
From: Jo Partington
Sent: 21 November 2017 23:24
To: Planning Policy Vale
Cc:
Subject: Vale Local Plan Part 2

Dear Sirs,

Please note that I wish to object to the above stated plan as unsound for the following reasons:

1. Proposed development of Dalton Barracks site (Core policy 8a/b)

Although I (conditionally) support the initial Dalton Barracks' site allocation I feel it cannot be sustainable without enhancing the public transport infrastructure already in place, namely the 4/4B bus route to ensure that the surrounding communities in Whitecross and Shippon can benefit. Traffic in the area is already heavy and will increase substantially due to the already agreed development of 900 houses between Tilsley Park and Peachcroft Farm. In this regard, I also note that the intention that for the first 1,200 dwellings at Dalton Barracks', the travel sustainability is not reliant upon the proposed Park and Ride (P&R) at Lodge Hill but by use of an improved 4/4B bus service which might be redirected through the site. Are facilities for job/start-up businesses on site to minimise commuting factored into these proposals? Nothing I can see has as yet been demonstrated for this. The enormous strain on the community from the extra traffic from Dalton as well could overwhelm local roads and for this reason I move on to:

2. Core policies 8a/b & 12a - I would urge consideration of the siting of the proposed Lodge Hill Park and Ride to the A34/A415 Marcham Interchange. Siting the P & R at Lodge Hill will irrevocably alter the nature of the surrounding Green Belt land and the small habitations close by e.g. Sunningwell, Bayworth and Sugworth Lane. Already used as 'rat runs' when the A34 is under strain, the populations would be blighted by the increase in traffic drawn through their centres to the P&R, if sited at Lodge Hill.

The A34/A415 Marcham junction already has a diamond junction and facilities for road users. The area surrounding the junction is so close to the Dalton site that I feel it should be considered at the site of the P&R rather than Lodge Hill. Traffic from the Dalton site could access the A34 and a P&R with much more ease, safety, and less effect on local surroundings and residents. There is a vast stretch of land between this Marcham junction and the village of Marcham and it makes much more sense to build it where its presence creates the best sustainability outcomes for the greatest number of potential users. There, it can be a transport hub for South bound journeys to Milton Park and Harwell, East to Abingdon and North to Oxford. Central and North Abingdon are already well served by the premium X3 bus service so moving the P&R to Marcham is not detrimental overall

Proposed safeguarding routes (Core policy 12a)

12a - The proposals for safeguarding land across the Green Belt to accommodate roads for the Lodge Hill P&R site are premature, unnecessary, ill-conceived and illogical:

1. There has been no local public consultation regarding these routes which will have an enormous impact on the local small habitations. Also no consideration has been demonstrated regarding the impact of the breaking up of the existing large parcels of Green Belt land into smaller ones. See below for comments regarding the existing assessment of the value of this area of Green Belt and its inappropriateness for development "in landscape and visual terms". It is also of importance that the proposed area for the routes contains a number of public rights of way.
2. This area, and specifically Sunningwell is used constantly for recreation by the local populations and walkers/cyclists/horse riders are drawn to it from the surrounding town of Abingdon for exercise and peaceful recreation. The detrimental impact on these activities by the proposed P&R development at Lodge Hill, and public transport using the new roads proposed to run across this area of Green Belt land, cannot be overstated.
3. There is no certainty regarding the Dalton site beyond 2031 so why does this land need to be safeguarded?
4. As Green Belt, the Vale (as the local authority) can develop this land if they see fit so safeguarding it is irrelevant
5. I have seen no proposals to fund this work (cycle and bus lanes through Green Belt around Sunningwell), or a bus lane on the A34, or indeed for these proposed satellite P&R sites of which Lodge Hill is one.
6. What would be the commercial viability of the proposed bus routes through this Green Belt land, when there is an existing bus route (4A/B)?
7. What is the rationale for these 'safeguarded' routes. The route appears arbitrarily drawn as the shortest distance between Dalton and the proposed Lodge Hill P&R but the new roads are shown as connecting with minor village roads with no paths or lighting. The villages of Sunningwell and Bayworth and the small habitation of Sugworth Lane all have no street lighting. The increase of traffic drawn to the proposed Lodge Hill site through these communities is likely to be substantial. Has any assessment been made of the likelihood of increased risk to these local communities from this increase?
8. These new routes would require appropriate lighting and fencing. Has any consideration been given to what the impact would be on these small communities from the associated noise and light pollution. I feel it would intrinsically alter the nature of these communities.
9. There seems to be no examination of possible potentially viable alternatives to these proposals e.g..
 - a. failure to examine viable alternative options which could include:-
 - i. further enhancements to the existing service bus provision
 - ii. routing dedicated "hopper" buses by the existing road network allowing sustainable access to the P&R for a larger population
 - iii. alternative safeguarding of routes that would provide segregated cycleway provision along the Wootton Road and increased access by foot and cycle from the North Abingdon site allocation

3. Green Belt (Core policy 13a)

4. **13a - The Bus and Cycleways as shown cause severe detriment to the Green belt. The road surfaces, fencing, lighting (and bus gates or equivalent to prevent unauthorised use) are inappropriate and intrusive on a ridge feature designated as Green Belt.** The most recent study of the Green Belt, commissioned by the Vale, by Hankinson Duckett Associates notes that these parcels of land "form part of the footslopes to Boars Hill. Both Parcels are rural in character and are characteristic of the 'Abingdon to Kennington Limestone Ridge with Woodland' local Character Area. The Parcels form the rural setting to the village of Sunningwell. Both Parcels also contain numerous rights of way, which provide rural connections between local settlement and the wider

landscape. There are open views of the land within Parcels 8 and 9 from these rights of way. **Both Parcels have high landscape sensitivity and high visibility and neither is suitable for development in landscape and visual terms**". The report goes on to state that both have **"a high contribution to at least one of the Green Belt Purposes. None of the Parcels are suitable for development in landscape and visual terms and development within any of these Parcels would harm the openness and integrity of the Green Belt."**

I strongly endorse the SPADE and Sunningwell Parish Council consultation responses.

Mrs Jo Partington