

**From:** Tim Lancaster  
**Sent:** 22 November 2017 11:28  
**To:** Planning Policy Vale  
**Subject:** East Hanney Planning

		<b>Local Plan 2031 Part 2</b> Publication Version Representation Form		<b>Ref:</b>  (For official use only)
<b>Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:</b>				Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2
<p><b>Please return by 5pm on Wednesday 22 November 2017 to:</b> Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email <a href="mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk">planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk</a></p>				
<p>This form has two parts:  <b>Part A</b> – Personal Details  <b>Part B</b> – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.</p>				
<b>Part A</b>				
1. Personal Details*		2. Agent's Details (if applicable)		
<small>*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.</small>				
Title	Mr			
First Name	Timothy D.G.			
Last Name	Lancaster			
Job Title (where relevant)				
Organisation representing (where relevant)				
Address Line 1				
Address Line 2				
Address Line 3				
Postal Town				
Post Code				

Telephone Number			
Email Address			
<b>Sharing your details:</b> please see page 3			

**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    YES                                      Policies Map

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

4. (1) Legally compliant                                      Yes                                      No TICK HERE

4. (2) Sound                                      Yes                                      No TICK HERE

4. (3) Compiles with the Duty to Cooperate                      Yes                                      No                      TICK HERE

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.

The Local Plan defines East Hanney as a large village. Using the VOWH criteria this is clearly NOT the case. The village has lost further amenities since the Local Plan pt.1 was rejected so I fail to see how this application is in any way legally compliant. It has already seen significant building, the rural environment and nature of the village now faces significant threat

In the context of the plan being sound it is not because East Hanney floods! There are no ifs or buts here. I have been a village resident for 35 years and the field north of Ashfields Lane floods.

Traffic levels are unsustainable . The A338 becomes gridlocked and traffic travelling South down Winters Lane from the huge estates at Southmoor and Kingston Bagpuize make rush hour an impossibility in the village. It is only a matter of time before there is a pedestrian fatality judging by the speed the traffic transits the village.

(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.

Why cannot small infilling developments, as many as necessary be built on the several available plots in the village and why cannot they built in the style and vernacular fo the village rather than hideous great estates that are seemingly randomly built and “bolted” onto the village boundaries, the slums of the future.

Why are the ancient villages allowed to be desecrated in this way.

(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.**

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

No thank you

**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:

Tim Lancaster

Date: **22 November 2017**

### 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 TICK HERE

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.**

There are also issues in East Hanney in respect of planning including

**FLOODING** as mentioned above and including 1) Ground water Flooding 2) Surface water Flooding 3) Sewage capacity and flooding ..... raw sewage in the streets 4) Lack of applicability of SUDS solutions 5) Condemning future potential home owners on these sites to the misery and crippling financial penalties of their homes flooding

**SCHOOL CAPACITY**

**LACK OF SOCIAL FACILITIES**

**HISTORIC VILLAGE WITH COMPLETE LACK OF ROAD CAPACITY ND FOOTPATHS**

**ASHFIELDS LANE NORTH of EAST HANNEY INCLUDING FRONTAGE ONTO THE LANE**

**NOISE**

**DITCHES**

**ECOLOGY**

**URBAN EXTENSION**

**PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

**CONTRIBUTION TO VILLAGE FACILITIES**

**LACK of COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

**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)

There is a general assumption that flooding can be alleviated by using SUDS (Sustainable drainage systems). The parish council have not been convinced that these techniques are applicable. In our experience flood risk assessments have been carried out by general engineering consultants that have a poor understanding of flood risk, the assumptions have not been substantiated by suitable bore hole and permeability tests and in addition builders have not implemented agreed solutions.

The applicability of SUDS solutions cannot be assumed until much more detailed investigations have been conducted. The cost of such investigations and possible solutions may mean that the developers will again request reducing the amount of affordable housing and so negate the principal reasons for development.