

Comment

Consultee	Mr Ken Dijkman (404457)
Email Address	dijkman@msn.com
Company / Organisation	Dijkman Planning LLP
Address	35 Berkeley Road Newbury RG14 5JY
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Dijkman Planning LLP (Mr Ken Dijkman)
Comment ID	LPPub2377
Response Date	14/01/15 16:10
Consultation Point	Core Policy 5: Housing Supply Ring-Fence (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? Yes

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.

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. This land referred to in this submission 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).

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.

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 Southmoor.

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? Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination

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.

Q7 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The 8 hectares of land shown on the attached plan has been considered by the Local Plan team but considered unacceptable based upon a landscape appraisal that did not taken into account the recent permissions for development in the immediate vicinity. Development which is currently underway. Those changes materially alter the landscape edge of the village and mean that the development of this proposed site would be acceptable in its context. Concerns were also raised about road capacity, but without the benefit of a highways statement demonstrating the road is acceptable to serve the site. Traffic and highway matters are technically resolvable given the extensive are of land ownership, either side of the Hanney Road, by the owners of this site. 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 Southmoor which is being proposed as a way of helping to establish a Sound Plan.