



Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd

Hearing Statements for Vale of White Horse Local
Plan 2031 Part 2: Detailed Policies and Additional
Sites
Matter 4

Prepared by WYG Environment Planning Transport
Limited



Preamble

WYG are instructed by Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd ('our client' hereafter) to provide planning consultancy advice in respect of their land interests at land South of Steventon Road, East Hanney, which lies within the boundary of the Vale of White Horse District Council.

Detailed comments have been made at all stages of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Parts 1 Part 2.

WYG have been representing the client since January 2016 and appeared at the Stage 2 Hearings for the emerging Local Plan on Matters relating to Housing Land Supply and the Spatial Strategy. Prior to WYG's involvement, representations were submitted on behalf of the client by Oxalis Planning.

Representations were made to the Council's Call for Sites consultation in July 2016 and these were supplemented in October 2016, in respect of the Local Plan Part 2. Most recently, submissions were made to the Preferred Options consultation in May 2017 and to the submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan in November 2017.

Our client's site lies adjacent to the settlement of East Hanney, on its eastern edge (identified in Appendix 1 of Appendix 1). East Hanney is a 'Larger Village' as identified in the Local Plan Part 1, providing a number of services and facilities which meet the day to day needs of the area.

An outline planning application for the development of our client's land interests at East Hanney was refused on 25th November 2015 by VoWH District Council, contrary to the Planning Officer's positive recommendation for approval. The grounds of refusal related to matters of heritage and landscape impact and the absence of a Section 106 Agreement at the point of determination.

A planning appeal was submitted against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission on 26th February 2016 and was heard via the Written Representations procedure (appeal ref: APP/V3120/W/16/3145359). On 7th July 2016 the Inspector issued his decision, dismissing the appeal. The sole ground for dismissal related to the scale of the proposed development, which was considered to be *"out of character with the existing form and layout of the village and disproportionate to its existing size"* (para 36, Inspector's report). It is of note that the refusal was predicated only on scale, and not in relation to the principle of development in this location per se, which was acknowledged to be appropriate in all other technical respects, including the absence of *any* harm to heritage assets.

The site is therefore now promoted for a development of 50-75 dwellings, commensurate with the wider housing distribution strategy established by the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part



1. The merits, benefits and sustainability credentials of the site remain as identified in the May 2017 representations and are not repeated here.

This Hearing Statement seeks to reiterate and update where necessary, comments previously made in respect of the Submission Version Local Plan Part 2 and associated Sustainability Appraisal, to confirm our Client's position. The Statement is structured under the following broad themes, flowing from the Inspector's Matters and Questions:

Matters to which this Statement refers:

Matter 4 – specifically inspector's questions 4.1 a) to d) inclusive and 4.5



Inspector's Question 4.1 – d) South East of Marcham

The proposed allocation is considered unsound as it is neither justified, effective nor consistent with national policy.

No additional work has been undertaken by the Council to address the concerns raised regarding the soundness of this site, nor does the Statement of Common Ground (Doc Ref SCG13) address the matters raised.

There is no evidence that the necessary mitigation for transport matters in order to address the significant air quality issues nor any highways impacts are capable of being delivered, or if any funding has been secured for such delivery. Not all impacts, mitigation measures or costs are yet known (page 63 of Doc Ref CSD10: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LPP2 Update) Final Report – February 2018) for the transport infrastructure which may be required. In addition, as set out in the Statement of Common Ground (Doc Ref: SCG11, para 2.2) the site will safeguard land for the proposed South Marcham Bypass but no costs or funding to secure this bypass have been identified either.