

Comment

Consultee	Mr Keith Diment (825516)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	Lay Cottage Main Street Wantage OX12 0JE
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Mr Keith Diment
Comment ID	LPPub1012
Response Date	19/12/14 10:15
Consultation Point	Core Policy 4: Meeting Our Housing Needs (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3

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.

I propose the removal of the development of East Hanney from the Plan on the basis that it is 'unsound' with particular reference to: Core Policy 4: meeting Our housing Need ? which specifies the scale and location of new housing ensuring development is built in the most appropriate locations.

The proposal of about 200 new dwellings for East Hanney would have a devastating effect on the existing village but would form only a very small part of the thousands of dwellings in the overall plan. The omission of the East Hanney proposal from the plan would be a great relief to the existing residents and would save large and unknown infrastructure costs, while making very little difference to the plan. The major disruption to the existing community would seem to be out of all proportion to its almost insignificant contribution to the Plan.

The Plan shows that the proposed new dwellings in East Hanney would be within reach of existing features such as shops. That is misleading. There is a very small village shop, run entirely by volunteers who take it in turn to serve behind the counter for a few hours a week or a month, while others collect bread, milk, vegetables and so on for the shop weekly or more often as required. It is far from what any new residents would expect. The village has no doctor, dentist, shoe shop, pharmacist or bank to name but a few, no car fuel or servicing facilities, in fact very few amenities that modern families would normally take for granted.

As a resident of East Hanney since 1966, I well remember the floods of 2007. I can only praise the achievements of the volunteers of Hanney Flood Group whose work has surely prevented a recurrence of that awful experience, and I have no confidence in the ability of the Plan to lessen the risk of further flooding.

I understand that East Hanney only just qualifies as a 'large village', and might be about to lose that rating anyway. If it were no longer a 'large village' then such large-scale development would not be appropriate and could not appear in the Plan. East Hanney might well be no longer a 'large village' by the time the soundness of this Plan is tested.

East Hanney does not have 200 job vacancies. Any new residents would have to travel, mostly by car, to places of work and education so adding congestion to already overcrowded roads. The plan should surely strive to reduce the amount of commuting required. Any development in East Hanney would increase commuting traffic because it offers so few employment, secondary education, shopping or leisure facilities itself.

Some small-scale development might be welcomed by young people of the village seeking to buy their own property without having to move away and by older residents wishing to down-size. Such demands are unlikely to be met by the proposed large-scale high-density new housing to which there is overwhelming local opposition.

The major change to the Plan, moving the proposed development from the east of the village to the south of the village, would have a profound effect on traffic and residents were not consulted on that change.

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.

Remove all mentions of any large-scale development at East Hanney from the Plan.

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