

Comment

Consultee	Mr Richard Emptage (868655)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	1 Rectory Farm Close West Hanney OX120LR
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Richard Emptage
Comment ID	LPPub28
Response Date	30/11/14 19:29
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
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.

The Local Plan is unsound as 200 houses will completely alter the character of the Hanneys. This represents a near doubling of the size of East Hanney turning it from a SMALL village into a dormitory

town. (East Hanney only achieves Large Village status due to the fact that we have a mobile library service which is under threat anyway !)

Siting the houses to the South of East Hanney will lead to more traffic trying to exit the village onto the A338. A large proportion of the traffic from the village already heads to and from Didcot station during the rush periods. The A338 is set to become even busier with the planned developments at Wantage and Grove. There is no provision in the Local Plan for improving St. James' primary school in the Hanneys and this is already at capacity. There will therefore be an increased need to bus primary school children (or worse still add more cars to the school run) in order to meet the need generated as well as an increased number of secondary school children. This is unsustainable in my view and does not meet the Vale's requirement to introduce new developments sustainably.

The area proposed is upstream of the village and forms an area which retains water during periods of heavy rain. This water will therefore be displaced down-stream into the village and cause large scale flooding of residential properties.

The development does not mark an end to the un-controlled expansion in the Hanneys but merely a beginning. There should be some control on the numbers of new houses which will be added over the next few years.

We in the village fear that we will not be properly represented at council planning meeting. Personally I have very negative experiences concerned with a development at the end of Rectory Farm Close in West Hanney. Our elected councillor declared an interest in the development and then did not speak again during any of the subsequent planning stages. He was not even prepared to intervene in disputes with the developers. This signals that the un-elected planners and developers can do whatever they want. Our constructive suggestions about alternative access to the Rectory Farm Close development were ignored thus depriving the village of the potential traffic calming benefits that an access on the edge of the village would have brought.

I have similar concerns for the proposed development at East Hanney unless additional direct access to the A338 is provided as this will already add to the traffic and queues onto the A338 for traffic from both East and West Hanney. Providing traffic light at the Steventon road will merely cause through traffic to come off the A338, travel through East Hanney and join on at the end of the village thus turning a small residential road into yet another rat run.

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.

The proposed development to the South of East Hanney should be abandoned in its entirety. I object in the strongest terms to the nature of question 5 which sets out to make me and other objectors complicit in any scheme proposed by suggesting modifications to them. WE DON'T WANT ANY OF IT ! FULL STOP !

We have a small village and we would like it to stay that way - that's why we moved here !

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