

Comment

Consultee	Mr T Palmer (749659)
Email Address	
Address	6 Morlands East hanney Wantage OX12 0JW
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr T Palmer
Comment ID	LPPub496
Response Date	16/12/14 16:46
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.

I believe that the plan is neither sound nor compliant with the duty to cooperate and therefore by definition is in my mind not legally compliant ? my objections and concerns however revolve around the lack of soundness and it?s non-cooperative nature.

My main concern is around the loss of character and village identity. The development of 200 homes will overwhelm the nature and size of the existing village with a 60% increase in the total number of homes in East Hanney (334 homes in the 2011 Census). The imposition of a large, densely populated estate, upon a village lacking the necessary capacity, will blight our existing community, culture, quality of life and environment. Whilst the facilities score under the Vale?s assessment may suggest that East Hanney ranks as a ?large village?, this is a small community with limited services that are inadequate to support the huge proposed increase in residents. The points scored for having a ?shop? do not take into account the nature of such a tiny facility staffed purely by community volunteers. There are no services or facilities for teenagers and young families, other than volunteer groups. It should also be noted that the imminent loss of the mobile library will return the village to a ?small? ranking and thus would not, under the Vale?s own criteria, have warranted any such development. 10 Villages with populations greater than East Hanney and with a facilities score either the same as, or higher than, East Hanney have NOT been earmarked for development One village in the Vale that received a facilities score of 21 and has over 1,000 homes has only been allocated a development site for 220 houses, increasing the total number of homes by just 22% .Compare this with the almost 60% increase in homes for East Hanney. The housing designs and styles are anticipated to be out of character with the existing settlement at East Hanney and, with 25 homes per hectare proposed (equating to 10 per acre), so will the density. A principle of the Local Plan is to reduce air, noise and light pollution. Development of the site South of East Hanney was appraised by the Vale to bring about ?minor negative? effects. East Hanney currently has very few street lights and, given the scale of growth proposed, I find it difficult to understand how any development of this huge scale can have any impact that is minor in this respect. Will the new development have street lights? See the Vale?s Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness and 44: Landscape. The NPPF requires the Plan to be ?justified? by being ?the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives? Do you believe this is true? If not, then the Plan is ?unsound?. The simple fact is that increasing the size of any village by this massive amount can not but have a major impact on the character of the village. I have worked all my life to be able to live in a small village and have the life that this brings ? I cannot contenance it being destroyed in this way. It already takes me a significant amount of time to get out of the village onto the road to get to work, how will this be affected by 200-500 additional vehicles on the road in this direct vicinity? There are so many reasons why this plan is flawed: ? Increased risk of flooding ? Capability to deal with sewage and other refuse ? Roads and infrastructure ? Destruction of heritage ? Other, larger more developed towns in the area are not having such massive expansion levied upon them This should not be aloud to go ahead.

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.

Engage in real consultation, reduce the expansion to a sensible level (10-15%) and stop the destruction of everything an English Village stands for,

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