



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	Ms	
First Name	Linda	
Last Name	McKendrick	
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: please see page 3

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

4a

Policies Map

Additional Site 2

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is: *(Please tick as appropriate)*

4. (1) Legally compliant

Yes

No

Possibly- legal
view required

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.

The proposal for 600 houses in Fyfield (KBAG_A - initially incorrectly stated as Kingston Bagpuize) is unsound. The false description itself and absence of initial consultation with the representatives of our parish council should not be taken lightly. It was a real failure to recognise and consult with affected stakeholders. Many of the descriptions in LPP2 contain inaccurate or misleading analyses of the value of the site (e.g. ratings of landscape impact, ecology impact, historic environment and access issues all exclude important parameters). As to whether all this false description renders the proposal illegal, would be a question for lawyers to take a view.

For potential new residents this proposal merely provides homes in a location that already suffers from serious rush hour road congestion and, due to its rural setting requires car transport for them to commute to work - 75% of commuting trips are by private car – hardly the best place to add new homes. I believe that an Oxfordshire Growth Board report “red-flagged” the area in 5 out of 7 metrics.

For current Fyfield residents, this leads to a 9 fold increase in existing housing and will add to the difficulty that many already have with the use the 66 bus service for fear of crossing the A420. Judging a gap in the traffic, with the time it will take to cover the width of the road without breaking into a sprint, and thus crossing the road safely, is challenging and potentially very dangerous. Additional light and noise pollution will accompany the increased traffic.

The addition of these houses will represent creeping urbanisation of a rural setting and will no doubt form a base line from which future new housing plans will start.

One point of particular concern is the consistency with conservation area protection. I own and live in one of the Grade 2* listed buildings within Fyfield (25, Digging Lane, a former farm worker's thatched cottage in a traditional farming village). This building has been part of the landscape for more than just a few centuries and is probably why it still stands today. It is a simple dwelling but completely in harmony with the fields and wildlife around it. I feel less of an owner and more of a guardian for the cottage and it is a privilege and responsibility which I don't take lightly. I have spent considerable time and resources to ensure the house is maintained in full accordance with its listing and that it remains a valuable addition to its rural village setting. All of this would seem rather pointless if our preservation of the built environment is met with a destruction of the natural, rural environment. Narrow and unsuitable rat runs through the village and along the lanes at peak times will increase and traffic noise levels (with or without a new roundabout) will increase further.

Finally, the proposal was initially intended to ignore the objections of the residents of Fyfield and Tubney. Only after parishioners and their representatives inserted themselves into the process have our objections been heard and incorrect facts and analyses challenged. This is in direct contradiction to the statement made that LPP2 proposals have been formulated after consultation with key stakeholders. Presumably, the residents of the parish who are being urged to accept a 9 fold increase in housing are not regarded as key stakeholders by the Vale authorities. The parish council are strongly opposed as are residents (310 signed the petition against the proposal out of 313 people who could be reached – representing 92% of homes in the village)

(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.

The proposal should be scrapped and focus given to small in-fill developments consistent with the protected rural nature of the community.

There is an undeniable responsibility in this decision-making process to ensure that changes are achieved whilst preserving and respecting the heritage and rural balance which has taken centuries to develop and could take just a few months to destroy forever.

Kingston and Fyfield are two very individual places. It is vital that both their identities are preserved for their communities and that they develop in harmony and without detriment.

(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?

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

 Yes

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:

To ensure that the very apparent irreversible and detrimental effects of developing the 'Fyfield' site are fully aired, appreciated and considered, so that an informed decision can be made, which reflects an enduring, logical and considered balance between short term gain and the loss of a significantly important part of Oxfordshire's heritage and rural environment.

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: LS McKendrick

Date: 20.11.17

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

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.**

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