



Hearing Statement
Respondent Reference: 831779

**EXAMINATION INTO THE VALE OF WHITE
HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 1:
STRATEGIC SITES AND POLICIES**

August 2015

Introduction

1. This statement is submitted to the Examination into the Vale of White Horse District Local Plan 2011-2031: Part 1 on behalf of the below listed landowners.
2. This statement responds to each of the issues raised by the Inspector in his Matters and Issues in turn.
3. Represented landowners
 - Robert Graham Boyles
 - Geoffrey John Boyles
 - Jean Ellen Frances Boyles
 - Elizabeth Ann Boyles
 - Robert Gee
 - John-Michael Gee
 - Richard Venables
 - Tracie Palfreyman
 - Julie Van Onselen
 - Lisa Venables
 - John Rand
 - Denise Fletcher
 - Lucy Hick

Word count: 2,799 (excluding Appendix and Inspector's questions).

Matter 3 – Spatial Strategy and Housing Supply Ring Fence

“3.1 Is the proposed distribution of new housing and employment land (policies CP4 and CP6) soundly based? In particular:

(a) Does the proposed distribution of housing set out in policy CP4 appropriately reflect the settlement hierarchy (policy CP3) and the core planning principle of the NPPF (para 17) to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable?

(b) Does the distribution appropriately reflect the role of Oxford in providing for employment and services for the residents of Vale of White Horse?”

24. Oxford is a larger employment and service centre than any location in the Vale of White Horse district. Areas such as Cumnor look to the city, rather than the broader district for employment and facilities.
25. The plan focuses new housing in the Science Vale Area to complement the considerable levels of employment. Oxford is a major employment centre therefore the same justification exists for emphasis on growth in those areas with a direct connection to the city. Opportunities for sustainable development should not be precluded by administrative boundaries. The settlement hierarchy should afford weight to those areas benefitting from the best connections to the city to allow growth to be accommodated in the most sustainable locations.

“3.3[sic] Is it feasible that a significantly different distribution of housing development from that proposed could be delivered?”

26. No comment.

“3.4 Is the “housing supply ring fence” approach of policy CP5 to the delivery of housing in the Science Vale area (a) adequately explained in terms of its practical operation, (b) justified, (c) likely to be effective and (d) in accordance with national policy?”

27. The rationale for applying a housing supply ring fence is understood and provides the Council’s rationale for allocating the majority of planned housing

within the Science Vale area. The principal aim of the ring fence is to ensure that sufficient housing is provided to support the significant employment growth envisaged in the Science Vale; that is not to say that additional housing elsewhere in the district would undermine the plan.

28. The plan sets out the strategy for delivering ‘at least 20,560 new homes’; additional homes should be allowed to come forward in all areas of the district. Homes in addition to the minimum requirement of 20,560 identified in the SHMA should be supported and should not be seen to detract from the ring-fenced provision.
29. Explanatory text to policy CP5 sets out: “It is the jobs being created in Science Vale that generate the need for a significant proportion of the houses required in the district”. The rationale behind the housing supply ring fence is based upon plans at a district level. It is widely accepted that surrounding districts will have to accommodate additional housing to satisfy Oxford’s unmet need. As the housing supply ring fence is justified at a district level it should not be fundamental in establishing the best location for homes to meet this wider requirement. Clearly also, if jobs are being created at Science Vale but for some reason housing supply is not keeping pace, it would be inappropriate to prevent housing development elsewhere.