

## Comment

|               |                             |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Consultee     | Mrs Gillian Parry (1143228) |
| Email Address |                             |
| Address       |                             |

|                 |                                      |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Event Name      | LPP2 Publicity Period Oct - Nov 2017 |
| Comment by      | Mrs Gillian Parry                    |
| Comment ID      | 340                                  |
| Response Date   | 22/11/17 08:42                       |
| Status          | Submitted                            |
| Submission Type | Web                                  |
| Version         | 0.1                                  |

|  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| <b>Q1 To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? Please state the paragraph or policy or policies map.</b> | core policies 3, 4 and 44 |
|--|---------------------------|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant?</b> | No |
|--|----|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound?</b> | No |
|--|----|

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Q4 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</b> | No |
|---|----|

**Q5 Please provide 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 cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.**

All of my comments relate to the Local Plan 2031 - Part Two. Specifically, the two proposed areas for development in East Hanney.

- 1 I do not consider the Plan to be legally compliant. I believe the initial assessment process which included East Hanney to be a Large Village was flawed. East Hanney should have been classified as a Small Village and excluded for the following reasons:

- 1 The village facilities are not consistent with other Large Villages in the Plan but are consistent with those in Small Villages. The facilities which do exist are a very small, community-run shop, a pub and a school which is currently too small to meet existing demand. There is no medical centre, supermarket or library. All of these are in other villages and towns and require transport to reach them.
- 2 There is no direct public transport link to either Didcot or Milton Park and there is no footpath or cycleway integration with roads and paths in the village. The development will therefore have a significant impact on local traffic both to the rest of the village and to other local villages and towns.
- 3 The proposed sites would have a significant detrimental impact on the local waste water capacity (already stretched) and on the local flood run off. It risks creating or increasing flood risk for other parts of East Hanney through the development of what is currently a flood soak away field.
- 4 The proposed location of a large, dense development (relative to the housing density generally in the village) on the fringe of this very rural village was a chief reason for the Inspector dismissing an appeal to allow development of a site of 200 houses on the southern edge of the village in 2016. This was a site which had been suggested for development by the Council. The two sites proposed in the Plan are similarly located on the fringe of the village and have a similar, semi-urban, density. Why then, should these sites be considered appropriate for inclusion in the Plan when the Council's previous suggested site was refused?

2. I do not consider the Plan to be sound (as far as it relates to East Hanney) as it contravenes the following Core Policies:

**CP3 Settlement and Hierarchy, CP4 Meeting Our Housing Needs and CP44 Landscape**

The Plan states that any development proposals will have to demonstrate that the settlement's character is retained.

Both the sites in East Hanney call for development which is contrary to the existing rural nature of the village in terms of:

- 1 Density of build
- 2 Location
- 3 Lack of integration with the existing village with respect to footpaths, cycleways and access to (the very few) village facilities

I therefore consider this core policy to have been disregarded. Furthermore, the proposal is contrary to the stated aims of the NPPF where the Plan is inconsistent with the desire to retain rural village character through managed slow and incremental growth.

An additional consideration must also be given to the considerable 'windfall' development since 2010 which has doubled the number of houses in the village and is already changing the character of the community. None of the new developments have done anything other than pay lip service to the existing character of the settlement and are urban fringe in style and density.

The Plan further states 'the need to protect.....the important landscape settings of settlements'. It is hard to see how the plans for East Hanney support this aspiration as set out in CP44. The proposal is for two large developments on the very rural fringes of the village, clearly visible from the approach roads from Steventon in one case and Oxford in the other. The scale and density of any development proposal which meets the required number of houses on these two sites would give a visual impact contrary to the rural nature of their location and more consistent with an urban fringe.

3. I do not consider that the Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate.

The Council has completely disregarded the wishes of the community of East Hanney as set out in the approved Neighbourhood Plan. Specific sites for small, integrated developments were selected through consultation with the villagers. These are consistent with the need for the village to grow at a slow and steady pace in order to enable the village to retain its character and

community spirit. This is despite the village already having been subject to an increase of 100% in its size over recent years.

Furthermore, the villages have soundly rejected both proposed sites at a recent public meeting.

The Council, by including East Hanney in the Plan, have chosen to ignore the wishes of the community and by doing so have failed to meet their Duty to Cooperate.

**Q6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at 5 above. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate 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.**

Both proposed sites in East Hanney should be removed from the Plan and East Hanney should be re-classified as a Small Village.

**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

**Would you like to hear from us in the future?**

- . I would like to be kept informed about the progress of the Local Plan
- . I would like to be added to the database to receive general planning updates