

## Comments

### LPP2 Publicity Period Oct - Nov 2017 (11/10/17 to 22/11/17)

**Comment by** Dr JAMES TRIFFITT

**Comment ID** 394

**Response Date** 22/11/17 13:41

**Status** Submitted

**Submission Type** Web

**Version** 0.1

#### Files

**Q1 To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? Please state the paragraph or policy or policies map.** PARA 2.44, POLICY 8a,Pp24&27

**Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant?** Yes

**Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound?** No

**Q4 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** No

**Q5 Please provide 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 cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.**

Nppf core policies ignored and site conditions not fully considered. Local views of village inhabitants not considered and ignored resulting in proposition of undeliverable and unsustainable sites being proposed

**Q6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at 5 above. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate 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.**

Site 7 North of East Hanney (up to 80 dwellings) removed from the Plan Part 2 and Site 8 (up to 50 dwellings) preferably removed or significantly reconsidered with respect to integration to rest of settlement

**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

**Would you like to hear from us in the future?**

- . I would like to be kept informed about the progress of the Local Plan
- . I would like to be added to the database to receive general planning updates

**Please upload any supporting information**

Response to Vale Published Plan  
Part 2 consultation

East Hanney has been the focus of intense and excessive development over the past six years, as never before in its long history. There has been a very large (66%) increase in houses from 2011 when there were 341 houses, without any consideration of provision of any infrastructure support or of the unique nature of this small village in the Vale of the White Horse. Despite reasonable public objection to the Vale's proposed site preferred options consultation and consultation by the Vale planning policy team with East Hanney Parish Cllrs, the planning authority has dismissed all considerations and now include two additional, yet unsustainable, sites in the village which, if accepted, will more than double the village size. This is unacceptable to almost all current parishioners and their quality of life. The Vale officers, furthermore, propose development in unsuitable sites which are most likely to adversely impact the historic character and increase significant flooding in East Hanney, one of the historic "Islands of the Vale". With respect particularly to the site in East Hanney North of Ashfield Lane for 80 houses on land which is historically commonly known locally to flood frequently we wish to make the following points.

It is very apparent that officers determining planning policy in the Vale have no relevant personal knowledge of the areas in Hanney that have been proposed for development. The sites proposed are demonstrably unsuitable, unsustainable and impractical. The proposed large developments will cause significant harm and be destructive to the quality of life of all parishioners. In addition wider harm will be caused to all communities who use the arterial commuter links to Oxford and Didcot/Harwell through East Hanney as additional vehicles clog the already saturated roads and junctions at peak travel times. It is of note that from Crashmap data there have been numerous accidents with casualties recorded on the A338 close to the proposed site since 2011. Those recorded are four slight accidents at Venn Mill, a fatal accident in 2015 just North of the proposed site, a serious accident in 2016 just North of the proposed site, and 2 slight accidents at the proposed site entrance location. Casualties were recorded in all these accidents.

As the Environment Agency comment regarding the accuracy of surface water flood risk information they supply, "Flooding from surface water is difficult to predict as rainfall location and volume are difficult to forecast. In addition, local features can greatly affect the chance and severity of flooding." Hence by all accounts there is great uncertainty in the prediction of flooding and local historic knowledge is likely to be more accurate over time. Flooding images at the site North of Ashfields Lane are readily available and some from 2007 are attached to this document. It is also apparent that flood risk at vulnerable sites will further increase significantly with global warming and that accuracy of current flooding estimates will be further compromised in the future.

Environment Agency maps shown a high proportion of this site is at flood risk by surface water. These areas should not be built on as this will exacerbate local flooding by removing large area of important floodplain that currently ameliorates local flooding. It follows therefore that this site is not suitable for development to contribute significantly to the Vale requirements for housing in this area as the 80 houses proposed are not achievable.

The Council acknowledges that it now has a more than adequate required five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Appeals for separate development of up to 200 houses each on two other sites in Hanney were dismissed by inspectors. It was noted that if either had been successful the 200 houses "would unacceptably dominate the established village". The present total of 130 houses proposed similarly would be severely detrimental to East Hanney. The present Northern site comprises open fields on the western side of the A338 and forms

the foreground of travel from the North on the approach to the attractive lowland Vale village. Such open aspects define the essential character of East Hanney and development here would cause significant harm to the environs of the village and the adjacent conservation area.

In the past 5 years there have been planning permissions for a large number of dwellings in the village and the present proposals would give unacceptable increase of over 100% in the number of dwellings in the village. The adverse effects on the rural character of the village with particular regard to location and density of the North of Ashfields Lane development would be severe and would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. As indicated by the inspector in the appeal on the South of Summertown site, "regard must also be had to the impact on such matters as local distinctiveness and how well new developments integrate into the settlement. In this regard I am very concerned that due to its scale, siting, density and form the proposals would fail to reflect the established character and distinctiveness of the settlement. It would appear as a substantial, self contained addition wholly out of keeping with the host settlement and with which it would fail to integrate..... The scale of the proposals would overwhelm the modest scale of East Hanney." Such comments are equally relevant to both the present sites proposed in the Vale plan part 2 but particularly the one to the North of Ashfield's lane.

Images of flooding adjacent to site.



End of Ashfield Lane - looking North at junction with Ebbs lane. July 2007



Middle of Ashfields Lane – looking West towards Ebbs lane. July 2007



Top of Ashfield lane – looking North along A338 July 2007