

**Local Plan 2031 Part 2**  
Publication Version  
Representation Form

Ref:

(For official  
only)

**Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:**

Vale of White Horse Local  
Plan 2031 Part 2

**Please return by 5pm on Wednesday 22 November 2017 to:** Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

This form has two parts:

**Part A** – Personal Details

**Part B** – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

## Part A

### 1. Personal Details\*

\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

2. Agent  
Details  
applicable

Title

Mr

First Name

Clive

Last Name

Fewins

Job Title (where relevant)

Retired

Organisation representing  
(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Postal Town

Post Code

Telephone Number

Email Address

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph 2.44

Policy 8a

Policies Map Fig. 2.2

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: *(Please tick as appropriate)*

4. (1) Legally compliant	Yes	No
--------------------------	-----	----

4. (2) Sound	Yes	No
--------------	-----	----

4. (3) Compiles with the Duty to Cooperate	Yes	No
--	-----	----

5. 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 Cooperate. 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.

The two proposed developments in East Hanney are to be built on land that floods regularly. Their design and setting would have an adverse impact on the character of the area; on the setting of designated heritage assets; and on the rural character of the settlement with particular regard to such factors as location and density.”

See detailed comments attached

The Vale of White Horse District Council totally ignored the extensive written and verbal comments submitted by the East Hanney Parish Council and residents of the village.

(Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary)

6. 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.

The two proposed developments in East Hanney are to be built on land that floods regularly. Their design and setting would have an adverse impact on the character of the area; on the setting of designated heritage assets; and on the rural character of the settlement with particular regard to such factors as location and density.”

See detailed comments below

The Vale of White Horse District Council totally ignored the extensive written and verbal comments submitted by the East Hanney Parish Council and residents of the village.

(Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary)

Name or organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph 2.44

Policy 8a

Policies Map 2.47

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: *(Please tick as appropriate)*

4. (1) Legally compliant No

4. (2) Sound No

. (3) Compiles with the Duty to Cooperate No

5. 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 Cooperate. 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.

(Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary)

6. 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.

(Continue on page 4 /expand box if necessary)

**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.**

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

***Please note*** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature: C B Fewins

Date:

### Sharing your personal details

Please be aware that, due to the process of having an Independent Examination, a name and means of contact is required for your representation to be considered. Respondent details and representations will be forwarded to the Inspector carrying out the examination of the Local Plan after the Publicity Period has ended. This data will be managed by a Programme Officer who acts as the point of contact between the council and the Inspector and respondents and the Inspector.

**Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our website alongside your name.** If you are responding as an individual rather than a company or organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email / postal address and telephone numbers) or signatures online, however the original representations are available for public viewing at our council office by prior appointment. All representations and related documents will be held by Vale of White Horse District Council for a period of 6 months after the Local Plan is adopted.

**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 do not contact me again

**Further comment:** Please use this space to provide further comment on the relevant questions in this form. **You must state which question your comment relates to.**

**See letter at foot of this form**

**Alternative formats of this form are available on request.** Please contact our customer service team on 01235 422600 (Text phone users add 18001 before you dial) or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

**Please return this form by 5pm on Wednesday 22 November 2017 to:** Planning Policy, Vale of White Horse District Council, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton, Abingdon, OX14 4SB or email [planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

### The Vale Local Plan 2031 Part 2, Consultation

The inclusion of 130 houses split 80/50 allocated to East Hanney in the Vale Local Plan Part 2 is both alarming and surprising.

#### North of Ashfields Lane – up to 80 dwellings

We are told in Chapter .2 section 2.47 of the Vale document that the larger village of East Hanney offers a good range of services and facilities and is relatively unconstrained as it is not located within the Oxford Green Belt or areas of flood plain.

East Hanney is by far the smallest of the 'Larger Villages' and indeed, as a result of loss of services has fallen below the points threshold, it should be considered as 'smaller village'.

East Hanney was classified as a larger village, on the basis of a points system. Fourteen points was the starting band for a larger village. East Hanney scored only 14 points so only just qualified as a larger village. One of these points was for a mobile library. This library no longer visits and has not done so for more than two years. The village shop is a small enterprise run by volunteers and contains a small post office which does not offer all the services and closes on Saturdays and all weekday afternoons. It is therefore factually inaccurate to describe East Hanney as a 'larger village'

The VOWHDC document also states that East Hanney is not constrained by the designated flood plain. Whether East Hanney is located in an area that is technically flood plain or not the fact is that it is still highly prone to flooding at times of high rainfall. This letter is accompanied by a photograph of the site we are talking about taken in January 2014.

