

**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 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.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title

Mr

First Name

William

Last Name

Falkenau

Job Title

(where relevant)

Organisation

(where relevant)

Address Line 1

6 Rectory Farm Close

Line 2

West Hanney

Line 3

Wantage

Line 4

Post Code

OX12 0LR

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

(where relevant)

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation :

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

Paragraph	Appendices Para 3 Page 18	Policy	Allocation of land south of East Hanney	Proposals Map	Appendices Para 3 Page 18 no reference provided
-----------	---------------------------------	--------	---	---------------	--

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Changes have been made in the final version of the Local Plan that have not been subject to adequate/proper public consultation. The acceptance of such changes renders the consultation process as a token exercise.

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.

The site allocation should revert to the land east of East Hanney proposed in the public consultation in February 2014. No notice has been given prior to the publication of the latest version in November 2014 that such a change would be made. Consultation on this change has been non-existent and fails to meet the requirement for soundness. If such a major change was to be made, a further round of consultation should have been conducted prior to preparing the draft for referral to the Planning Inspectorate. It should be noted that in the February consultation document, the proposed development was deemed to be part of the South Vale Sub Area. It has now been migrated to being part of Abingdon on Thames, and Oxford Fringe Sub Area and yet moved further away from these areas. Reverting to the site proposed in February 2014 would remove the claim that consultation has been inadequate. The change in the location of the East Hanney site allocation creates new conflicts with NPPF policies that have not been adequately considered.

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:

I have no confidence in the planning officers to give regard to the points raised and feel it necessary to directly participate in the oral examination. The change in the location of the East Hanney site allocation creates new conflicts with NPPF policies that have not been adequately considered.

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:

19/12/14