

Local Plan 2031 Part 2

Publication Version Representation Form

Ref:

(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:

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's Details (if applicable)

Title	Mr	
First Name	Gavin	
Last Name	Newman	
Job Title (where relevant)	Director of CPE Certification, Liberty Global	
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

Policy

☒

Policies Map

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) Complies 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.

Regarding the “Fyfield” Lioncourt development. There has been a complete lack of accurate and completed Impacts Analysis conducted on the effects of this development. The limited assessment process that has been performed, has used old data reports that have failed to be updated with today’s significantly changed current Traffic modelling for the A420 and the A415 in all directions, nor has there been any assessment of Farringdon’s growth or other considerable traffic growths from Witney and local developments that are now using these roads.

There has also been a total lack of assessment for the impacts on Health regarding Air and Noise pollution to the local communities of Fyfield resulting from both the development, its increase in traffic but also more importantly the needless road changes proposed to the A420 by adding a 2nd roundabout. This 2nd roundabout offers no gain to A420 traffic flow, in fact it is obviously clear it will add even greater Traffic Congestion, Noise and Pollution to a already overloaded A420 for no benefit.

No “current” evidence has been released covering any of these subjects, and as the A420 is rated as a Main Principle Artery road of England, there has been a complete lack of analysis as to the impacts that this roundabout road development will have on the A420 and its surrounding feeder roads. Nothing current or scientific has been published endorsing such a design, suggesting either its non existence or indeed any such analysis that has been done to date, does not give evidence to support the new development / changes to the A420 and as such has been hidden from public view. Either case is clear Gross Dereliction of duty but

also questionable practice under law if it is the case, for something of this scale and importance to the road infrastructure of Oxfordshire.

(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.

To make this plan for the Fyfield Lioncourt section compliant, the following is needed

- A comprehensive Analysis including Traffic measurement and modelling is needed for the A420 and surrounding feeder roads with an associated Pollution and Noise assessment, and its results published to the public and its results enacted upon. This survey should include the areas of Fyfield, Tubney, the new development and Southmoor / KB.
- A comprehensive forecast model of the expansion impacts for the next 10 years growth in Traffic, Noise, Pollution and congestion should then be created and published based on the results of the new Analysis, re my previous point
- The removal of the new and needless A420 roundabout creation is a priority.
- A reduction in the scale of the development is obvious as this will reduce both many issues that all of Fyfield residents have, but also the strain of additional traffic load.
- Marcham will need a By pass as the A415 through Marcham is gridlocked today at peak times, any increase will make it worse and cause the already legally breached pollution levels to be worse directly because of this development.
- Frilford Heath will need a new road junction design, as the A415 is gridlocked today at peak times, any increase can only make it worse directly because of the development.
- NewBridge A415 will need an additional bridge construction, as the A415 is gridlocked at peak times, any increase can only make it worse directly because of this development.
- The A420 will need a permanent enforced Average Speed of 30MPH adding to it over Southmoor / Kingston Bagpuize / Fyfield / Tubney Stretches.
- A complete resurfacing of the A420 in the local area with Sound suppression Tarmac as per parliamentary guidance for Artery roads 2011. Oxfordshire Highways have failed to abide by this guidance even this year using cheap spray stone resurfacing the A420 at Fyfield increasing road noise by @> 4 -5 dB, which is considerable.
- New and additional sound suppression installation will be needed along the whole of the A420 as it is already near to or indeed already does breach on occasion the noise legislation limits during the average day

(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.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

X

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral 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:

Gavin Newman

Date:

18th Nov 2017

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

X

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.**

Question 5

The whole process for the Fyfield development has been disingenuous at best. Originally named as the Kingston Bagpuize development whilst actually on Fyfield parish land to avoid challenge was the start.

The need for such a development by the side of the A420 is a location of convenience not design, whilst the additional roundabout on the A420 serves no gain other than to allow further expansion into Fyfield into even more open land that St Johns college will conveniently make available, further more destroying the village of Fyfield, which is one the foundation villages of the St Johns college itself.

There is no other genuine reason for a 2nd roundabout, and the disingenuous message of benefit to Kingston Bagpuize is at the direct negative impact to Fyfield and importantly the A420's road efficiency today.

The lack of proper and current Impact Analysis regarding this development has been staggering and raises considerable suggestion of complicit decisions breaching all legal and fair process. Its hard not feel the situation is as if "the job is done regardless", and so paying lip service to the rights of local people who will clearly suffer in so many ways as a direct consequence because of this development.

Recent presentations on the local plan confirm much of this sentiment as if Fyfield doesn't even exist and the Council is just focussing on meeting its housing target regardless, which itself has been acknowledged as being false and inaccurate, and yet no change to the development that is the start of the destruction of a >1000 yr old village.

It is also quite clear there is little publicity of any binding plan between Planning and developments and the Highways authority and the other services to ensure all the commitments and promises being made in the "grand vision" will actually be enforced and delivered. And how we can be sure that the developers wont at any chance, renege on any promise or commitment given the opportunity, as has happened so often in developments across the country.

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