

	<p>Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part One: Strategic Sites and Policies</p> <p>Publication Stage Representation Form</p>	<p>Ref:</p> <p>(For official use only)</p>
--	--	---

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031

Response form for the Vale of White Horse strategic planning policy document, the Local Plan Part one. Please return to Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, Benson Lane, Crowmarsh, Wallingford, OX10 8ED or email planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk no later than Friday 19 December 2014 by 4.30 pm precisely.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	Professor	
First Name	James	
Last Name	Triffitt	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	Bramley House	
Line 2	Mill Orchard	
Line 3	East Hanney	
Line 4	Wantage	
Post Code	OX120JH	
Telephone Number	██████████	
E-mail Address (where relevant)	██████████	

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation :

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text" value="X"/>
4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text" value="X"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text" value="X"/>

Please mark as appropriate.

5. 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.

(continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

The Local Plan cannot be legally compliant since inadequate, rushed and inappropriate consultation procedures have been followed and the main methods for the present consultation are unduly obstructive to gaining the views of all inhabitants of the district. The latter procedures are unfairly complex and the instructions given for consultation not written in plain English for all to understand and to give adequate response to such extensive documentation. For detailed analysis by any observer and adequate response, the Plan details may only reasonably be obtained at personal expense by using lengthy periods with computerised technology. This is not useful to all local people, many who are unfamiliar with such devices, and who unable to travel to local council offices or libraries. Hence this obstructs severely and unfairly the objections of many. In addition, any responses to this Plan are sent to the Vale's representatives rather than directly to the Planning Inspectorate, which does not suggest transparency of information received and could suggest bias in any collation of data received.

In addition to the lack of consultation before this Plan was hurried through, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is based on employment figures which are unsound as determined by a number of expert analyses and the Vale's Local Plan 2031 Part 1 is as a consequence unsound as it is not based on proportionate evidence.

6. 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 at 5 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.

Reduce the local projected jobs total to reasonable levels and hence the projected housing needs. Other aspects mentioned above indicate that this Plan should be rejected outright.

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.

7. 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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Date:

16 December
2014

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation :

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph	Re: land to the South of East Hanney	Policy	CORE POLICY 4	Proposals Map	STRATEGIC SITE 6 Land South of East Hanney
-----------	--------------------------------------	--------	---------------	---------------	---

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound (Positively Prepared, Effective and Justified)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please mark as appropriate.

5. 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.

See next page

This proposal is unsound for many reasons that are presented in detail in the local response by the East Hanney Parish Council, which I support entirely.

In addition, there are a large number of particular reasons of great importance to me as a resident of this village for almost 50 years and indications as to why this site South of Summertown is unsound and not deliverable are given as follows:

This proposed development is upstream of the existing village of East Hanney and the flooding risks to the rest of the village are grossly exacerbated by any development on this land. This proposal goes right down to edges of the Letcombe brook, and encompasses flood plain behind Dandridges Mill and the old Mill Orchard.

The proposed development encroaches on important historic wildlife sites of crucial local importance to the extensive flora and fauna of East Hanney.

The excessive and extensive nature of the site extends the village towards the Grove boundary and will completely obliterate the character and environment of the existing village and it's inhabitants. It will mark the greatest change in East Hanney's long history and will destroy the quality of life and environment of all existing villagers. This is because this development is so large that it will double the population of this small village and will change entirely the nature of the village. The proposed site development will be a separate entity in itself with no possible, reasonable connection to the village and the present minimal existing infrastructure and furthermore will destroy the existing adjacent rural community.

The Vale's proposal for blocks of 200 houses and rejection of all other possibilities is unreasonable. It is completely illogical for any government to insist that small communities such as Hanney have blocks of 200 houses imposed upon them and that lesser developments are not considered in the quota. This is a nonsense and if implemented it is a political scandal. Such destruction of the Green Belt and lack of attention to extensive development of brownfield sites in more strategic locations is also irresponsible.

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.

7. 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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Date:

16/12/2014