

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

**SUBMISSION IN RESPONSE TO THE
EXAMINATION OF THE EXAMINATION OF
THE VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL
PLAN 2031 (PART 1 STRATEGIC SITES AND
POLICIES) –**

**STAGE 1- INSPECTOR'S MATTERS
AND QUESTIONS**

ON BEHALF OF CATESBY ESTATES LTD

**STATEMENT - MATTER 1 –
DUTY TO CO OPERATE AND
OTHER LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

AUGUST 2015

**BY FRAMPTONS TOWN PLANNING
CHARTERED TOWN PLANNING CONSULTANTS**

REF:PJF/LS/3700(1073)

CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Matter 1	5

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by Frampton's in response to the Inspector's Questions in relation to the following hearing session: Matter 1 Duty to Co-operate and other Legal Requirements.

- 1.2 The statement is submitted on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd who have land interests at the Land East of Wooton and the land North West of Abingdon-on-Thames (which form part of the North West of Abingdon-on-Thames site allocated for 200 houses under draft Core Strategy Policy 4).

- 1.3 Submissions have been made at previous consultations on the draft Local Plan and these representations should be viewed in the context of these previous comments too.

2.0 MATTER 1 – DUTY TO CO-OPERATE AND OTHER LEGAL REQUIREMENTS.

2.1 The Inspector’s question is as follows:

Matter 1: Duty to Co-operate and other Legal Requirements.

1.3 Is it appropriate for the plan to include only Strategic Policies and Site Allocations and for detailed planning policies and non-site strategic site allocations to be devolved to a Part 2 Local Plan document? Is there a clear justification for this and does it accord with national policy?

2.2 The LPA have chosen a threshold of 200 units to define “strategic” site allocations, irrespective of their location inside or outside the Green Belt (GB) (para 3.9 in Topic Paper 3: Strategic Sites Selection ref. TOP03). However, whilst Catesby accepts the need to define a level at some point, this does however represent a missed opportunity to deliver housing at the early stage in the plan period, namely the first five years.

2.3 In choosing a threshold of 200, the LPA have, by virtue of the nature of the terrain in the Vale, eliminated from the strategic search otherwise acceptable sustainable locations for housing, merely on the basis that the fields in question are smaller than around 6-7Ha (allowing for 200 units at a density of 30 DPH).

- 2.4 By placing an arbitrary limitation on a settlement growth in the next five year (assuming such site are allocated for a smaller quanta in 2015) the plan cannot be considered positively prepared as a list of exceptions can be considered restrictive and negative when the emphasis of Government Policy is to deliver sustainable growth.
- 2.5 By screening sites based solely upon a “200+ unit” threshold the LPA have ruled out all development, even where it can be demonstrated to be desirable, sustainable, deliverable and appropriate (in terms of the relevant settlement capacity) thus denying many sites and settlements the chance to deliver housing. Whilst it is accepted that such allocations could take place through the Part 2 process, no binding timetable has been published for the consultation/adoption process.