

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	<input type="text" value="Mrs"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text" value="Louise"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text" value="Willden"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation representing (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Postal Town	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

2.45, 2.46

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

No

4. (3) Compiles 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.

Paragraphs 2.45 and 2.46 are **unjustified** because their references to site KBA_G ('the Fyfield site') are faulty:

1. The site is in open countryside in Fyfield not Kingston Bagpuize and para 2.45 should be addressing the implications of the development for Fyfield
2. The description of KBS as a sustainable village has been invalidated by its enforced doubling of size in the last 5 years without any improvement in the infrastructure: it is becoming a ribbon-developed, car-dependent, dormitory conurbation for commuters.
3. Paragraph 2.46 is vacuous planner-speak. However much the frequency of bus services is improved, the absence of jobs within reasonable reach by public transport is tiny (as shown in the Oxfordshire Growth Board review in 2016) and the vast majority of workers living in the proposed new houses will be dependent on cars to get to work. The A420 is already seriously over capacity at peak hours (as shown in the Fyfield and Tubney representations and the development will harm the quality of life of existing users of the road.

The lack of justification for the way the paragraphs are written makes them **unsound** as a basis for allocating the Fyfield site for development.

I object to the misleading nature of these paragraphs and others which completely fail to recognise the seriousness of the impact which the development will have on already congested roads and the environmental harm that will be caused to Fyfield and Tubney. Earlier reports prepared for the OCC

identified some of these problems but understated them. The paragraphs completely ignore these impacts, particularly the evidence base presented in Topic Paper 5. I believe that they are so severe that the site does not meet the NPPF's criterion of environmental sustainability. The proposal to build on KBAG-A (Fyfield site) is for that reason unsound.

The proposal to build at least 600 houses on the Fyfield site is unsound because of the traffic impacts this will have on the A420. My reasons are:

The A420 is running at capacity now, it will run at over-capacity, should the Fyfield site development go ahead.

Modelling of traffic impacts relies on an out-of-date baseline.

Recent traffic surveys undertaken by Fyfield residents, together with video and online (Google Maps) evidence, indicate that current traffic flow is underestimated.

RAG analysis of traffic impact in LPP2 is out-dated and misleading.

Trip rates indicate the Fyfield site will have a severe impact on the A420.

New roundabout on A420 will encourage rat-running and the access road to the Fyfield site cannot be considered a 'relief road'.

Proposed mitigations will have little or no impact on traffic congestion on the A420 and may exacerbate problems.

Improvements to public transport (four buses per hour instead of three) will not be enough to enable commuters to access new employment growth centres.

Traffic between the Fyfield site and the Science Vale and retail facilities in Abingdon would have an adverse impact on the Marcham AQMA.

Further details of the objections to the Fyfield site are included in the representation made by Fyfield and Tubney Council which I support and agree with in its entirety.

As a resident in Tubney, we find the traffic from the A420 moves onto the Abingdon Road due to the problems on the A420 especially at both the A420/A415 roundabout and the Frilford Crossroads. The traffic going towards Abingdon can be queued back as far as past Heathside in the morning rush hour.

There is no public transport through the village of Tubney and it is unsafe to use the 66 route bus as there is no way to safely cross the A420. This development will exacerbate these problems.

This is an unlit residential road with no pavement and traffic on the road already makes it unsafe for children to walk to visit friends in other houses on the road. As the road is long and relatively straight speeding is also a problem on the road, again both of these issues will be exacerbated by the resulting increase in traffic from this unsound development.

(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.

1. Acknowledge the damage done to the sustainability of KBS by the overdevelopment to date
2. Recognise the location of the site as Fyfield not KBS and discuss the damage to the community in noise, light and environmental pollution and reduced quality of life
3. Drop the absurd and misleading enthusiasm for improved public transport and recognise that the development will add several hundred cars at peak hours to already over capacity roads without any prospect of mitigation
4. Drop the Fyfield site from the list of allocations

(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 local residents views are heard

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:

Louise Willden

Date:

19/11/17

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

Yes

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.**

I cannot sign documents electronically. However I confirm that these are our views on paragraphs 2.45 and 2.46, that they should be recorded as such and that we wish to support them by appearing personally at the Inquiry. We similarly confirm that comments in my name on other paragraphs and policies should be formally recorded as our views

Mrs Louise Willden
Prof. Richard Willden

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