

24/02664/PIP – The Pheasant Pluckers Inn, Burdrop

I strongly object to this permission in principle (PIP) application for the reasons outlined below.

The site lies in an elevated position on the northern side of the Sib Valley in the heart of Burdrop and within the Sibford Ferris, Sibford Gower and Burdrop Conservation Area. The application fails to mention that the site lies within the Conservation Area. The site is listed as an undesignated heritage asset by The Conservation Area Appraisal, Section 72 (General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions) of the 1990 Listed Building and Conservation Act notes that “special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”.

Burdrop is steeped in history and the site has been identified as being within an area of archaeological interest with mention of the possibility of medieval development according to the OCC Planning Archaeologist report 22 October 2024.

Views of the Sibford Gap across the car park of the PH from a small public green (to the front of the car park) will be adversely affected by infill. The proposed development is contrary to *Section 33 of the Cherwell Local Plan which states that “the council will seek to retain any undeveloped gap of land which is important in preserving the character of loose-knit settlement structure or in maintaining the proper setting for a listed building or in preserving a view or feature of recognised amenity or historic value”*. The site is directly adjacent and in close proximity to several Grade II listed buildings.

The site has a long history of planning and enforcement including the unauthorised use of the PH as a dwelling house. The PH is temporarily closed. It is unclear if the proposal of 3-7 dwellings is restricted to the curtilage of the car park and garden or includes the PH (as it looks to be included on the site plan indicated by the red boundary line). The amount of development proposed appears to be disproportionate to the area of land available. This will reduce/eliminate any available space for parking, in effect denying the village any chance of it being run as a viable PH again.

There is no requirement to build additional houses in the Sibfords. The target has been achieved in the Cherwell area. There has already been significant development in the Sibfords most recently with a housing development currently under construction, Deanfield Heights with 25 houses and permission granted for a further 5 houses on land off Woodway Road.

The number (up to 7 dwellings), density, prominence and intrusiveness of the proposed development will harm the character and appearance of the street scene and I have concerns for associated boundary creep within a conservation area. It is not a brownfield site. Access to the site is on a steep, narrow single-track road with limited pavements and already congested with on street parking. It's junction with Hawk's Lane on a steep incline will become extremely dangerous with construction traffic needing to access the site.

In the face of poor public transport infrastructure and an infrequent unreliable bus service, the vast majority of Sibford residents rely on their cars to make journeys for shopping, commuting to school and work etc. The pattern of vehicle use that this development would create will result in a disproportionately larger number of cars using minor or unsuitable roads and is contrary to *Core Policy 21 as set out in the current Local Plan Review 2040, stating “One of our key objectives for meeting the challenge of climate change is to ensure that housing and employment are located within sustainable locations. Encouraging sustainable transport modes, low-carbon technologies, and living closer to jobs, education, services and amenities can lead to reduced travel, reduced carbon emissions and generally more sustainable communities”*.

In conclusion, I urge CDC not to approve the PIP proposal for the reasons outlined above.