|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **New%20Image1** | **Local Plan 2031 Part 2**  Publication Version  Representation Form | | | | | | | | **Ref:**  **(For official use only)** |  |
|
|
|  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:** | | | | | | | | Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 | |
| **Please return by** **5pm on Wednesday 22 November 2017 to:** Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk) | | | | | | | | | |
| This form has two parts:  **Part A** – Personal Details  **Part B** – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Part A** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Personal Details\* | |  |  |  |  |  | 2. Agent’s Details (if applicable) | | |
| \*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation  boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2. | | | | | | | | | |
| Title | | Mrs | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| First Name | | Helen | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Last Name | | Marshall | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Job Title (where relevant) | | Director | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Organisation representing | | CPRE Oxfordshire | | |  | |  | | |
| (where relevant) | | | | | | |  | | |
| Address Line 1 | | 20 High Street | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Address Line 2 | |  | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Address Line 3 | |  | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Postal Town | | Watlington | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Post Code | | OX49 5PY | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Telephone Number | | 01491 612079 | | |  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |
| Email Address | | director@cpreoxon.org.uk | | |  | |  | | |
| **Sharing your details**: please see page 3 | | | | | | |  | | |

**Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

Name or organisation: CPRE Oxfordshire

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Policies Map

8b

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: (*Please tick as appropriate)*

4. (1) Legally compliant NO No

4. (2) Sound NO No

4. (3) Complies with the Duty to Cooperate NO No

|  |
| --- |
| 5. Please provide details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate. 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 Cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments. |
| 1. NOT LEGALLY PROCEDURALLY COMPLIANT   The Policy is not legally procedurally compliant. It is unclear what is proposed. The plan at Fig.3 in the Plan Review differs from the plan at page 13 of the appendices. In the first the red outline is “proposed strategic allocation” and in the second “proposed housing allocation”. The confusion is compounded by the wording on Page 37 of the Plan Review (copied at the end of this section) which says both that the site will be wholly removed from the Green Belt and that a large part of the site will be left in it. It continues that the land remaining in the Green Belt will be limited to “Green Belt compatible development” which, since if it were to be truly in the Green Belt the comment would be superfluous, again increases uncertainty.  What is intended must be clarified beyond equivocation for the Plan to be sound. It is noted that these anomalies have been brought to the Council’s attention in previous consultations.  Para 3 page 37*. The Site is removed from the Oxford Green Belt in accordance with Core Policy 13a.The site area however contains a large area of land that will remain within the Oxford Green Belt and any development on this area will be limited to Green Belt compatible development. The area will contain a substantial Country Park located on the Western part of the site that should be planned for as part of the comprehensive development framework*.   1. NO DUTY TO CO-OPERATE   The Policy is not compliant with the duty to co-operate and neither is the whole Submission Plan since no duty to co-operate to provide for Oxford’s unmet need can exist until Oxford itself has defined that need. Not only has it not done so but it has resisted all entreaties to do so, and the draft Oxford Local Plan defines neither the unmet need nor Oxford’s ability to meet it, should any exist.  CPRE has provided evidence to that Local Plan consultation that the City is capable of providing all of its need as determined by the SHMA, and more than twice its need as it would be determined under the Government’s new OAN formula, now under consultation.  Consequently, there can be no requirement, obligation or duty to satisfy Oxford’s unmet need and the Vale Plan Review is in that way neither compliant with the duty to co-operate, nor necessary.   1. NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NPPF.   The Policy is not in accordance with the NPPF in that there is no necessity to release any of the land from the Green Belt to accommodate the level of housing proposed, and consequently no exceptional circumstances exist for release of Green Belt land. It is noted that the Inspector dismissed a series of Green Belt releases which were not required for housing in Part 1.  Paragraph 89 allows for the redevelopment of previously developed sites within the Green Belt, providing the impact on openness is not (disproportionately) greater.  The Dalton Policy is silent on density of development proposed, although it does refer to *“mixed tenure homes and housing types that are genuinely affordable”.* Whilst there is no current Government numerical advice on densities, the Housing White Paper of March 2017 states that it is necessary to ***make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities*** *where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing requirements*. (Our emphasis).  **PPG3** required that *Local planning authorities should avoid the inefficient use of land and encourage housing development which makes more efficient use of land (between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare net); and greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility such as city, town, district and local centres or around major nodes along good quality public transport corridors.* (Dalton is close to the A34 and to Abingdon).  It is CPRE’s view that higher densities should be targeted to reduce land-take, provide the “genuinely affordable” housing the Vale seeks, and to balance the housing stock. Presently desirable Victorian Terraces were typically built at densities of 75 to the hectare. A green village concept can be achieved without a waste of space, or the provision of unnecessarily expensive houses.  However, even taking the mid-case of PPG3 would mean 40 dwellings to the hectare, say 5,200 within the Council’s shaded area in Figure 2.3, or 4,560 within the smaller area CPRE considers to be truly “previously developed”.  Arguably, given the Council’s own stated position, that the requirement is for *housing types that are genuinely affordable,* densities at the higher end of the PPG3 scale, or even at Victorian terrace levels should be aimed for, meaning the capacity of the shaded “previously developed” part of the site would be 7,800 houses or higher.  In any event, since the previously developed part of the site is several multiples greater than the houses intended to be built, there can be no justification for its removal from the Green Belt, as the development would be appropriate within the Green Belt under paragraph 89. It may be relevant that this does not appear to be considered in the Plan.  It can only be that the intention is to remove a large area of Green Belt in case a need for it later emerges, which is exactly the basis on which the reviews proposed in Part 1 were dismissed by the Inspector.  Further, releasing that area or allowing development of the shaded area to “sprawl” out over it would be totally inappropriate as it would risk merging Abingdon, Wootton, Dry Sandford and Shippon, threatening the gap to Marcham, as well as encroaching upon open countryside, contrary to the key purposes of designating land as Green Belt, with no justification.   1. NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES   Exceptional circumstances are irrelevant to this case as the proposed housing could be accommodated without releasing land from the Green Belt.  For the record, the exceptional circumstances proposed at 2.75 are:   1. *That the land has become unexpectedly available*. To consider that the unexpected equates to the exceptional, would be to drive a cart and horses through Green Belt protection. 2. *The Green Belt study*. The Green Belt study is not an exceptional circumstance. Even if it were not fatally flawed, one piece of land cannot be released because it is subjectively less valuable than another piece, as clearly this process would result in only one piece being left. At most the Study could inform a decision to release if there were genuine exceptional circumstances. 3. *The site is close to Oxford*. Proximity to Oxford is not an exceptional circumstance and in any case the site is ten miles from the City. Oxfordshire is a single housing market area, and there is no more merit in provision within the Green Belt that surrounds the City than beyond it. 4. *The site contains a large area of brownfield*. This is not an exceptional circumstance to release it from the Green Belt. On the contrary, it reinforces the point that the proposed housing can be built within it without affecting its Green Belt status.   (Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary) |

