

Comment

Consultee	Mr Tony Lee (872091)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	The Bakery Ashfields Lane Wantage OX12 0HN
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Tony Lee
Comment ID	LPPub501
Response Date	16/12/14 17:02
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
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

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 would like to formally object to the proposed development of approximately 200 houses to the existing village of East Hanney. The proposed development does not state how it will deal with adapting the current sewerage works to cope with the proposed increase. It does not guarantee any necessary works will be completed before any (future) works commencement. Thames water has officially stated that they do not have any future schedule in place to enable the current sewerage system to cope with any village expansion. This implies that the developers must meet any future costs. The proposal does not account for flood risks nor does it offer any solutions for water management in the event of flooding

to protect the current (original) village and its properties. Much of East Hanney is within a Conservation area. The proposal would do nothing to preserve or enhance the area and if no preventative flood measures were established prior to development, would threaten the conservation area with likely damage to existing properties through flooding and its consequences. The proposal will breach a wildlife corridor along Letcombe Brook which currently houses protected and endangered species. The proposal leads to losing a green field site and the demise of an orchard which is over a century old. The above points I've raised contravenes both Article 1, protocol 1 and Article 8 of the European Court of Human Rights: Article 1, Protocol 1, This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land.

Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings.

The proposal does not address other key issues that will result from the development.

These are:

Lack of educational facilities that will arise from the proposal Highway Infrastructure and essential expansion

The current school will have to be expanded to accommodate any new young population. The current school is at capacity, so if the primary schooling age expands by any percentage, it creates an immediate shortfall with alternate schooling sought. There are no proposals to accommodate public transport and using private transport will increase pollution.

The developer will be responsible for highway expansion to accommodate any working population commuting to a place of work. Taxpayers are not expected to financially supplement a private development by publicly funding any adaptations to public highways and carriageways.

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