




# Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Community Governance Review: we'd like your feedback

Any personal information supplied to us within the comments that could identify anyone has been redacted and will not be shared or published in the report. Further information on data protection is available in our general consultation's privacy statement on our [South](#) or [Vale](#) website.








1. Are you responding as:				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	a resident within the parish		91.43%	32
2	someone who works within the parish		0.00%	0
3	a business / organisation operating within the parish		0.00%	0
4	a visitor or interested party		5.71%	2
5	a councillor (parish, district, county)		0.00%	0
6	an officer (parish, district, county)		2.86%	1
7	Other (please specify):		0.00%	0
			answered	35
			skipped	0
Other (please specify): (0)				
No answers found.				

2. If you are responding as a business / organisation, council or body please provide its name:				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	2
	1	Personal View		
	2	Fyfield & Tubney Parish Council		
			answered	2
			skipped	33

### 3. To help us analyse responses, please provide your full postcode (e.g. OX12 1XX)

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	34
		answered	34
		skipped	1

### 4. How far do you support or oppose the proposal to make no change to the boundary of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield and Tubney Parish?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly support 	57.14%	20
2	Tend to support 	2.86%	1
3	Neither support or oppose 	8.57%	3
4	Tend to oppose 	2.86%	1
5	Strongly oppose 	22.86%	8
6	Not sure 	2.86%	1
7	I don't have a view 	2.86%	1
		answered	35
		skipped	0

### 5. If you have selected tend to oppose or strongly oppose, please outline your reason(s) below.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	17
1	Unsure as the impact of this relating to the stupid proposals to build 600 house on land east of Kingston Bagpuize		
2	Because the new Lioncourt development on the land to the south of the A420 will impact Kingston Bagpuize/Southmoor considerably more than Tubney or Fyfield. Therefore, the residents of Kingston Bagpuize should have the Lioncourt residents' Council Tax contributions so that, via the Parish Council, the village can introduce or influence decisions taken about the development - pre-planning and post sales. The safty of road traffic and pedestrians (to and from bus stops, going to school, etc) on the sections of the A420 and A415 in this area must be improved if more housing is being introduced and it is only likely to happen if one Parish Council is responsible for this area.		
3	We strongly support keeping the boundary as it is; there is no need to change the boundaries. This is merely an attempt by Lioncourt to garner support for an untenable development on this land, which has no local support and to which we have raised numerous worrying concerns. These objections have been completely ignored by Lioncourt.		

**5. If you have selected tend to oppose or strongly oppose, please outline your reason(s) below.**

4 There is no logic to the proposal, except the desire for Kingston Bagpuize to subsequently wave through a controversial planning application for that land and for them to receive the benefits in terms of investments from the developers, while leaving the residents of Fyfield and Tubney to deal with the negative impact of the development. Since Kingston Bagpuize already has a by-pass for the A420, they are sheltered from the worst traffic impacts that the new development would create. This is a very cynical proposal by Kingston Bagpuize

5 I am the Treasurer of the KBS News and we publish a magazine to every house in the village each month at no charge. Doing this requires our small team to be aware of what is going on in the Village and endeavouring to keep resident informed. July 2022 edition attached.

The Boundary Change between Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish and Fyfield & Tubney Parish is a completely sensible request.

The land in question is divided from Fyfield Village by the Dual carriageway A420 but abuts directly onto Kingston Bagpuize Village.

The VOWHDC is currently considering a planning application to build, on the land covered by the requested Boundary Change, 660 houses, an extra care development of up to 70 units, a local centre of up to 0.5ha, a one form entry primary school on an area for educational provision of up to 2.2ha, playing field and car parking, informal open space. The application is entitled Land East of Kingston Bagpuize. Not South of Fyfield.

Both Parishes have expressed their objection to the development but it is clear that at some point in the near future the building will go ahead.

Fyfield Village has a Church and a Pub but no other facilities whereas Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor has 2 Coop shops, one of which includes a post office, a One Stop shop, a Village hall, a public park area (the Millennium Green), a Tennis Club, a Bowls Club, a Football Club, a Cricket Club, a Scouting Group and many clubs and societies. We also have a Pub and a Church.

