

Comment

Consultee	Philip Hawtin (831034)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Cumnor Parish Council
Address	unknown unknown unknown
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Cumnor Parish Council (Philip Hawtin)
Comment ID	LPPub3729
Response Date	23/01/15 09:03
Consultation Point	5.31 Paragraph (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
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

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.

Paragraph 5.31 is unnecessary as its contents are already outlined in paragraph 5.30. Further the use of the word 'could' renders the comments meaningless. There are a wide variety of outcomes that could flow from the Vale's Plan. In particular a failure to attract a supermarket could render the whole of this aspect of the Plan nugatory. A Plan that relies on an obviously implausible assumption cannot be regarded as robust.

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 red outline in Figure 5.3 should be removed and the associated rubric in paragraph 5.38 modified to reflect the actual position. The sentence 'Botley also functions as a district centre in the Oxford City context' should be removed. Paragraph 5.31 should be removed in its entirety.