



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

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	<input type="text" value="Dr"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text" value="Christopher"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text" value="Baker"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation representing (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Postal Town	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Sharing your details: please see page 3

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or organisation: Christopher Baker

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

Paragraph 2.44 Policy 8a Policies Map Fig. 2.2

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

4. (1) Legally compliant Yes No

4. (2) Sound Yes No

4. (3) Compiles with the Duty to Cooperate Yes 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.

The two proposed developments in East Hanney are to be built on land that floods regularly. Their design and setting would have an adverse impact on the character of the area; on the setting of designated heritage assets; and on the rural character of the settlement with particular regard to such factors as location and density.”

See detailed comments on Page 5.

The Vale of White Horse District Council totally ignored the extensive written and verbal comments on the draft Part 2 Plan submitted by the East Hanney Parish Council and residents of the village.

(Continue on page 5 /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.

Elimination of the North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney sites.

(Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary)

Name or organisation: Christopher Baker

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

Paragraph 2.47 Policy 8a Policies Map Fig.2.2

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

4. (1) Legally compliant Yes No

4. (2) Sound Yes No

4. (3) Compiles with the Duty to Cooperate Yes 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.

The two proposed developments in East Hanney are to be built on land that floods regularly. Their design and setting would have an adverse impact on the character of the area; on the setting of designated heritage assets; and on the rural character of the settlement with particular regard to such factors as location and density.”

See detailed comments on Page 5.

The Vale of White Horse District Council totally ignored the extensive written and verbal comments on the draft Part 2 Plan submitted by the East Hanney Parish Council and residents of the village.

(Continue on page 5 /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.

Elimination of the North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney sites.

(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?

X

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 hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Date: 20 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 X

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

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.**

I am restricting my comments to my principal local concerns, namely the two developments that continue to be proposed for East Hanney. These appeared in the Vale's draft 2031 Local Plan Part 2 and met with strong opposition from both the East Hanney Parish Council and the vast majority of residents. It is clear that VWHDC paid no attention to this as they still appear in the Publication Version of the Plan.

I oppose both additional developments. Both proposals conflict with the Vale's stated aim "to promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character". East Hanney is now a Small Village, as defined in Part 1 of the Plan with limited facilities. In particular, the Hanney War Memorial Hall, including its car park, is "saturated". The latter is widely used by parents dropping off and picking up their children at St James' School. A further 130 houses on top of the 100 or so already approved on Dews Meadow and Steventon Road would make the situation untenable. It would encourage parking on the road outside the school, thereby creating a hazard for children and parents alike.

I question the need for yet more houses in East Hanney. The CPRE has consistently challenged the current Oxfordshire housing targets as over-exaggerated and flawed. This contention is now supported by a new simplified Government methodology for working out the figures for each area. Under this new approach, the Oxfordshire-wide target would drop by over 30% and the figures for Oxford City would drop by around 50%. This would dramatically reduce the pressure on surrounding Districts such as the Vale of White Horse. This has not been considered in Part 2.

Even if additional new houses are required (given the above, this is probably unlikely), there are compelling reasons why they should not be built in East Hanney. As indicated below, several aspects contravene the NPPF and the Vale's own policies.

1. *Paragraph 2.47* (Part Two – Detailed Policies and Additional Sites) states that "the larger villages of East Hanney and Marcham offer a good range of services and facilities and are relatively unconstrained and are not located within the Oxford Green Belt, or areas of floodplain, which are particularly extensive in this Sub-Area." There are three errors of fact in this one sentence alone (the statement that we are not located in the Oxford Green Belt is however correct):

(i) As noted above, East Hanney is a Small Village according to the criteria applied in Part 1. The terms “Smaller” and “Larger” villages are not defined either in Part 1 or Part 2.

(ii) East Hanney does NOT offer a good range of services and facilities. It has a village hall (often filled to capacity), a primary school with no possibility of further expansion, a mission church, a community shop staffed by volunteers, a farm shop, a pub and an Italian restaurant. It does not have even a small supermarket, pharmacy or medical facilities. It is admittedly on the Wantage-Oxford bus route but there are no direct services to the Science Vale or Harwell Campus.

(iii) East Hanney DOES lie within a floodplain and the two proposed sites in particular ARE prone to flooding. The village floods on a regular basis. See the Vale’s “Bible” on this topic “Vale of White Horse Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Appendices Part 2, pp. 55-57”. Flooding is discussed further below.

It is not clear to me why East Hanney is included in the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area at all. It should logically lie in the South-East Vale Sub-Area, which includes Wantage, its post-town, with which it shares the OX12 postcode. It has very little connection with Oxford.