The proposed planning application includes connecting all the new properties to Thames Water's sewage plant in Southmoor. None of the Fyfield and Tubney properties do this.

Fyfield is a delightful village but it is obvious that if the proposed development goes ahead the new residents will want to use Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor facilities. Many of the present Fyfield and Tubney residents already do.

It is obvious that the boundary should be changed to bring everything under the Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish.

It appears that the VOWHDC Planning dept believe the new development will be part of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor having recently asked the Parish Council to consider whether it will be prepared to adopt the proposed Public open spaces, Sports field and Pavilion should the planning application be approved.

6 The Parish Council has previously vigorously opposed this change and fully supports the decision not to make the change.

Conformation of our opposition is detailed in the attached document.

7 If it changes risk of more houses being built and don't have infrastructure to deal with it

8 it's ridiculous to move this boundary to make kbs even bigger when we have no local surgery, schools are maxed out busses are worse than useless no pharmacy services or post office choosing which day they fancy opening!

9 As the boundary change will lead to a huge housing development in the area with lots of wildlife and no infrastructure to support the influx of people it is not acceptable

10 Why not leave as Tubney/ Fyfield? It's on the edge of KBS actually in Tubney/Fyfield and would make more sense to leave in the current parish. KBS has quadrupled in size in the last 6 yrs. the other parish hasn't. Even some of the KBS is classed as Longworth whilst the actual Longworth is the other side of the A420 to KBS. Very stupid and confusing for delivery drivers - now the PC wants to stick Tubney in too. The PC would be better changing the boundary from Longworth to Southmoor at the Faringdon end of the village so that longworth is on one side only of the A420. But no they're dipping in somewhere else instead of sorting out existing issues. I want to live in a village not a small town

**5. If you have selected tend to oppose or strongly oppose, please outline your reason(s) below.**

	which KBS is becoming. KBS roads are busier, yet no more facilities such as doctors or dentist or even a chemist. Keep it as it is or are the Tubney/Fyfield parishioners with money worried a new estate in their small tiny parish will suffer on their house prices? <redacted>.	
11	The villages are big enough and we have to make sure they do not become one urban sprawl	
12	it would be better in general	
13	To allow essential services provision to be under control of KBS parish when new homes are built on the land because the residents will tend to rely on KBS rather than Fyfield & Tubney.	
14	I oppose the boundary change. The parishes with Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor have had more than their share of housing developments. We do not need anymore.	
15	If I line with KBS parish, hopefully no further land development would be granted on stated plot.	
16	The village of Kingston Bagpuize and Southmoor is already large enough.	
17	The recent developments in KB&S is excessive, especially with no Appropriate infrastructure in place. The nearest larger supermarket is many miles away as are facilities for Doctors, Dentists, Chemist. The road systems with our present SMALL Coop outlet at the mini roundabout with WitneyRoad on the A415 is likely to result in a very serious accident that is waiting to happen. The vehicle access on this route is likely to increase dramatically, with the changes of large commercial vehicles excess passing through Marcham - Air Quality, so again the residents of KB&S have to suffer, if these changes take place. The changes are likely to create further increase traffic flow. This change, will again create financial issues with KB&S Parish Council. If this change results in the building of 700 further houses, the changes to the road system requires changing, along with a Medical Centre, which is apparently not included.	
	answered	17
	skipped	18

**6. Are there any other comments you would like to make to support or oppose the proposal to make no change to the boundary with Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield and Tubney Parish?**

