



**Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part One:
Strategic Sites and Policies**
Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For official
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan

Response form for the Vale of White Horse strategic planning policy document, the Local Plan Part one. Please return to Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, Wallingford, OX10 8ED or email planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk no later than Friday 19 December 2014 by 4.30 pm precisely.

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*

**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.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	Mr	
First Name	Stewart	
Last Name	Scott	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	Cross Tree House	
Line 2	The Green	
Line 3	East Hanney	
Line 4	Oxfordshire	
Post Code	OX12 0HQ	
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address (where relevant)		

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation :

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

Paragraph Policy Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text" value="yes"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text" value="No"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text" value="No"/>

Please mark as appropriate.

5. 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.

I believe that the allocation of 200 houses on 8.2ha on land South of East Hanney is unsound for the following reasons.

1. Housing Density – The proposal is for 25 houses per hectare, this 2 or 3 times the housing density in the current village. Core Policy 24 states that housing densities of 30 per ha will be required unless this would have an adverse effect on the character of the area. East Hanney is a rural village with a very low housing density. The proposed density is completely out of character with the existing village and does not comply with Core Policy 24.
2. The site includes an area which was identified by the Vale District Council as non-deliverable, so how can the vale say part is undeliverable yet propose that the complete site is deliverable?
3. The site does not comply with Core Policy 33 and 35. This states that sites should promote sustainable transport.

There is a public footpath from East Hanney to Grove but this is across ploughed fields, involves crossing more than 10 styles and an uncontrolled crossing of the main London to Bristol railway line. This is not suitable as a route for walking to secondary school, health care facilities, leisure centre or shopping facilities.

There is a bridleway to Grove from East Hanney but this is an unmade farm track, heavily rutted and extremely muddy except in the driest of weathers. This is not suitable as a route for cycling to secondary school, health care facilities, leisure centre or shopping facilities.

Cycling along the main A338 road to Grove and Wantage is dangerous due to the limited road width and high volume of existing traffic. In addition the road traverses over a narrow humpbacked railway bridge. Until the road reaches Grove there is no pavement that could be used as a safe cycle route.

East Hanney is on a bus route between Wantage and Abingdon but there are no direct connections to the centres of employment at Harwell Science Centre, Didcot or Milton Park. Travel by bus to these employment centres requires two buses from separate companies and takes over 1 hour to travel less than 8 miles.

The site does not safely link in with the existing facilities within the village. There is only one route for pedestrian access as this is by a narrow bridge which crosses the Letcombe brook. The footpath next to the road is for over 50m only 18inches wide and in some sections does not exist. This is the route to the village pre-school and primary school from the proposed site and so is unsuitable and dangerous for small children and parents with pushchairs.

The primary school is at capacity and will require expansion, the existing grounds are too small so it is proposed by the vale to move the preschool to the new housing site. Moving the preschool to a separate site will discourage parents from walking as many will have to visit both pre school and primary school and so this will encourage them to use a car instead.

4. The site does not comply with core policy 39. There is evidence of an ancient manor under the site and signs of a roman road are clearly visible in the adjacent field. If this site is developed these historic features may be destroyed unless archaeological surveys are conducted in advance.
5. Many properties and the road system within East Hanney are at high risk of flooding. The site acts as a storage area for rainfall and the undulating nature of the old orchard and the cropped areas increase water retention and increase the soil moisture deficit levels. The community have formed a very active flood group and are aware of how vulnerable the village is. The data used for assessing flood risk is often based on LIDAR data and this has not sufficient spatial and height resolution to enable accurate modelling to be carried out. The low bank heights of the stream and flat terrain mean that differences in height of only a few inches can make a significant difference in both direction and volumetric flow. Construction of 200 houses on this site next to the stream and upstream of the village could cause flooding of property in the existing village.
6. East Hanney should not be classed as a Larger Village. The scoring system has chosen an arbitrary 14 points and above to be classed as a Larger Village. East Hanney score exactly 14. There is a single point for a Library, but this is a mobile library that is expected to be lost as this services is being reviewed. We have one point for a local shop, but this is a small community shop run by volunteers and is not a commercial enterprise, and we have one point for a place of worship, this is a tiny chapel. The analysis to determine which are larger villages and so which are identified as suitable for strategic housing development is too course.
7. The site does not comply with Core Policy 46: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity. The site is adjacent to a rare chalk stream river which is an important wildlife corridor.

There are a number of red listed species found on the site and the area is being suggested as a Local Wildlife Area by Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust. The site had a sustainability assessment and this identified two Major negative issues. I believe that the site has failed the Vale's own sustainability assessment.

8. The proposed site is not provided with the required infrastructure. As well as flooding, the village also suffers from poor sewage infrastructure. Thames Water have identified this in recent planning applications yet planning is still allowed on the assumption that this will be provided. An increased sewage infrastructure will be required locally for 200 houses and with major developments on the other sites in Wantage and Grove will mean that the Wantage Sewage Treatment Works will need to be upgraded. Thames Water operate on a rolling 5 year plan and there are currently no plans agreed with Thames Water. This is likely to mean that housing will be built in advance of the sewage infrastructure being available. East Hanney is down stream of the outfall from the sewage works. Legally Thames Water can discharge untreated water into the brook in times of high rainfall, until the sewage treatment works capacity is increased East Hanney is again at risk of flooding because of the additional discharge from the treatment works.

I believe that the Local Plan has failed in its duty to co-operate.

The Local Plan originally indicated land to the East of East Hanney. At the public meeting which I attended there was overwhelming objection to a single site of 200 houses, but there was support for smaller developments within the village.

The Vale did not engage in any more public consultation and changed sites to the South of East Hanney. There was no advance warning to the public, no leaflets, no information on the Vale's web site, no exhibitions. In fact the recent Vale News which is distributed by email on 3rd October there was no mention of the Local Plan at all.

It was stated that the Vale would set out the reasons for this change based upon evidence and public consultation. There was NO public consultation on the proposal to change from the East to the South.

Many East Hanney residents have helped prepare a community response which has been submitted by the Parish Council. I ask that this is given sufficient consideration as a well researched document from the community.

6. 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 at 5 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 strategic Housing allocation of 200 houses on land to the South of East Hanney should be removed.

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?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

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.

Signature:

Date:

16 Dec 2014