

## Comment

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Stephen McKechnie (868197)
<b>Email Address</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Address</b>	Orchard Cottage Summertown Wantage OX12 0JG
<b>Event Name</b>	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
<b>Comment by</b>	Mr Stephen McKechnie
<b>Comment ID</b>	LPPub3980
<b>Response Date</b>	23/01/15 14:46
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Core Policy 8: Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Email
<b>Version</b>	0.5
<b>Files</b>	<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.**

Comment 8

Could this be the only reason why the location changed?

This is a submission to The Vale, dated 11/04/14, after the only consultation that ever took place regarding East Hanney and appears to be the only source of responses promoting the land that is currently proposed. Has the Vale been drawn into negotiations as a result of this which has derailed the original process and led to the revised proposal, which in the cold light of day carries a number of significant difficulties compared to the original site?

The following comments are interesting:

Para 3 ?my land is on the same side as the village ad would enable easy access?.

The recent larger, and current development totally over 50 houses have taken place on the Eastern side of the village, so any further development would be a natural progression looking into the village. Development to the South could not be integrated into the village successfully because of the number of constraints so it is illogical and unsustainable.

As the photographs in the sustainability section show, it would not be easy access. The EA had confirmed that they will not culvert the stream that runs alongside Summertown because of flooding, and the road is too small and dangerous for pedestrians, especially with push chairs.

Para 3 ?I own sufficient land to enable a footpath between the village and Grove (Railway) Station should that ever be reopened?.

The new proposed development in the South in that case would have better connection to a village three miles away than the village it is supposed to integrate with. As regards the railway station; that is highly speculative and not in the gift of The Vale of OCC and so should be disregarded.

Para 4 ?I can confirm ?.that it does not flood?.

That is in complete contradiction to the OCC map shown above, and local knowledge.

***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