

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Thelma Scott (868212)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	The Old Mill House Cottage East Hanney Nr Wantage OX12 0JJ
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mrs Thelma Scott
Comment ID	LPPub32
Response Date	02/12/14 15:17
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Inadmissible
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.

I do not consider the Local Plan is legally compliant because the Vale have not followed the correct process with regards to consultation on the change of the East of East Hanney site to the South of East Hanney site.

Consultation - Please note that the South of East Hanney site is a new site and at no point has been the subject of public consultation. The only consultation has been on the site to the East of East Hanney to which there was little objection compared to the mass objection to the South site at a recent public meeting and on the Hanney web site. There is no clear reason why the site was changed.

On the Local plan 2031 Part 1 Strategic Sites and policies SHLAA Appendix 8 East Hanney, part of the Southern site EHAN05B in the overall assessment of site deliverability is stated as Undeliverable. Why has this now become deliverable? It is also stated under policy constraints as adjacent to **Conservation Area** and listed building, archaeological constrain, **Flood Zone** 2 and 3 in northern part (at access). This point of access is also stated as having no continuous pedestrian access to village facilities.

To expand on these two issues:

Conservation Area - The South site is a known ecological area and home to a large number of protected species, both plant and animal. The land is also of major ecological interest being a priority habitat comprising of lowland calcareous grassland and an ancient orchard as well an important wildlife corridor along the brook. The proposed development is in breach of the Vales duty to conserve bio diversity including both preservation and enhancement. In the document Local Plan 2031 Part 1 Sustainability Assessment Part 3 Findings and recommendations South of East Hanney Paragraph 7 states : The site was appraised to have a **major negative effect in terms of the natural environment**. The site to the East of the village would not have this effect.

Flooding - The proposed South site lies in a flood prone area and any water running off that site or unable to sink away into the site will run into the village. Anything that increases this risk is of particular impact to my family who were flooded out in the major flood of 2007 and were unable to move back into the house for three and a half years eventually returning in December 2010. Also Christmas Eve 2013 the water was just inches from my back door. My understanding is that the Vale has a duty not to build on land sites liable to flood or causing flood to adjacent areas, this site would significantly increase the flood risk to the surrounding area. The site to the East of the village would not have this impact.

Sustainability - This is also a key issue as the proposal of 200 houses in East Hanney, an existing village of about 360 houses, is a village on a village which is not sustainable. The Sustainability Assessment mentioned above states in Para 2. that the site has good access to local community centre, primary school and local shops. This is not true. It is also noted in the SHLAA document that there is no continuous pedestrian access to village facilities from the South site ref EHAN05. This is true, the road is very narrow, cars can not pass in parts of it, the half pavement is dangerous to even walk along and could not accomodate a pushchair or wheelchair. There is no commercially operated village shop, it is a small community shop run by volunteers with a limited supply of goods.

Para 8 of the Sustainability Assesment states that there will be a major negative impact in terms of cultural heritage, townscape and landscape. The impact of a site with 200 houses is totally out of keeping in close proximity to a traditional village, the majority of which, is in a conservation area with listed buildings.

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.

I strongly object to the to the proposed development to the South of East Hanney for the above stated reasons and would ask the inspector to first consider if 200 houses in a village of 360 is realistic and sustainable.

If Hanney has to have some development, then a far lower number of around 50 houses on the East of East Hanney site is the modification I suggest.

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