

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** prteasdale [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 January 2021 10:11  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** F A O :- Matthew Chadwick - Application 20/03467/F

Dear Mr Chadwick,

I am writing to object to the proposed development of 'The Poplars' by Blue Cedar Homes for the following reasons:-

1. Previous applications for development of the site.

Since 1959 there have been eleven applications for development and all have been refused ,two on appeal. A further application near the Castle Grounds opposite Home Farm (19/02444/OUT )was allowed on appeal despite its unanimous rejection by Cherwell District Planning committee. The Inspector indicated that this approval should not act as a precedent for more development along the Clifton Road. This application is, of course, an attempt to do just that.

2. Reasons for objecting to the proposal.

One of the main factors for rejecting the other applications has been the impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the Conservation Area .Previous English Heritage Inspectors have considered that any development of the site would amount to 'substantial harm' of the setting of the Castle. This proposal to develop the Poplars is inconsistent with NPPF para. 193 , which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation ( and the more important the asset the greater the weight should be ).This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Para. 194 of the NPPF states that any harm to or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset ( from its alteration or destruction or from development within its setting ) should require clear and convincing justification. Clearly as there are a number of alternative sites for development in Deddington the proposal does not meet the justification outlined in the NPPF para 194. Furthermore, para. 194 (b) states that assets of the highest significance , notably Scheduled Monuments, Grade 1 & II \* listed buildings ( i.e. Castle Barns ) should be wholly exceptional.

It should be noted that the applicant in looking at the planning history of the site only looks back to April 2014 and thereafter thereby avoiding reference to the many applications before. The site itself ,of course, has been largely unchanged for a thousand years.

3. Planning intentions.

The Planning Statement indicates that the current proposal for development at the Poplars is their sole intention. Indicating that there will be no further development in subsequent phases and that no more development of the site is being considered. This is misleading since ownership is quite likely to pass to another developer who will be at liberty to pursue further development in their own right .

4. As already indicated the applicant cites the approval of the fifteen houses opposite Home Farm as evidence that development on the Poplars is acceptable when the Inspector concerned clearly states in her report that the approval should not be treated as a precedent.

5. Alternative sites.

Cherwell District Council regularly invite stakeholders to put forward areas of land that they would like to develop. There are already a significant number with more, no doubt ,waiting to be put forward. Not all will be suitable but there will be a number of sites not in the sensitive area of the SAM and the Conservation area which will be suitable for development. CDC have consistently indicated that the Poplars is unsuitable for development, hence the rejection of the previous 11 applications as outlined above.

4. Cherwell District Council Policies.

There are a number of saved CDC policies that protect the historic assets.

These include H18 – no dwellings in the countryside

C23 -retention of features contributing to the character and appearance of the conservation area

C25 – Developments affecting the site or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument

C28 – Layout, design and external appearance of a new development

C23,C25 & C28 are the most significant to the protection of the Heritage Assets.

There are three assets at risk. The SAM ,the conservation area and the curtilage listed Grade II\* Barns ( linked to Monks Court and Castle End )

The development will reduce the open field fronting the Castle by one third. Furthermore parts of the development will be much closer to the SAM than any of the earlier rejected applications. This is insensitive to the history of the Castle which was deliberately built away from the village to establish dominance of the area by the ruling Normans.

English Heritage refer to the significance of this separation (English Heritage. RefPOO393885.)

Clearly the reduction in the open land and additional housing will change the character and appearance of the conservation area . This is inconsistent with CDC policy C23.

The proximity of housing ,back gardens and storage areas will impact adversely on both the SAM and the conservation area.( C25 )

The layout and design is very unlikely to be compatible with the existing immediate area.( C28 ). For example the buildings currently near to the site are remote from the Castle with substantial gardens. The two 2 storey properties proposed will dwarf the bungalows being provided .When viewed from the Monument the view will be of an urban addition to a rural location and out of character (C28).

Cherwell District Council has striven over many years ( successfully ) to protect the green spaces in the conservation area. It is important to recognise that these green spaces have been deliberately included in the CDC plan for the benefit of future generations.

I fully understand the desire for additional age restricted properties. However this does not need to be at the expense of the heritage assets. Furthermore when the development of seven properties at St Thomas Street were considered the Inspector stated that in no way could the benefits outweigh the harm to the Heritage Assets.

For all of these reasons I respectfully ask you to reject this application.

Therese Teasdale  
Stonecroft  
Clifton Road  
Deddington  
OX15 0TP

This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.  
For more info visit [www.bullguard.com](http://www.bullguard.com)