

Rachel Tibbetts

From: prteasdale [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2021 09:53
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Application 20/03467/F

I should have included my full address for this email which is:-

PR Teasdale
Stonecroft
Clifton Road
Deddington
OX15 0TP

Regards
Paul Teasdale

From: prteasdale [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 January 2021 18:47
To: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Subject: Application 20/03467/F

Dear Mr Chadwick,

I am writing to object to the above planning application to build seven one and two storey age restricted dwellings on the land known as " the Poplars", Clifton Road, Deddington.

There have been eleven previous applications to build on this land between 1959 and 2014. All have been rejected or withdrawn.

In 2014 an application to build seven houses at the rear of St Thomas Street (13/01941/OUT) was rejected, on appeal. The Inspector of Ancient Monuments for English Heritage said:-

" The proposed development will cause harm to the significance of the Scheduled Ancient Monument known as Deddington Castle through its impact upon its setting. The local authority will need to weigh any public benefits of the proposal against that harm and if the benefits do not outweigh the harm the application should be refused." He also said (page 6 s.33) "The delivery of 7 dwellings is an important benefit. However, to my mind it is insufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the Castle and the conservation area, whether considered individually or collectively."

It was refused and now this is another application also for seven dwellings but much closer to the Castle. The applicant for this new proposal in their Heritage Statement on page 41 say that English Heritage, in a private communication, believe the development will result in slight " less than substantial" harm to the significance of Deddington Castle. It is difficult to reconcile these two statements when the current application is similar in size and so much closer to the Castle.

In any event the NPPF para. 193 states " when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset great weight should be given to the assets conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. It also states that any harm or loss of the significance of a designated asset should require clear and convincing justification. The applicants lengthy Heritage Statement attempts to show sufficient benefits to justify the development and finishes " To conclude it is important in closing to stress both that considerable weight must be accorded to any harm likely to be caused to designated heritage assets and that the provision of open market houses and the associated economic activity are very weighty matters". I truly believe that the construction of seven open market dwellings and the economic activity that would generate could not possibly outweigh the preservation of such an important Scheduled Ancient Monument together with its setting which has remained intact for a thousand years.

The recent approval to build fifteen houses South of Home Farm, Clifton Road (also close to the Castle) was the result of an Inspector overturning the unanimous decision to reject the application by CDC Planning Authority. The Inspector, however, said in her report (page 5 .23) " The development should not be considered to form a precedent, there are sufficient numbers of remaining field parcels that preserve the peripheral feel of the area and

any future development proposals would need to account for the subsequent and cumulative loss of any field parcels and any consequential effects "

Needless to say , and as was entirely predictable, the current applicant is treating the approval as the green light for this application which is further along the Clifton Road towards the main village and is within both the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument and the conservation area.

The applicant also states in the introduction to the Planning Report " that these proposals represent the only development aspirations that the applicant has for the site. There is no intention to provide any further development in subsequent phases. This is an important issue and clearly indicates that no further development proposals are being considered." This is disingenuous as there is nothing to prevent the remaining land being sold to another developer with different views.

It is not only the Scheduled Ancient Monument that is threatened by this application .There are also the curtilage listed Grade II* buildings (Castle Barns) and the conservation area. The applicant in the Heritage Assessment goes to great lengths to dispute the status of Castle Barns. After lengthy comment it concludes (page 22, section 3. 4.3) However, tentatively this heritage statement will adopt the stance that Castle Barns does not share the listing of the principal building Castle End and Monks Court for the reasons given in the preceding paragraphs. This is despite CDC Planning Authority having treated Castle Barns as Grade II* listed buildings when it approved two earlier applications for improvement work to be done on the Barns (14/01254/LB and 08/02189/LB).

In conclusion I do not believe seven dwellings in such a sensitive area, which has been rigorously protected over many years by the Planning Authorities, can ever be justified particularly when there are alternative sites in the village with more, no doubt , about to be offered when the revised Neighbourhood Plan is concluded.

Yours sincerely
PR Teasdale
Deddington

This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.
For more info visit www.bullguard.com

This email has been scanned by BullGuard antivirus protection.
For more info visit www.bullguard.com