This site appears to be at odds with the Vale's "Bible" on this topic "Vale of White Horse Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Appendices Part 2, pp. 55-57". Some of the worst flooding in East Hanney has occurred very close to this site, in Ashfields Lane and halfway down Ebbs Lane. The latter is the very lowest point in the village, and marks the end of the carefully-planned system of

ditches devised in medieval times to circulate water round fields, farms and houses. This system of ditches still works to the extent that a substantial corner of the land in question remains a boggy area that is likely to remain just that.

In East Hanney all floodwaters still tend to run towards this point. Residents of Ebbes Lane have acquired their own water pump to use during these floods. The water is pumped onto the land that is the VWHDC potential site. In July 2007 the road outside the old bakery East Hanney, where the Green joins Ashfields Lane and Ebbes Lane flooded to a depth of waist height. I know because I stood in it trying to assist our elderly retired widowed village baker who lived there at the time!

The site as indicated is important to the village as land that can absorb surface water in an area with an exceptionally high water table. This has again become apparent with the installation of services to serve four large new houses built fronting on to Ebbes Lane. Here very recently contractors found it to be less than two feet beneath the existing road surface.

The the land you earmark as a potential site for housing has served for many years to help protect low lying areas of East Hanney from flood. Common sense dictates that high density building on this site –ie up to 80 dwellings – would significantly add to the likelihood of flooding.

East Hanney has delivered well over 200 houses in a relatively short space of time, almost doubling its housing stock. There is outline planning permission already given for another high density development at Dews Meadow, Summertown and the garden nursery, Steventon Road. The infrastructure of the village can hardly cope at present and certainly will not be able to cope with any further large developments. Eighty dwellings constitutes a large development in East Hanney.

Approaching East Hanney from the North the view towards this site is a very attractive rural setting to the built form of the village. This area should be protected and enjoyed by future generations. This is part of our heritage.

There are many other negative points to be made in association with this proposed site. It extends the village into the countryside outside the village envelope. It is not included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for East Hanney. And it runs adjacent to a Conservation Area which needs protecting from inappropriate developments which by their very nature will simply not fit in with the existing pattern of houses, which has emerged organically over many years.

Up to 80 houses on the site in question would mean added road noise and pollution from the generated traffic, which would add to the burdens of the already very busy A338 running alongside this land. Future large developments in Wantage and Grove will also generate increased traffic on the A338 and yet more noise and pollution. Up to 80 new homes on this land would add to this substantially.

Up to 50 houses north of Steventon Road

In the Vale's Key Objectives for this site it is stated that if developed it would: "deliver a high quality and sustainable **urban extension**"

This is fundamentally mistaken.. East Hanney is a small historic village in a rural location. We are not a town. As I have stated above we are not even a properly classified 'larger village' as we are below the classification requirement. Any housing extension to the village of appreciable size needs to be of a rural nature in keeping with the setting and character of East Hanney, and aligned to the designs and traditions of the existing village.

We recognise that there has recently been some development neighbouring this site and would want any development to both reflect a rural feel, bring about a sense of community, and fit with the immediate surroundings.

This proposed site does not link in with these other recent developments. It is isolated – not an integrated design-hardly ideal. Further, it is nearly a mile away from the hub of East Hanney – the War Memorial Hall. Any parents taking their children to school in the morning along the busy Steventon Road would have to use cars, adding further to the congestion which has been mounting steadily in East Hanney over the past few years, particularly in the early mornings and when the children are taken to our primary school, and early evenings.

\* \* \*

East Hanney has already been subject to a mass of applications for development, and a village of only 340 dwellings in 2011 has subsequently had a further 211 approved. This represents a significant increase in village size. It is a level of rapid growth far in excess of most villages of this size within the District. This has resulted in the village and community being subject to mass disturbance, construction activity, traffic, and the loss of many areas of green space and open fields. As a consequence the community has really had enough, and is strongly opposed to any further encroachment on peoples lives, and loss of rural and environmental space.

To sum up: I believe I have shown that neither proposal satisfies the Vale's stated aim "to promote thriving villages and rural communities whilst safeguarding the countryside and village character". I do not believe that the sites are compliant with basic NPPF and some of the VWHDC's own core policies. I am thinking of Core Policy 33: Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility, Core Policy 35: Promoting public transport, cycling and walking, and Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness. This indicates to me that this aspect of the Part 2 Plan is **unsound**. On this basis these two sites are barely linked to the rest of the village and serve to remove the character of what is a typical and very attractive lowland Vale village.

I therefore request that the sites to the North of East Hanney and North-East of East Hanney be removed from the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2. Both sites flood, have a negative visual impact, are out of character with much of the village, both in terms of appearance and density, and are far removed from the centre of the village.

Clive Fewins, 21<sup>st</sup> November 2017

\*Attached. Photo of the site to the north of the village taken in January 2014



\*Attached. Photo of the site to the north of the village taken in January 2014



