Name

Job Title

(where relevant)

Organisation

(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

(where relevant)

### 2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Mr

Ken

Dijksman

Dijksman Planning

35 Berkeley Road

Newbury

RG14 5JE

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Linden Homes (Thames Valley)

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph	<div></div>	Policy	Core Policy 4 (Strategic sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 12 and 13)	+	<div></div>
-----------	-------------	--------	--	---	-------------

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<div>YES</div>	No	<div></div>
4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)	Yes	<div></div>	No	<div>NO</div>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<div>YES</div>	No	<div></div>

*Please mark as appropriate.*

5. 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.

See attached Representations

6. 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 at 5 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.

See attached Representations

Modifications are sought to the Allocations under Core Policy 4 to delete sites within the green belt and AONB and to substitute sustainable non AONB and Green Belt sites, including this site at Shrivenham.

***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.***

7. 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

☒

**YES**

**Yes**, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Linden believes that the site it controls at Shrivenham constitutes a significantly more sustainable and deliverable proposal than those allocated in more sensitive and less sustainable locations elsewhere (sites 1,2,3,4 12 & 13). The overall Soundness of the plan is compromised by: 1. the lack of acceptance that unmet housing need increases the quantum of 5 year land supply, 2. by allocations with Green Belt and AONB locations when sustainable alternatives are demonstrably available 3. Reliance upon an artificial 'ring fence' related to housing delivery through major allocations, a mechanism that is considered necessary because their deliverability is in doubt. These three issues render the plan unsound and contrary to Government Policy. These matters require open debate and discussion as do the merits of the site at Shrivenham which is being proposed as a way of helping to establish a Sound Plan.

**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.

Signature:



Date:

19/12/2014