

## Comment

Consultee	Mr Clive Manvell (829424)
Email Address	
Address	Tamarisk Main Street Wantage OX12 0JE
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Clive Manvell
Comment ID	LPPub813
Response Date	18/12/14 12:24
Consultation Point	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs ( <a href="#">View</a> )
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.**

Furthermore the area of the proposed development south of East Hanney is not legally compliant in that it has not been consulted on as part of the due process. An area to the East of East Hanney was

proposed and consulted on in February 2014, not this area. A survey of residents quantified this no consultation process in answer to the question: Were you aware before the 15th October (the date on which the revised version of Local Plan 2031 was ratified) that the Vale had changed its original proposal and identified the area for development as south of East Hanney? 234 - Answered NO; 16 - Answered YES; 1 - declined to answer. Additional responses were received from outside the village; 19 - Answered NO; 1 - Answered YES. The same survey, in answer to the question ?Are you in favour of or opposed to the Vales proposal to develop 200 houses South of East Hanney? 254 - Opposed to the development; 5 - In favour of to the development; 1 - declined to answer, with responses outside East Hanney: 19 - Opposed to the development; 1 - In favour of to the development.

Given the nature of the proposed development which would be adjacent to the conservation area, with its listed buildings and distinctive building materials, the new development would bring about a major detrimental effect on the appearance and outlook thereby not preserving the character of the village. Even the Vale appraised the proposal as bringing about a major negative effect in respect of heritage and landscape. The proposed site includes evidence of a Roman road; an ancient Manor House and has yielded a number of archaeological artefacts. The NPPF has core principles to conserve heritage assets and these will potentially be lost. The Plan is not justified as being the most appropriate strategy, and is therefore unsound. The question of archaeological issues and potential loss of artefacts suggests that the plan is not effective in meeting NPPF criteria and is therefore unsound.

The area that the Vale have proposed to build on to the South of East Hanney is rich in flora and fauna and is a precious environmental assets. The proposed site is land that runs along Letcombe Brook from Dandridge?s Mill through the ancient orchard and into a spinney. It includes the wild life corridor along the brook which although known to be and designated as a wild life habitat of protected species is directly subject to threat by the proposed development. The habitat here is extremely rare and home to the wildlife and ecology which the residents of East Hanney all have the benefit of enjoying. The proposed development site threatens the breeding ground of many species, some of which are endangered. Their presence helps make East Hanney one of the special places identified by the VOWHDC (The Vale is a special place, it is uniquely beautiful with a rich natural and man-made heritage). Under the plan the proposed development will build across this area which would destroy the habitat. In the spring and the summer many types of rare species can be found here and if the proposed development takes place, this will be lost forever.

**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.**

The Plan as proposed for the site south of East Hanney should be abandoned as there has been no consultation regarding the proposal and what is proposed has not been justified and is 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