

I am hugely concerned about the Vale of White Horse local plan 2031 and the apparent contradictions within the document. I am aware that a lot of hard work has been spent on putting this document together prior to going out to consultation and I wish to make comments with regard to the policies that emerge within the document and in some areas a lack of regard for consistency and no real cohesion. (My Division in common with others has been blighted with speculative development for far too long as the Vale has not had a local plan in place.

1 I represent the Faringdon Division which is made up of:- Buckland, Buscot, Coleshill, Eaton Hastings, Gt. Coxwell, Lt. Coxwell, Faringdon and Littleworth. Faringdon, has always been the smallest of the market towns in the Vale of White Horse and yet it is taking 1,000 new houses. There is no protection offered in the document to town centres of this size – where's the innovation/care to detail and sheer love of an area gone into the writing or the development of the Vale plan? I see it as a document that puts houses down anywhere to just make the numbers up and to fulfil the SHMA numbers! The town of Faringdon just does not have the strategic ability to take the increase in road traffic (the road system of the town is medieval in design and at commuter times, when bus transport adds to the traffic volume ferrying students to and from school from the outlying villages, the one-way road system running through the centre of the town is absolutely grid locked. As the town centre is a conservation area there is no way that traffic flows can be improved. The schools are full to capacity (the Community College, the Junior School and the Infant school), I repeat, the school buses cram the residential streets both at the beginning of the school day and the end. The medical centres are stretched now to capacity and it is with dread that people in my Division telephone the local GP's for appointments – many have to wait over a week for an appointment now – how much worse will it become in the future?. How much longer will locals have to wait for medical treatment once all the proposed development comes on-line? The enlargement of Swindon with 8,000 houses will also affect my Division adversely as people will buy property in Swindon (a cheaper housing market) and commute eastwards along the A420 to work within Science Vale/Harwell/Culham, Abingdon, Oxford etc.

a. The plan does not appear to have any cohesive strategic planning as to where development should take place. I feel that Faringdon town and other parts of my Division are being besieged by prospective development and planning battles. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) favours sustainable development and in my Division this national policy is most definitely not be adhered to.

b. The plan has contradictions as I have mentioned above for throughout the document the village of Gt. Coxwell for example carries the designation "small village" and yet pages later is it designated differently - there are planned for developments that will increase this village of 102 dwellings with an additional 400 houses. So the small village will then have 502 houses!!! (Please look at the core policy 4 pg.38 and pg.87 This village has no facilities – no school, no village shop/PO, no village pub/inn it does have a small reading room with a ceiling of capacity of 75 people and it is

made up of in part single track lanes. How on earth has it been right to saddle this village with this development when other villages in my Division appear to be protected and are not and will not be taking such huge expansion? This means that the people who live in these houses will use the schools in Faringdon, the medical facilities in Faringdon etc. adding to the busyness of the this small market town. (Is the Vale working on the presumption that the boundary changes will mean that the current outline planning permissions for Fernham Fields and The Steeds developments will move these developments into the parish of Faringdon and out of the parish of Gt. Coxwell. The planned for developments in my Division will not bring economic wealth as people will not work in the area – professional people will work elsewhere as I have mentioned above. (Faringdon is a dormitory town.)

c. There is mention of social housing – the aim is to drop the 40% to 35% of social housing per development (a static which is still above the national norm elsewhere), but no mention that I can see of Extra Care Housing for the elderly or people with Learning Disability. I can advise that with demography increasing – all of us are living longer and many of us with complex needs, together with the increasing numbers of people suffering with Learning Disability there really ought to be a social conscience as to where these people are to live. The times I hear families saying for example, “my father/mother has just died and I wish to move my father/mother nearer to me – but, there’s nowhere for him/her to live independently and yet live close by me – we need extra care housing where care is always available 24/7”. I do wonder if the proposed sites “earmarked” for development are in actuality a viable proposition for developers.

d. Finally, the documentation that has come through my and others’ mail boxes has spelling mistakes – Faringdon is only spelt with one “r” not two. Equally, the officers are not aware that the developments of Fernham Fields and The Steeds are in the parish of Gt. Coxwell and definitely not Faringdon. These elementary mistakes give one no confidence in the final document.

Judith

Judith Heathcoat
C/Cllr Faringdon Division
Cabinet Member, Adult Social Care
Oxfordshire County Council