|  |
| --- |
| 6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at 5 above. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate 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. |
| For the plan to be sound it would have to be demonstrated first that the Oxford unmet need was a robust and credible figure. We submit there is no evidence to support it.  It would secondly have to be demonstrated that the proposed 1,200 houses could not be built within the previously developed area of the site despite our demonstration that it could accommodate several times that number, or, should there be any shortfall that it could not be accommodated elsewhere in the District outside the Green Belt or, under the duty to co-operate, elsewhere, before Green Belt release could be considered. It should then cover only the area required for the deficit in housing.  In the absence of this evidence the intention to release the site from the Green Belt should be struck out, any housing should be limited to the capacity of the previously developed area and Policy 8b should be amended accordingly.  (Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary) |

**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.**

7. 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

YES

|  |
| --- |
| 8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why  you consider this to be necessary:  It is expected that the matters we contest will be the subject of argument across the floor at the EIP in which we believe it would aid the Inspector for us to participate. |
| ***Please note*** *the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.* |

Signature: Date:

**Sharing your personal details**

Please be aware that, due to the process of having an Independent Examination, a name and means of contact is required for your representation to be considered. Respondent details and representations will be forwarded to the Inspector carrying out the examination of the Local Plan after the Publicity Period has ended. This data will be managed by a Programme Officer who acts as the point of contact between the council and the Inspector and respondents and the Inspector.

**Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our website alongside your name.** If you are responding as an individual rather than a company or organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email / postal address and telephone numbers) or signatures online, however the original representations are available for public viewing at our council office by prior appointment. All representations and related documents will be held by Vale of White Horse District Council for a period of 6 months after the Local Plan is adopted.

**Would you like to hear from us in the future?**

I would like to be kept informed about the progress of the Local Plan

I would like to be added to the database to receive general planning updates

Please do not contact me again

**Further comment:** Please use this space to provide further comment on the relevant questions in this form. **You must state which question your comment relates to.**

**Alternative formats of this form are available on request.** Please contact our customer service team on 01235 422600 (Text phone users add 18001 before you dial) or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

**Please return this form by** **5pm on Wednesday 22 November 2017 to:** Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)