2. *Flooding.* Flooding occurs periodically in East Hanney. Both the proposed sites are subject to flooding and both act as soak-aways for the flood water from surrounding areas. What will happen to this water if these sites are built upon is not addressed in the Plan. Presumably, neighbouring dwellings, including our own, will be flooded as a result,. The North of East Hanney site is particularly sensitive in this regard as it acts as a sink for floodwater from the A338, Ashfield Lane, and Ebbs Lane.

Building on land subject to flooding contravenes the NPPF and the Vale’s own policies.

3. *Traffic.* The two new developments (total 130 dwellings) would add around 260 additional vehicles, which would feed either onto the A338, in the case of the North of East Hanney site (80 houses), or the Steventon Road in the case of the North-East of East Hanney site (50 houses); many of these latter vehicles would also end up on the A338. The A338 is extremely busy already. When traffic signals were installed last summer to enable road works to be carried out, the southbound traffic was backed up beyond Venn Mill during the evening rush hour. More often than not, northbound traffic in particular travels at speeds well in excess of the 30 mph limit, often overtaking cars travelling within the speed limit. Crossing the road by the bus stop is hazardous, particularly for mothers with young children and the elderly. I often have to wait in excess of five minutes to pull out of my driveway during the morning and evening peak periods. These situations will be made even worse when the new developments in Wantage and Grove are completed. The proposed exit from the North of East Hanney site onto the A338 will make this stretch of road even dangerous than it is already. To my knowledge there are no plans to alleviate this situation. Isn’t it about time that someone on the VWHDC made a detailed assessment of the total picture?

Traffic noise is also a problem on this stretch of the A338 and will only get worse. When the A34 is closed for any reason, the situation is intolerable (e.g. heavy lorries travelling at speed in a 30 mph zone cause our house (located 25 m back from the road) to shake).

What would be the impact on traffic in the area if Thames Water did decide to build the Upper Thames Strategic Water Storage Reservoir? This question is not addressed in the Local Plan.

3. *Visual Impact.* Both proposed developments would create major negative visual impacts. The Part 2 Plan admits that the North-East of East Hanney site would be clearly exposed to southbound traffic on the A 338. Adjacent developments on Steventon Road are largely hidden from view by trees. However, this would not be so in the case of the North-East of East Hanney site, which would also be clearly exposed to eastbound traffic on the Steventon Road.

The visual impact of any North of East Hanney development would be even worse. It would be a real blot on the landscape, particularly to the residents of north-east East Hanney and to traffic travelling southward on the A338. Moreover, the site is located adjacent to the Ebbs Lane conservation area and would have a detrimental effect on the character of this part of the village.

Both sites are located on the edge of the village; they are described in Appendix A4 as “sustainable urban extensions”. They are certainly “urban” in character. By definition, they are incompatible with a rural village, and therefore not sustainable. Moreover, the proposed housing densities considerably exceed that of most of the village. In a recent survey undertaken during the course of the preparation of the emerging East Hanney Neighbourhood Plan, about 99% of the respondents opposed the North of East Hanney proposal and a large majority opposed the North-East of East Hanney site. In fact, most opposed any extension to the village boundary at all.

Part 1 of the Plan included a proposal for a strategic site for 200 houses south of Summertown Road, East Hanney. A planning application for this site was rejected by the Vale’s Planning Committee, a decision that was upheld on appeal. The Committee’s reasons for refusal related to “the alleged adverse impact of the proposals on the landscape character of the area; on the setting of designated heritage assets; and on the rural character of the settlement with particular regard to such factors as location and density.” The site was subsequently withdrawn from the Part 1 Plan by the Council who concluded that it was undeliverable. The same objections apply to the North of East Hanney site in particular, which should be deleted from the Plan on the grounds that it is unsustainable and conflicts with NPPF. In other words, the harm outweighs the benefits.

3. *Pedestrian Access to the Village.* The Plan stresses the desirability of new residents being able to integrate with the village in order to access its existing facilities. Unfortunately, this is unlikely to happen because of the distances (over a mile) between the developments and the core of the village. The North-East of East Hanney development is also separated from the village by the A338. There is no pedestrian walkway along the busy Steventon Road and, as noted above, crossing the A338 is also extremely hazardous.

There is no pedestrian walkway along Ashfield Lane. A recent planning proposal suggested that the pedestrian access to the North of East Hanney development should be on Ashfield Lane, close to the A338. This is convenient for the bus stops but not for the village amenities, including the school. Previous experience has shown that the hoped-for integration of the residents of these developments into the rest of the village is unlikely to occur, at least in the short term.

These proposed developments therefore do not comply with the Vale's policy to encourage walking and cycling.

In Conclusion. I respectfully request the Inspector to remove the North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney sites from the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2. Both sites flood and the developments would have a negative visual impact and be out of character with much of the village, both in terms of appearance and density. They are also far removed from the centre of the village and would lead to even more traffic on the already dangerous A338 and through the village, particularly in the vicinity of St James' School.

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

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