

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Claire Cable-Alexander (1142765)  
**Email Address**  
**Address**

**Event Name** LPP2 Publicity Period Oct - Nov 2017  
**Comment by** Mr Claire Cable-Alexander  
**Comment ID** 124  
**Response Date** 18/11/17 17:05  
**Status** Submitted  
**Submission Type** Web  
**Version** 0.1

**Q1 To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? Please state the paragraph or policy or policies map.** 4a and 8a

**Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant?** Yes

**Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound?** No

**Q4 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** No

**Q5 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 co-operate. 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.**

I believe the plan, specifically the proposal to build 600 houses east of Kingston Bagpuize (in Fyfield and Tubney) to be unsound in a number of areas:

- it is **unsound** as the plan has not been undertaken in compliance with its duty to co-operate (comments expressed at an earlier stage have been ignored, the parish council have not been properly consulted. At no point have we received any written communication from the DC, despite living some 200 metres from the proposed site.

- it is unsound on the basis that it does not comply with a number of the councils sustainability objectives. It does not provide appropriate homes in an appropriate place. The homes are not affordable homes and nor are they economically viable as outlined by my parish council's comprehensive objection.
- it is unsound as it will significantly increase traffic heading East on the A420, particularly in the morning rush hour. Traffic is already terrible and this will not help.
- It is unsound as it will significantly add to air, noise and light pollution in the rural parish of Fyfield, in stark contrast to the sustainability objectives.
- it is unsound as it will undermine the rural and heritage aspect of our parish of just 185 homes. We will be dwarfed and the character of our village, in particular the rural aspect, will change forever.

**Q6. 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.**

Remove the Fyfield site from the Additional Allocations in Policy 4a (and Policy 8a)

**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.**

**Q6 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

**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