

## Comment

Consultee	Mr Paul Aram (868060)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	2 Snuggs Lane East Hanney Wantage OX12 0HU
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Paul Aram
Comment ID	LPPub37
Response Date	03/12/14 00:15
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area ( <a href="#">View</a> )
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.**

The Local Plan is not legally compliant and unsound for the following reasons: There has been a complete failure to consult the parishioners of East Hanney with regards to the site South of East Hanney.

This is evidenced through the lack of knowledge throughout the village of the proposal for housing to the South. The original plan proposed land to the East of East Hanney which is much more suitable for development on the following grounds:

1. Access to Science Vale by car (the largest area of employment) is more direct from the East.
2. The East site does not exit onto the A338 a road that is already at capacity during busy times
3. The East site is low grade agricultural land compared to the South site
4. The East site forms a better village perimeter than the South site

The plan is inconsistent with regards to the NPPF, failing on the grounds of sustainability, failing to meet community needs and health and well being.

1. Sustainability - the plan fails on a number of accounts:

a. Provide suitable housing - the village does not need 200 homes for local families

b. Availability of facilities - the village has a community shop and a farm shop - this is not sufficient to support the community, a car journey will be required for any shopping needs

c. There are no banks, doctors, dentists etc within walking distance, therefore the plan fails to address reducing the need to travel. Footpaths and bridleways are made up of mud or gravel, there are no tarmac routes to the nearest village - Grove - which is 4 miles away. The cycle route would be down the very busy and narrow A338 which crosses the main London-Bristol railway line over a hump backed bridge which does not have any pedestrian paths over it. I would certainly not send any child down this road.

d. The health and well being for the villagers will be reduced not improved - more traffic will increase the risk of pedestrian injury on roads that do not have footpaths - which are present throughout the village. Unlit roads throughout the village are what the village wants, but with an increased population may lead to increased risk of accident. The school is oversubscribed already, local children are already bussed to other schools which is not acceptable.

e. Improve natural environment - the plan is detrimental to the environment and local wildlife. It cuts off an essential route through the village for local wildlife such as deer, badgers and birdlife. The green area to the south of the village is used by flocks of birds migrating as it has good clear sight lines and space.

f. Improve cultural heritage and landscape - this area made up of an ancient orchard and ridge and furrow field complex. Roman finds have been made in the area as the A338 is a roman road. The village has grown over hundreds of years in an evolutionary manner with pockets of development of thatched cottages, red brick houses and flint or cotswold stone. The roads are narrow with a single lane hump backed bridge. This all adds to the feeling of a small and slow paced environment which is the very appeal of the village. A large homogenised development stuck on the side of the village would be totally out of character and detrimental to the remainder of the village.

g. Reduce emissions and air/light pollution - in contrary, the carbon emissions will increase due to the necessity to drive to anything, schools etc. The village does not have any lighting to speak of. The new development will have to comply to latest development legislation and will therefore require flood coverage lighting which will detract from the beauty of the country isolation and cause light pollution.

h. Increase the resilience to climate change and flooding - again this is complete nonsense as the village has been flooded on more than four occasions since 2007. Considering this was meant to be a once in a hundred year event, we are living on borrowed time before the village floods again. The latest being in February 2014 when the roads throughout the village were under 6 inches or more of water totally isolating the village from any travel East or West. Several vehicles were written off in the flood water by the village hall.

In Summary:

Is the plan justified or legal - I do not believe that the planned volume of housing is justified for East Hanney. The proposed 200 houses would increase the village size by 60%, which is far above many

other villages. Indeed there are some villages which rate higher in the facilities score that have not been allocated any housing and yet have better access and scope to develop. An expansion of say 100 houses over a number of sites in the village would be more in keeping with the precedence set.

The planned site was not consulted upon, the site is not acceptable for the reasons highlighted above, the site does not contribute to the benefit of the area sustainability or reduced travel.

The number of proposed houses is disproportionate compared to other sites identified in the plan in other villages

The location is quite ridiculous as it increases the likelihood of flooding to existing properties, increases the volume of vehicles having to travel through the village, is the least connected option to the village, has a significant impact upon the environment and wildlife, it is to be quite honest the most ill conceived plan I have seen. It fails to consider the impact upon the very reason why Oxfordshire is a sought after place to live - it is rural.

**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.**

Consultation with the villagers over which site to choose

Review of the number of houses proposed, review of the the facilities score which is incorrect as some facilities have been lost since the score was calculated.

Reconsideration of the East site which was in the original published plan and has better access, less fertile land and lower risk of flooding or causing flooding to the existing properties.

**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