## **East Hanney Housing Plan Proposal**

| 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2014 |
|--------------------------------|
| Tel:                           |
| Mob:                           |

## **Dear VoWHDC Planning Team**

I would like to formally object to the proposed development of approximately 200 houses to the existing village of East Hanney. The proposed development does not state how it will deal with adapting the current sewerage works to cope with the proposed increase. It does not guarantee any necessary works will be completed before any (future) works commencement. Thames water has officially stated that they do not have any future schedule in place to enable the current sewerage system to cope with any village expansion. This implies that the developers must meet any future costs.

The proposal does not account for flood risks nor does it offer any solutions for water management in the event of flooding to protect the current (original) village and its properties. Much of East Hanney is within a Conservation area. The proposal would do nothing to preserve or enhance the area and if no preventative flood measures were established prior to development, would threaten the conservation area with likely damage to existing properties through flooding and its consequences.

The proposal will breach a wildlife corridor along Letcombe Brook which currently houses protected and endangered species. The proposal leads to losing a green field site and the demise of an orchard which is over a century old.

The above points I've raised contravenes both Article 1, protocol 1 and Article 8 of the European Court of Human Rights:

Article 1, Protocol 1, This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land.

Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings.

The proposal does not address other key issues that will result from the development.

These are:

Lack of educational facilities that will arise from the proposal Highway Infrastructure and essential expansion

The current school will have to be expanded to accommodate any new young population. The current school is at capacity, so if the primary schooling age expands by any percentage, it creates an immediate shortfall with alternate schooling sought. There are no proposals to accommodate public transport and using private transport will increase pollution.

The developer will be responsible for highway expansion to accommodate any working population commuting to a place of work. Taxpayers are not expected to financially supplement a private development by publicly funding any adaptations to public highways and carriageways.

Tony Lee