



## Comment on Application

**Application No:** 21/04187/SCOP

**Proposal:** Scoping Opinion - EIA scoping exercise for Land East of Park View, Woodstock

**Address:** Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton-on-Cherwell

Dear Cherwell Planning Team,

Further to your email of 6 January, please find below officer comments on the formal request by Blenheim Strategic Partners for an EIA scoping opinion under the EIA Regulations.

I see from the EIA Scoping Report that it is Blenheim Strategic Partners' intention to apply for outline planning permission to develop either up to 500 dwellings or up to 450 dwellings and a primary school, including a mix of housing types and a proportion of affordable housing, on land east of Park View, Woodstock, which lies within Cherwell District.

### Background

As you know, this site was considered and rejected by the Local Plan Inspector as part of the examination into the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Partial Review (adopted September 2020). Pages 12 and 13 of the Local Plan Inspector's Report set out his conclusion. West Oxfordshire District Council's Matter 8 Written Statement contains useful information, including landscape and heritage reports produced by consultants Chris Blandford Associates on our behalf <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/download/1347/matter-8-written-statements---woodstock>

### EIA Scoping Report

Given the sensitivity of the site, it is good to see the high priority to be given to assessing heritage (section 7) and landscape impacts (section 10).

Overall, while the report appears to have identified the majority of the key potential significant effects in terms of EIA, there are certain issues where I believe further consideration should be given to their significance, namely: pedestrian and cycle links and facilities; and the water environment. These are addressed below, along with other minor detailed observations, following the sequence of the report.

### ***6. Community, social and economic effects***

Para 6.5 rightly refers to WODC's 2016 West Oxfordshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In addition to this, more recently in 2019, Woodstock Town Council and Blenheim Estate produced a Community and Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the town <https://woodstock-tc.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Woodstock-Community-Infrastructure-Delivery-Plan-2019.pdf>

Para 6.7 looks at the effects on Kirtlington ward. Given the proximity to Woodstock, an assessment of the effects on the town should also be considered, including on local population and demography. New residents would inevitably impact upon and look to Woodstock.

In terms of assessment methodology, para 6.14 refers to using the 2011 average household size for Kirtlington ward. This should also look at Woodstock and, more usefully, make use of the 2021 census data which is to be released in spring 2022.

It is good to see recognition in Table 6.1 and paragraph 6.10 of the potential for health and wellbeing effects and of the proposed use of the Oxfordshire Health Impact Assessment Toolkit <https://futureoxfordshirepartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/210126-Oxon-HIA-Toolkit-FINAL.pdf>

### **7. Cultural heritage**

Para 7.11-13 set out the proposed assessment methodology. Consideration should also be given to guidance published by ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites): *Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Sites, 2011*.

### **10. Landscape and visual effects**

Para 10.3 identifies Cherwell District's report on landscape assessment. Given that landscape character rarely stops at a district boundary, it would be useful to also consider the highly regarded West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (<https://www.westoxon.gov.uk/media/cpqn2fj0/west-oxfordshire-landscape-assessment-1998.pdf>) and the reports produced by consultants Chris Blandford Associates, referred to above.

### **14. Traffic and transport**

Para 14.9 explains that as pedestrian and cycle links will be made through the site, the effect of the development will not be significant. However, as this site lies some distance from Woodstock town centre, the employment area south of the airport and Hanborough Station, the impacts on movements beyond the site itself are important, especially in light of the climate change emergency and the emphasis on encouraging active travel. Further consideration should be given to the potential effect of pedestrian and cycle links and facilities.

### **15. Waste and natural resources**

Given the climate change emergency, I would encourage the adoption of a circular economy approach to resource management.

### **16. Water environment**

In relation to the wastewater aspect of the water environment, para 16.9 says: 'Given that no specific capacity issues have been identified at the town's wastewater treatment works, and that treatment process upgrades can be undertaken using conventional technologies, no significant effects are predicted on treatment capacity in the area.' This seems to underplay the national and, well-evidenced and well-publicised, local concerns about water quality. I suggest a more detailed consideration is required before the water environment effects are scoped out. Presumably Thames Water and the Environment Agency will have been consulted and their views will clearly be important in this regard.

Should you require further information or clarification on any of the above, please contact [janice.bamsey@westoxon.gov.uk](mailto:janice.bamsey@westoxon.gov.uk)