

From: Dinah Hill [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 March 2019 16:40
To: Planning Policy Vale
Subject: Response to the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Modifications

I am a resident of Faringdon Road East leading to the airfield gates and am extremely concerned to learn that my road is being proposed as the main site access to the new development on the airfield with a proposed diversion of current Barrow Road traffic through the development along this route. Despite VWHDC's agreement in November 2018 to take only sufficient land out of the Green Belt from the Southern end of the airfield for the development of 1200 new houses, the inspector in a letter of 19 December 2018 looks beyond 2031 to suggest further development of Dalton Barracks should be considered. Should such development take place this would then meet the criteria of a Garden Village which must be standalone and separate from the village of Shippon. The draft modifications are clearly ignoring residents' acceptance of 1200 houses with the proviso that Shippon remain a small village, separate from the new development with an appropriate buffer zone. The current proposals would result in a vast suburban sprawl which there are no very special circumstances to justify. I strongly believe that the site entrance to the new development should be moved to maintain Shippon as a separate village rather than allow it to be swamped.

I am moreover saddened that OCC and Glanville Consultants did not feel it expedient to consult with local residents when preparing their Transport Delivery Report and the impact of the traffic that would result from it becoming the main site entrance to the new development. Residents could have offered a true insight into the current traffic through Shippon which this Report fails to accurately reflect. The report was commissioned to provide '...more detailed evidence of the potential impacts of the initial 1,200 dwellings...' including '...estimated traffic generation, trip distribution and identification... of any off-site infrastructure, improvement or mitigation measures that might be required'. However the Report contains errors and incorrect data that must render its findings deeply flawed and show that Faringdon Road is not suitable for use as a site entrance.

Reading the Glanville Report there seems to be no allowance of the fact that Shippon is used as a through route to access the schools on Faringdon Road and is already a bottleneck at morning rush hour. Nor is there any allowance for inhabitants of the new development taking their children to nursery or primary schools off-site. Here are some observations regarding specific points in the Report:

2.1 There appears to be no justification for changing access to the site from Sycamore Close to Faringdon Road East.

2.2 The change in priority proposed at the Barrow Road site access combined with the traffic calming scheme will have the effect of channelling all existing traffic through the site and down Faringdon Road. Already at morning rush hour overflow traffic cuts down Elm Tree Walk to Cholswell Road creating traffic queues and this will only be increased by inhabitants of new houses accessing secondary schools along the Faringdon Road. As 6.4 states the diversion of 'the majority of Barrow Road through-traffic through the site' and therefore onto Faringdon Road East. Clearly the increased volume of traffic on Faringdon Road would have extremely negative air quality impact.

3.10/5.4 Discounting the barracks site as a traffic generator in its own right and the assumption that the remaining military houses will remain empty or not be redeveloped seems highly unlikely and therefore invalid. Indeed several houses within the Officers Quarters area of the Barracks are already privately owned.

5.2 Where are the figures for the 2018 traffic surveys undertaken? Were they taken during school term time?

5.3-5.4 Background Traffic Growth 2031. These Traffic Flows charts are very hard to understand as none of the figures add up, with vehicle movement being lost/gained everywhere. For example on 'Do Nothing' AM Peak Hour Chart 651 traffic movements are recorded turning onto Barrow Road, by the site entrance these have grown to 705 but by Barrow Road's junction with Faringdon Road shrunk to 382. There appears to be no logic or accuracy at all.

On the 'Do Nothing' (i.e. without development) 8-9am chart how can the Faringdon Road-Cholswell Road junction have '0' traffic movements when currently there are queues here every morning as people cut down Elm Tree Walk

and I avoid leaving home before 9am if I can? Why is Elm Tree Walk not marked on the chart as this carries substantial traffic currently?

On the 'Do Something' 8-9am chart there are 35 traffic movements turning left at the Faringdon Road-Cholswell Road junction however this is below even the current traffic volume. Where has allowance been made for the extra traffic that will be channelled through the new site by the change in priority proposed at the Barrow Road site access and traffic calming scheme not to mention working commuters from the new development?

In conclusion I ask that the inspector rejects the findings of the Transport Delivery Report and looks again at the options for a site access that does not impinge so heavily on existing residents or place such a burden on the existing infrastructure.

Dinah Hill