From: Tim Cruttenden

Sent:17 November 2017 12:46To:Planning Policy ValeSubject:LPP2 Representation FormAttachments:VoWH LPP2 Rep Form.pdf

Please find attached a representation form with respect to LPP2. I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt.

Kind regards,

Tim



Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Publication Version Representation Form

(For official use 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

This form has two parts:

Dart A

Part A - Personal Details

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

raitA		
Personal Details* *If an agent is appointed, please complete the full control to	plete only the Title, Name and Organisation tact details of the agent in 2.	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Mr	
First Name	Tim	
Last Name	Cruttenden	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation representing (where relevant)		
Address Line 1		
Address Line 2		
Address Line 3		
Postal Town		
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
Email Address		
Sharing your details: ple	ase see page 3	

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or organisation:

3. To which	3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?						
Paragraph	2.45 & 2.46	Policy	8a	Policie	es Map		
4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: (Please tick as appropriate)							
4. (1) Legall	y compliant			Yes		No	
4. (2) Sound	ł			Yes		No	V
4. (3) Comp	lies with the	Duty to Co	operate	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.							
I object to the misleading nature of these paragraphs and others which completely fail to recognise the seriousness of the impact which the development will have on already congested roads and the environmental harm that will be caused to Fyfield and Tubney. Earlier reports prepared for the OCC identified some of these problems but understated them. The paragraphs completely ignore these impacts, particularly the evidence base presented in Topic Paper 5. I believe that they are so severe that the site does not meet the NPPF's criterion of environmental sustainability. The proposal to build on KBAG-A (Fyfield site) is for that reason unsound. See Further Comments below.							
		(Con	tinue on page	e 4 /expa	and box if ne	cessary)	
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. Remove KBAG_A (Fyfield site) from LPP2							
Remove NDAG_A (Fylield Site) Holli LFF2							
			(Ce	ontinue	on page 4 /e:	xpand bo	x 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.

7. If your representation is seekir participate at the oral part of the e	ng a modification, do you consider it necessary to xamination?
No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
you consider this to be necessary:	oral part of the examination, please outline why
I do not believe the local community he this site is erroneous. Oral examination	as been adequately listened to and believe the justification for is necessary for a balanced view to be put across.
Please note the Inspector will determine have indicated that they wish to particular.	ine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who ipate at the oral part of the examination.
Signature:	Date: 17-11-17-
and means of contact is required for you details and representations will be forwathe Local Plan after the Publicity Period	es of having an Independent Examination, a name our representation to be considered. Respondent arded to the Inspector carrying out the examination of has ended. This data will be managed by a not of contact between the council and the Inspector
website alongside your name. If you company or organisation, we will not put telephone numbers) or signatures online for public viewing at our council office by	are responding as an individual rather than a blish your contact details (email / postal address and e, however the original representations are available y prior appointment. All representations and related Horse District Council for a period of 6 months after
Would you like to hear from us in the	future?
I would like to be kept informed about th	e 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	<u> </u>

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.

QUESTION 5

The proposal to build at least 600 houses on the Fyfield site is unsound because of the traffic impacts this will have on the A420. My reasons are:

The A420 is running at capacity now, it will run at over-capacity, should the Fyfield site development go ahead.

Modelling of traffic impacts relies on an out-of-date baseline.

Recent traffic surveys undertaken by Fyfield residents, together with video and online (Google Maps) evidence, indicate that current traffic flow is under-estimated.

RAG analysis of traffic impact in LPP2 is out-dated and misleading.

Trip rates indicate the Fyfield site will have a severe impact on the A420.

New roundabout on A420 will encourage rat-running and the access road to the Fyfield site cannot be considered a 'relief road'.

Proposed mitigations will have little or no impact on traffic congestion on the A420 and may exacerbate problems. Said mitigations will also have no impact on rat running through Netherton – already a dangerous issue (no pavements, schoolchildren etc).

Improvements to public transport (four buses per hour instead of three) will not be enough to enable commuters to access new employment growth centres. One extra bus caters for a maximum of 60 people – there will be approx. 1200 adults living on this site – that is a lot of extra car journeys.

Traffic between the Fyfield site and the Science Vale and retail facilities in Abingdon would have an adverse impact on the Marcham AQMA.

Further details of the objections to the Fyfield site are included in the representation made by Fyfield and Tubney Council which I support and agree with in its entirety.

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

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