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	10
1	If this relates to the proposed building of 600 houses on land east of Kingston Bagpuize then I'd like register my disapproval for these plans. The local infrastructure, specifically the traffic on the A420 simply cannot handle this development. Let alone the impact on the rural area. This is a beautiful part of the county that does not need these houses		
2	We support wholeheartedly and without reservation the proposal to make NO CHANGE to the boundary.		
3	There is an application to build more than 650 houses in the area subject to the boundary review. If this goes ahead it would dominate Fyfield and Tunney. The land should therefore remain in F&T so that we can at least benefit from CIL/S106 monies, although the entire parish is extremely strongly opposed to the development - it's quite out of place and inappropriate for a rural area. There are many other reasons, not least the loss of high grade agricultural land at a time when we need to increase UK food production.		
4	None whatsoever		
5	leave the boundary where it is and do not build more houses in a high unemployment area there's nothing here for families to do so why build more expensive family homes		
6	I fully support NO change to the parish boundary. The change proposed is unsustainable, increasing the strain on the already limited facilities &		

**6. Are there any other comments you would like to make to support or oppose the proposal to make no change to the boundary with Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and Fyfield and Tubney Parish?**

	infrastructure in KBS. I am pleased that no change is now being fully discussed.		
7	No		
8	KBS parish Council have failed to hold the agreement to take on common areas of bloor Kingston Park Estate, resulting in an upcoming increase on estate management fees for all residents. Should this new boundary be changed or not, it is hard to have faith in their management of the locality.		
9	The request from Kingston Bagpuize Parish Council to cede the proposed land in from Fyfield & Tubney Parish is nothing short of scandalous method of placing themselves (KBS) in-line for requesting future CIL monies. This pecuniary request should be seen for what it is; simply a means to sell genuine infrastructure reservations on traffic and air quality in return for cash.  Fyfield & Tubney Parish Council and FLAG have genuine and clearly reasoned arguments for the defence of this land from developers and should be applauded for taking a principled stand. The land is part of Fyfield Parish and should remain so.		
10	Gerrymandering of worst sort in a backdoor effort to facilitate the urbanisation of our community- a move opposed by ALL residents of this Parish.		
		answered	10
		skipped	25

**7. You can upload any supporting documents using the button below.**

File Type	Average Size	Files Uploaded
.pdf	6422806.5Kb	2
To view the files uploaded, go into the individual results.	answered	2
	skipped	33

Please see attached supporting documentation uploaded.

**8. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make on the Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Community Governance Review 2022?**

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Open-Ended Question	100.00%	11
1 Don't allow these houses to be built. The A420 between tubney and Kingston Bagpuize is far too busy as it is.		
2 There should be no change to the parish boundary. This is being driven by a CIL tax grab not a genuine reason.		
3 I do regularly attend the Parish Council monthly meetings and feel confident that the Parish Council is doing a good job for the residents within it's powers and financial limitations.		
4 Please consider additional infrastructure & amenities for the already hugely expanded villages of Kingston Bagpuize and Southmoor.		

## 8. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make on the Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Community Governance Review 2022?

	A Dr's surgery is desperately needed. The roads need to be upgraded (dualing from Swindon to Oxford).		
5	I would like council tax banding standardised and looked at. I feel there is a real discrepancy between bands dependant upon year of build. You don't get any support when you move in and appeal.		
6	<redacted>		
7	As the village is expanding so much, it seems very strange that some of the addresses at the far end of the village are still Longworth addresses, when the A420 was built in it's current form, ages ago. Would also be nice to see some more facilities available to people who live there. There should be a doctor's surgery and a proper post office. A lot of elderly people live in the village and often struggle to get their prescriptions. Seems like the village is going backwards in a lot of things.		
8	no		
9	No		
10	Should the boundary change, it should be protected from further development. Uphold agreements made and support residents of the community by adopting the local common areas.		
11	The request from Kingston Bagpuize Parish Council to cede the proposed land in from Fyfield & Tubney Parish is nothing short of scandalous method of placing themselves (KBS) in-line for requesting future CIL monies. This pecuniary request should be seen for what it is; simply a means to sell genuine infrastructure reservations on traffic and air quality in return for cash.  Fyfield & Tubney Parish Council and FLAG have genuine and clearly reasoned arguments for the defence of this land from developers and should be applauded for taking a principled stand. The land is part of Fyfield & Tubney Parish and should remain so.		
		answered	11
		skipped	24