

## Comment

Consultee	Mr Stephen McKechnie (868197)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	Orchard Cottage Summertown Wantage OX12 0JG
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Stephen McKechnie
Comment ID	LPPub1772
Response Date	09/01/15 11:17
Consultation Point	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.6
Files	<a href="#">South versus East comparison.pdf</a>

**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.**

4.1 Legally Compliant: I believe that the plan that covers the land to the south of East Hanney is not legally compliant as The Vale did not hold, or offer, any consultation with the community over the change in proposal.

This is too dramatic a move, and effects everyone in the village, for you to completely ignore your obligations to consult, and classify it as a minor adjustment.

The Vale also wrote, and published the following "land east of East Hanney we replaced with an alternative site to the south of East Hanney better connected to the village and also preferred by the community"

That is a complete untruth and a fabrication. How could The Vale know the feelings of the community as they never, at any stage, prior to publication of the 2031 Plan consulted?

Graciously The Vale apologised to the clerk of EHPC for this misrepresentation however, no correction was made, and no correction has ever appeared in subsequent public documents.

This untruth continued as at a public meeting on 21 | 11 | 14 at The Beacon in Wantage, I asked the question as to why the site was changed. Still at that public meeting that line "preferred by the community" was still being used and given as an answer to me, that was at the very best uninformed, at worse illegal.

4.2 Sound: The very basis of the proposal is flawed so how then can it be sound?

It is not positively prepared as it is based on an untruth, and not representing the views of the community

It is not justified as it does not reflect the overwhelming views of the community who after two public meetings and a ballot prefer the proposal to be returned to the East, The Vale's original "preferred site"

4.3 Complies with the duty to cooperate. That clearly cannot be how could The Vale cooperate when they did not know the overwhelming views of the community

**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.**

South versus East Comparison attached to representation

On all of the above criteria that are subject to guidelines within the NPPF the current proposal to develop in the South is without the worst decision the Vale can make.

The current proposal is illogical, uninformed and misinformed

If 200 houses in one development have to be built then the only logical place is to return to the Vale's previously preferred site to the East, the Vale would then be legally compliant.

**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?** Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

**Q7 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

Only if required to clarify any uncertainties in my representation