

---

**From:** Maxted, Andrew  
**Sent:** 11 December 2017 11:42  
**To:** David, Aileen  
**Subject:** FW: Process irregularities application P17/V2579/SCO - St John's College land in  
Fyfield east of Kingston Bagpuize

Hi Aileen,

Could you please double check we have this recorded as a response to the consultation? If not, please do so.

Many thanks for your help.

Kind regards,

Andrew

Andrew Maxted

Planning Policy Project Lead  
Vale of White Horse District Council  
135 Eastern Avenue  
Milton Park  
Milton  
Abingdon  
OX14 4SB

[andrew.maxted@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.maxted@southandvale.gov.uk)

-----Original Message-----

From: Fyfield Tubney [mailto:[savingfyfield@gmail.com](mailto:savingfyfield@gmail.com)]

Sent: 17 October 2017 12:56

To: Andrew Maxted <[Andrew.Maxted@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Maxted@southandvale.gov.uk)>

Subject: Re: Process irregularities application P17/V2579/SCO - St John's College land in Fyfield east of Kingston Bagpuize

Dear Mr Maxted

Your reply is only helpful in so far as it indicates that the professional officers who run planning matters are complicit in processes which totally undermine the advertised principles of local consultation. Why is it that a 'promoter of a site' should have opportunity to lodge a set of highly crafted information which will not be subject to any kind of objective scrutiny and is not required to address any of the issues raised by local residents within the parish it is located?

That this system has already been used to fast-track large scale developments against the wishes of local residents is indicative of the flaws in your response. As a concerned resident of Fyfield and Tubney Parish please consider this as a formal objection to the application: the publication draft of LPP2 includes saved policies from the 2011 Local Plan as part of the Development Plan and makes it clear that all planning applications will be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taken as a whole, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is obvious that the applicant has chosen to ignore the saved policies in LPP2011 and in particular does not mention saved policy NE7 dealing with the Corallian Ridge. We can see no conceivable material consideration for this application to be exempted from compliance with the

current development plan, and the fact that the proposed development is effectively sub judice pending the uncertain outcome of the Inspector's Inquiry into LPP2 at the end of 2018 is a material reason why it should not be. It is obviously unfair and prejudicial that the District Council should give its preferred developers specially favourable treatment in this way and I would be interested to know what the systems of complaint linked to formal process would throw up here. We ask the District Council to abide by its own planning rules and to refuse to consider the application at this stage.

I also object to a substantial defect in the content of the scoping application. Following the regrettable example of the District Council itself, the applicant is effectively airbrushing Fyfield and Tubney out of consideration. It should be obvious that the existing 'receptors' most adversely affected in terms of traffic noise, and of air and light pollution, are the residents of Fyfield, for whom the new roundabout proposed within a few hundred yards of the village as an integral part of the scheme would be hugely damaging; and that the substantial general increase in traffic congestion and noise from the several hundred extra cars heading east on the A420 will have the most severe consequences for Fyfield and Tubney. It is absolutely essential that any environmental and traffic assessment does a proper study of the specific impacts on our villages. It is also indicative of considerable ignorance to suggest that the only significant historical legacy issues are those concerning Kingston House - a fact now noted by Historic England. It is alarming that officials are presiding over a system which allows such appalling omissions.

It is time that the District Council and its counter parties in this proposal took cognisance of Fyfield's existence and of the harm which the development will do the village.

Ms B Tink

Fyfield Tubney  
savingfyfield@gmail.com

> On 25 Sep 2017, at 10:56, Andrew Maxted <Andrew.Maxted@southandvale.gov.uk> wrote:

>

> Dear Mr Tink,

>

> Thank-you for your email concerning the proposed allocation located within Fyfield and Tubney Parish to the east of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor.

>

> The Council has received a 'Scoping Request' for this proposal. This relates to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which as you may be aware, is a requirement of the planning application process. The 'Scoping Request' is not in itself a planning application and does not seek to grant planning permission. It will be for the Planning Inspector, presiding over the forthcoming Local Plan Examination, to determine if they consider the proposed allocation is soundly based and so should be allocated. Details of this process are available within the Governments Planning Practice Guidance, see following link:

>

> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/environmental-impact-assessment>

>

> It may be helpful if I also explain that it is quite typical for promoters of sites being proposed for allocation in a local plan to submit a Planning Application ahead of the Local Plan Examination. The applicant, may consider that it assists them in demonstrating to the Planning Inspector, that in their opinion, the site is available and suitable for development. Nonetheless, it will be for the Planning Inspector to determine if they consider the site should be allocated or not. The Inspector will consider all evidence before making a decision.

>

> If you wish to participate in the Local Plan Examination, you can do so my responding to the forthcoming Local Plan Publication (11 October to 22 November). Details will be available on the Council website after the 11 October:

>  
> <http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-policy/local-plan-2031-part-2>  
>  
> I trust this is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions.  
>  
> Yours Sincerely,  
>  
> Andrew Maxted  
>  
>  
> Andrew Maxted  
>  
> Planning Policy Project Lead  
> Vale of White Horse District Council  
> 135 Eastern Avenue  
> Milton Park  
> Milton  
> Abingdon  
> OX14 4SB  
>  
> (Office Hours)  
> [andrew.maxted@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.maxted@southandvale.gov.uk)  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Fyfield Tubney [<mailto:savingfyfield@gmail.com>]  
> Sent: 21 September 2017 21:58  
> To: Andrew Maxted <[Andrew.Maxted@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Maxted@southandvale.gov.uk)>  
> Subject: Process irregularities  
>  
> Dear Mr Maxted  
>  
> I wonder if you would be so good as to explain the relationship between the processes connected to the development proposals within LPP2 (which were outlined to local residents at presentation events and online, complete with timescales) and individual planning applications posted during this period such as this <http://bit.ly/2xTzQs4>  
>  
> Clearly this scoping exercise presents an opportunity for the developer to get to a level of permission which fundamentally undermines the democratic/ consultative processes that local residents have been invited to participate in. At best it's sharp practice, at worst it's a cynical dodge that renders the process of presentation/consultation and decision that was ADVERTISED as taking place to Vale dwellers totally redundant.  
>  
> You have already stated to a Fyfield resident that there 'is nothing for Fyfield' in this development. For the Fyfield residents now to learn that the whole LPP2 process is a sham is a disgrace.  
>  
> I look forward to your answer  
>  
> B Tink