

## Comment

Consultee	Mr Oliver Cornish (868674)
Email Address	
Address	1 The Paddocks Main Street East Hanney OX12 0HX
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Oliver Cornish
Comment ID	LPPub1298
Response Date	22/12/14 13:06
Consultation Point	Core Policy 44: Landscape ( <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.**

Hanney is an old village rich with a long history. The proposal to build a new housing development south of it will be on of an ancient ridge and furrow site. Since 1984 84% of this type of land has disappeared in England (source: The Wildlife Trust). It is the breeding ground and natural habitat for

some of the U.K's most threatened bird life, mammals, wildflowers and insects. A Vale appraisal of the development site south of East Hanney stated that it would bring a major negative effect in terms of the natural environment. They further noted that it is adjacent to a major wild life corridor along the brook, which runs alongside the western boundary of the site, which potentially contains a UK Priority habitat, and this would be threatened by the proposed development.

Many residents enjoy having this valuable asset close by. It is not necessary to destroy this particular locality for housing. There are other more suitable development sites available locally.

**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.**

Paragraph 118 of the NPPF document states 'planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.' The proposed development will not have a neutral effect on the health and wellbeing of local residents. The solution would be to move the site to an alternative location.

**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