

Comment

Consultee	mrs nicola kauert (866283)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	Weir Farm East Hanney Wantage OX12 0JJ
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	mrs nicola kauert
Comment ID	LPPub276
Response Date	15/12/14 15:31
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

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.

East Hanney is a SMALL village (334 houses) with a voluntary run shop and village hall and is extremely prone to flooding

East Hanney has had a 15% increase in housing in 2014 and an almost 60% increase, is proposed with the South Site

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.

FLOODING

The proposed development will certainly not 'increase resilience to climate change or flooding' or bring about a 'neutral effect' in terms of flooding. In fact it will increase the flood risk to East Hanney. This is not consistent with national policy and is therefore UNSOUND

Para 100, Para 101, Para 103

SEWAGE

Grove sewage works (upstream of East Hanney) is at capacity. The development of Wantage and Grove and now East Hanney will only exacerbate flooding issues, as the treated and **untreated** outflow into Letcombe Brook during high rainfall will cause flooding half a mile downstream in East Hanney. No proposal has been put forward to provide a solution. The plan is therefore not 'effective' and thus UNSOUND.

ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

The 'undeliverable' site EHAN05B is an ancient apple orchard with ridge and furrow, and adjacent to a conservation area and county wildlife site. UNSOUND

Para 9, Para 17, Para 109, Para 118

HERITAGE

The 'undeliverable' site EHAN05B has a timber framed building in the middle of the site which should be preserved. There are reasonable alternatives, i.e. sites identified in the SHLAA report

Para 17

SCHOOL

The village school is at capacity and is unaccessible by public footpath from the South Site. The NPPF requires the Plan to be positively prepared. The school is not prepared and the development is therefore UNSUSTAINABLE and UNSOUND

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS

There is no public footpath from the South Site to the school, shop or village hall. There is little chance of creating a footpath due to Dandridges Mill Bridge and Letcombe Brook running along Brookside. UNSOUND

INTERGRATION of a CARBUNCLE

The lodging of 200 houses on the corner of East Hanney is destroying the very nature of an English village. It will be extinct from the community. It cannot be justified and is UNSOUND

CONSULTATION

I was present at the EAST site consultation. There was no mention of the SOUTH site. The South site has not been subject to any proper resident consultation or consideration.

Section 17 of NPPF makes the non-consultation to be ILLEGAL and 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