

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Susan Holroyd (872559)
Email Address	
Address	6 Norfolk Close Radley OX14 3BH
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mrs Susan Holroyd
Comment ID	LPPub2485
Response Date	18/12/14 18:40
Consultation Point	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

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.

Re Core Policy 4:

This policy sets out the housing target based on the Oxfordshire strategic housing market assessment (SHMA). There are two objections. 1. The SHMA is based on employment forecasts that are wildly optimistic and which have not been challenged, scrutinised or validated in any way by the Vale Council.

2. The SHMA itself states that it should only be a starting point for the determination of housing need. Environmental, social and infrastructure constraints should be taken into account as an integral part of this which has just not been the case. There are many issues to consider with possibly the two main ones being.

1 About 500 Radley residents responded in April using our standard letter. These were all considered as one objection, despite assurances from Council Leader Matthew Barber on 4th April that they would be considered individually. How can this possibly be right that at a stroke the views of 500 people are disregarded?

1 The Vale now admit that there were problems with their website. We can't know if any comments were lost as a result but an extension was granted to key landowner Radley College, whose response is dated 11/04/2014 a full week after the close. No such extension was offered to the public. The inequality of this is astounding.

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 whole process fails in a fundamental way in its duty to co-operate. The process has to date been undemocratic in that it has failed to allow the views of the community to be heard and to disregard its view when it does object as follows: Given the magnitude of what is being proposed this is completely unacceptable.

Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 2

1. the timescale to make any comment or objection and to complete the form, being in the run up to Christmas, makes it difficult to complete in the available time given the difficulties given the demands on people's time at this time of year;
2. the issues are expressed by the Vale in a complex form that makes it inaccessible to a significant proportion of our community;
3. the online registration process is unclear before even filling in this form. This will exclude many in our community;
4. the on line form is difficult to use and fill in with a fair degree of expertise being required to enable the form to be completed. Again this will make it inaccessible to many in our community;
5. not every one has a computer or the expertise needed to make the on line representation that first requires individual registration. If a paper copy has to be used these have not been provided by the Vale and have to be first downloaded from their web site;
6. the paper copy is not straight forward to complete with no guidance given on how to complete it. A number of separate pages of part B being required should more than one point need to be made.
7. the paper copy of the representation form states that it should be delivered to Planning Policy at the District Council at their office in Wallingford. This is no good if you live in Radley and wish to have a receipt! A good proportion of the village will not be able to get to Wallingford and again this will exclude many in the community from being able to express their views;
8. a detailed knowledge of the local plan is required that will exclude many in the community from being able to express their views;
9. the manner in which the first round of the consultation was undertaken and the means employed to disregard the views of hundreds of people in Radley gives little faith that the same will not happen again.

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