

21 NOV 2017



**Vale
of White Horse**
District Council

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

MRS

First Name

SHERRY

Last Name

HOWARD

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

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

4. (1) Legally compliant

Yes

No

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 KBAG_A site (the Fyfield site) development of 600 houses, as promoted by Lioncourt, does not appear to be commercially viable and therefore LPP2 is UNSOUND and NOT EFFECTIVE in this instance.

See further comment on page 4 below.

(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.

Delete the KBAG_A (Fyfield) site from the additional allocations in Policy 4a and from Policy 8a.

(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, 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:

This development will impact on the residents of the small villages of Fyfield and Tubney in whose parish it lies. We fear a much larger development is the likely outcome and will be a commuter wasteland that will introduce much more traffic to the A420 which is already running above capacity at Fyfield. We believe that we have not been properly consulted and our objections not given due consideration. Our voice must be heard by the Inspector.

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:

Date:

20/11/2017

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.**

Question 5

The KBAG_A site (the Fyfield site) development, as promoted by Lioncourt, does not appear to be commercially viable and therefore LPP2 is UNSOUND and NOT EFFECTIVE in this instance.

The landowner will extract the highest price for the land (85 acres). The average price of farmland approved for development anywhere south of Birmingham is now £1 million per acre according to Farmers Weekly. The cost of land per plot will therefore be c.£142,000 (given 600 plots in total).

Judging by Lioncourt public statements, the build will comprise predominantly 3-bed homes. The build cost of a good quality 3-bed home is c.£150,000. The cost of the proposed infrastructure will be c.£15 million (2 roundabouts @ £3.5m; access road £2m; school £3.5m; retail area £3.5m; playground and field £0.5m+). The average cost of infrastructure per house is therefore £25,000.

Planning policy indicates that affordable social housing should comprise 33% of the build therefore 200 homes will be sold at cost. A subsidy of c.£50,000 will need to be added to the cost of each market value house to pay for the social housing element. The total cost of a market value house is therefore likely to be £367,000. The current market price of a 3-bed house (100m²) in the area is £350,000, i.e. less than the expected cost without including the developer's profit margin (target 20%; min. 17.5%).

The proposed development is not viable without major changes to the scheme such as:

- Increasing the number of dwellings — Indeed, Lioncourt are now indicating 700 homes in anticipation of this problem on their website. The outcome of this would be to reduce the amount of amenity space and increase the traffic impact on the A420.
- Cutting the infrastructure — If anything, further infrastructure needs to be added such as a health centre and it's own village hall, given the distance to the existing one in Southmoor..
- Downgrading the quality and size of homes. The outcome of this would potentially be at odds with the deliverability of high quality homes as espoused in Core Policies 37 and 38.
- Reducing the social housing element or eliminating it altogether as has happened elsewhere.
- Eliminating one or both roundabouts and relying on access via the old Oxford Road (thus abandoning the notion of a 'relief road').
- St John's College selling the land at a discounted price.

This development, as promoted by Lioncourt, is not viable. LPP2 is therefore, in regard to this site, not positively prepared, unjustified (the evidence suggests a developer cannot deliver the scheme profitably) and therefore not effective. To continue including the site in LPP2 without major modifications to reflect commercial considerations is disingenuous and highly misleading.

CONCLUSION: CORRECTION REQUIRED TO POLICY 4a

Delete the Fyfield site from the additional allocations in Policy 4a and from Policy 8a.

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**

