

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Marion Turner (828290)
Email Address	<div></div>
Company / Organisation	Ashbury Parish Council
Address	Claremont Ashbury Swindon SN6 8LN
Event Name	Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part One - Publication
Comment by	Ashbury Parish Council (Mrs Marion Turner)
Comment ID	LPPub291
Response Date	16/12/14 04:30
Consultation Point	Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Files	CPRE Response to Vale of White Horse District Local Plan
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.	N/A
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.

The Local Plan is unsound in this sub area strategy because it fails to demonstrate how the unprecedented proposed housing development in the rural western vale, especially in Faringdon, Shrivenham and Great Coxwell, can be sustainable with a largely unmodified, already inadequate, road and transport infrastructure.

The vast majority of additional houses will be for commuters, both westwards into the traffic bottleneck of Swindon and east and south into Oxford and rural roads leading to the M4 at junction 14. The proximity of the border with the eastward expanding Swindon Borough means that Shrivenham's road infrastructure is already under intense pressure from both east and west. This issue has been amongst those put forward in the Statement Of Common Ground between the local authorities and the Western Vale Villages, of which Ashbury is a signatory.

Public transport links are good by poor local standards, but one bus twice (or even three times) an hour between Oxford and Swindon does not add up to "excellent transport links" and will do very little to ease congestion and does nothing to touch the increasing commuting from smaller villages which are also undergoing development.

There is a great deal of wishful thinking in talking of "minimising impact" on the existing infrastructure and environment. 106/CIL contributions cannot deliver timely improvements to already inadequate road systems, for example, and in many situations the developers' contributions are a tiny fraction of what is required to carry out substantial changes. Simply tinkering about with a few road junctions will not answer the case. The consequence will be gridlock on the main traffic arteries and wholesale rat-running on minor and rural roads.

There is little evidence of cooperation between the two authorities which share responsibility for the A420. In light of the huge development of East Swindon, right on the border of Oxfordshire, the fact that SBC and OCC's first discussion meeting was at the urging of the WVV, is telling.

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.

Major upgrading of the main arteries and the readoption of the A420 as a trunk road by the Highways Agency to increase funding for it, prior to or at least concurrent with planned housing development

***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, Yes - I wish to participate at the oral examination do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

***Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

Q7 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

We, Ashbury Parish Council, wish to participate , directly or via a WVV representative, at the oral examination of the Local Plan and /or to present further and more detailed evidence in support of some or all of the representations set out in the CPRE document attached. in particular, but without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, we wish the oral evidence and any further written evidence which may be required of him by the inspector to be presented by our road transport consultant Bob Hindlaugh and /or his associate Simon Boone.

Please upload any supporting information

CPRE Response to Vale of White Horse District
Local Plan