

Comment

Consultee	Mr Clive Manvell (829424)
Email Address	
Address	Tamarisk Main Street Wantage OX12 0JE
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Clive Manvell
Comment ID	LPPub818
Response Date	18/12/14 12:34
Consultation Point	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (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.

The proposed development south of the village of 200+ dwellings suggests an increase in vehicles of between 300 and 400 vehicles. The village is not served by bus routes anywhere near the areas

identified as employment centers namely: Milton Park, Harwell and Didcot, just services to and from Wantage to Oxford. The A338 already approaches capacity at peak times and with these additional vehicles entering and leaving the proposed development the Vale's appraisal as bringing about a minor positive effect in reducing the need to travel and reducing road congestion is farcical and clearly indicates that the Vale's Plan has not been positively prepared and is certainly not consistent with achieving sustainable development which makes the Vale's Plan unsound. There are no pavements, footpaths or cycle tracks connecting the existing village with the proposed development site south of the village. Pedestrian access to the village from the site would have to be around a narrow, sharp 90o bend where vehicles have to squeeze past each other. The plan is therefore unsound and not justified as being the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives ? the site to the east of the village which is connected by local footpaths.

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 Plan as proposed for the site south of East Hanney should be abandoned as there has been no consultation regarding the proposal and what is proposed has not been justified and is unsound.

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