

Comment

Consultee	Mr Matthew Hall (828437)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	56 Appleton Road Cumnor Oxford OX2 9QH
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Matthew Hall
Comment ID	LPPub2458
Response Date	16/12/14 20:49
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.

The plan is unsound in these ways:

Policy 4 ? The SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) is unsound. It predicts housing growth more than twice the governments own projection. It is not backed by data from existing companies (because very few companies are planing to expand in the current economic climate) and it does not suggest who the new employers will be. The plan seems to have been prepared in the ignorance of independent expert advice.

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.

1. There must be a full and transparent consultation on the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries.
2. Housing allocation must be reduced in line with the Government's own forecasts. If this were done, there would be sufficient available land without stealing from the Green Belt.
3. Adequate transpost provision must be made to allow residents of new and existing settlements to go about their business in a timely manner. This must include new rail stations outside existing towns to give rail access to the new housing, major exapnsion of capacity of the A34, or a scheme to separate N-S traffic from local traffic west of Oxford, and a guarantee of increased bus subsidies

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