

Comment

Consultee	Mr Oliver Cornish (868674)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	1 The Paddocks Main Street East Hanney OX12 0HX
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Oliver Cornish
Comment ID	LPPub1297
Response Date	22/12/14 13:05
Consultation Point	Core Policy 42: Flood Risk (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3

Q1 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? No

Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound (positively prepared, effective and Justified) No

If your comment(s) relate to a specific site within a core policy please select this from the drop down list. South of East Hanney

If you think your comment relates to the DtC, this is about how we have worked with the Duty to Cooperate bodies (such as neighbouring planning authorities)

Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate? No

Q4 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 am extremely concerned with the increased risk of flooding that the proposed development south of East Hanney could bring. The village experienced significant and damaging floods in 2007 and in 2014, and was very close to flooding in 2013. The proposed development is very close to the banks

of the Letcombe Brook upstream of the village, and will only increase the volume of water flowing through the village, both from runoff and water processed from the sewerage works. Part of the proposed development is on areas designated as unsuitable (EHAN05B refers). The Local Plan has no solution to managing the increased water volumes that will be generated by this proposed development. Paragraph 100 of the NPPF states that 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk'. The proposed development is in breach of this. Paragraph 101 states 'Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding'. There are other sites that should be considered prior to the one proposed. Paragraph 103 states that local planning authorities should 'ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere'. The proposed development is in direct contravention of this edict.

Q5 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 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.

In order to make this local Plan legally sound, the development will have to be sited at a different location. Because of its location upstream of East Hanney, it cannot fulfil the obligations contained in the NPPF document.

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.

Q6 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