

**The Old School  
Fyfield  
Abingdon OX13 5LR**  
Tel: 01865 390724    [MarkWBaker@aol.com](mailto:MarkWBaker@aol.com)

*From Mark Baker CBE*

Mr David Reed BSC DipTP DMS MRTP  
c/o Ian Kemp, Programme Officer Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2  
16 Cross Furlong, Wychbold  
Droitwich Spa WR9 7TA  
(via Email: [idkemp@icloud.com](mailto:idkemp@icloud.com))

31st August 2018

Dear Sir

**Examination Matter 8: Document HEAR08.1- Viability and Infrastructure Costs – comments on behalf of Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council and FLAG**

As participants in the Matter 4 hearing on 24<sup>th</sup> July, FLAG have reviewed this paper from the District Council, produced in response to your request at that hearing.

We had expected the paper to provide an updated statement about the viability and infrastructure costs of the proposed development on Fyfield land east of Kingston Bagpuize in the light of the delay of four years announced in document HEAR04.1 and the contributions needed to the upgrading of the A338/A415 junction at Frilford.

Instead the Council have simply repeated information already contained in the Examination documentation based on the original timetable, with no attempt to update it or to correct its obvious flaws. In particular Table 2 identifies '+ junction TBC' under Transport Infrastructure Improvements, but the total infrastructure cost per dwelling (already over £30k) at the end of the table makes no provision for that contribution (or for some other items still to be confirmed). The omission is seriously misleading in the light of the discussion on 24<sup>th</sup> July which made it clear that

1. An upgrade to the A338/A415 junction is a necessary precursor to occupation of the site, and is likely to be as costly as it is uncertain in timing.
2. Improving the junction makes no sense without building the Marcham bypass, for which no financial provision currently exists. Even if some funding for that is found from within the recently signed Growth Deal, the development should be expected to contribute to any shortfall.

We suggest that the estimated infrastructure cost per dwelling at the Fyfield site, high though it is, is massively understated.

There are also features of the development proposal which are invalidated by the new timetable, damaging its cash flow and calling its financial viability into question:

- 1 The Savills representation on behalf of Lioncourt (under ref 018 REP Reg 19 Consultation Responses) assumes that the Eastern Relief road and its associated roundabouts will be built ‘by the end of Phase 1’ (Appendix 2 section 4.3 dot point 20 near bottom of second page) and that the Old Oxford Road will be available for construction during that phase (Appendix 3 key). Since the Old Oxford Road is to be reduced to the status of a footpath under arrangements for the adjacent Bloor site development (as was said at the hearing on the 24<sup>th</sup> July) it would not be available for construction traffic on the new deferred timetable, making it necessary to fund the eastern relief road or at least part of it at the outset of the scheme.
- 2 A similar point applies to the school. As we argued at the hearing on 24<sup>th</sup> July, the capacity of the existing school would be fully absorbed by the time the development is now proposed to start. The new school would need to be built and paid for at the very outset of the scheme and not in Phase 2 as shown in the Savills representation Appendix 3.

FLAG had not asked to participate in the Matter 8 hearing on 5<sup>th</sup> September but would be glad to do so if you wish.

Yours faithfully

**Mark Baker**

**On behalf of Fyfield Land Action Group (FLAG)**