

# Comment for planning application 22/01715/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	22/01715/OUT
<b>Location</b>	Land South Of Perdiswell Farm Shipton Road Shipton On Cherwell
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of up to 500 dwellings with associated access, open space and infrastructure
<b>Case Officer</b>	Samantha Taylor
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Claudio Calvino
<b>Address</b>	8, Wheeler Avenue
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed development will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Negatively affect Woodstock's existing infrastructure beyond acceptable mitigation and will have a negative environmental impact.</li><li>2. Negatively impact the Archeologic Area of Interest and Scheduled Monument (1021367 - first listed 13-Jan-2005).</li><li>3. Irremediably affect the Areas of low archaeological potential defined in figure 5.10 of ES_Ch_5_Cultural_Heritage.pdf.</li><li>4. Destroy the Area of Archaeological Potential defined in figure 5.09 of ES_Ch_5_Cultural_Heritage.pdf.</li></ol> <p>In more detail:</p> <p>1. It is not easy to see the necessity to build five hundred new houses when significant developments are ongoing or have been granted planning permissions in Oxfordshire. Examples would be the two developments Blenheim is already planning in Woodstock (Hill Rise and Banbury Road) and the one at Long Hanborough, but also the ones undergoing in Bicester, Oxford (Oxford North), Kidlington and Eynsham. Those developments have added thousands of houses in the past and will add thousands more.</p> <p>It would be challenging to support Woodstock's existing service infrastructure is ready to sustain the weight of the population increment that the new development under study would drive. Recent data (<a href="https://insight.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/system/files/documents/Woodstock_profile_Dec20.pdf">https://insight.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/system/files/documents/Woodstock_profile_Dec20.pdf</a>) shows an increment in the population from the 2009 Census to 2019 of 319 people. The average number of people in the UK is - as of 2019 - 2.4. This statistic can lead to thinking that five hundred new houses could imply a population increment, in the ten years in which the new development is expected to be completed, of 1,200 people. This number is in line with the estimate presented by the Applicant at point 4.36 of the ES_Ch_4_Community_Social.pdf Document.</p> <p>This increment represents more than four times what Woodstock has organically experienced in the last ten years and does not account for any increment potentially driven by other phenomena. This same increment would take the total population in Woodstock from around 3,385 people as of 2019 to more than 4,500 in 2034, just for the effects of the new development. It is an exogenous increment of 32%, while the previous ten years' increment was 11%. The above does not consider the period from 2019 to 2022 and the other estates Blenheim is developing in Woodstock.</p> <p>The Park View estate that when completed, will account by itself for 300 houses and around 720 people to add to the numbers above.</p> <p>Hills Rise estate, which, when completed, will account for 180 houses and around 430 people.</p> <p>Banbury road estate, which, when completed, will account for 250 houses and around 600 people.</p> <p>The impact of Blenheim's venture alone on Woodstock's total population could be approximately 2,900 people, leading to an increase from 2019 to 2034 of 96%.</p> <p>In the analysis they presented, the Applicant implicitly recognizes the considerable stress that this new development would bring to already highly stressed and under-developed infrastructures:</p> <p>Businesses: most likely, there will be no beneficial effect, and Woodstock will become a</p>

dormitory city if this development is granted permission.

Education: point 4.44 of the ES\_Ch\_4\_Community\_Social.pdf document presents the Applicant's estimate for new needed additional places. A total of 366 new places will be required with increments that go - in their optimistic views - from 14% to 55% depending on the grade and will push schools over capacity.

Healthcare:

Woodstock has already the highest number of patients for GPs in Oxfordshire. For three full-time GPs, there are 9,260 patients (data from NHS Digital). This translates into a ratio of 0.32 GPs for 1,000 patients. Woodstock is already way below the average of 0.58 GPs for 1,000 patients in England. An increase of 1,200 people will bring this ratio to 0.28 - this without considering the other three development the Applicant is already building in Woodstock. To get Woodstock in line with the national average and after the new ongoing and proposed developments, Woodstock would need at least seven full-time GPs, more than double the current number.

There is already virtually no NHS dental practice in Woodstock. Considering the dental practice in Kidlington as an alternative to Woodstock-based services and the impact on this infrastructure as a small impact, without factoring in the pressure the practice in Kidlington will receive from other adjacent areas seems to be the results of superficial analyses.

It is evident from the data that the Applicant is reporting, that the best mitigation possible is not to build the 500 new houses, and surely not to build them relying on mitigations that rarely deliver on the promise.

Building houses impacts the environment both in the short and the long term. On average, building a house emits around 80 tonnes of Co2. Building 500 homes would emit approximately 40,000 tonnes of Co2 in the ten-year plan. Blenheim's pledge to "...become carbon neutral on scopes 1 to 3 of the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) across all operations by 2027..." and to "...remove 230,000 tonnes of CO2e from the atmosphere by 2050." would be made more challenging if not impossible by the new development. The attempt to distinguish between the virtuous management of the Blenheim to which the pledge refers and as stated on one of the pages of the website blenheim.com, and the activities that Blenheim runs or intends to run just outside its walls, could be perceived by the local community as greenwashing.

2-3-4. The presence of an Archeologic Area of Interest and Scheduled Monument officially recognized by Historic England (1021367 - first listed 13-Jan-2005 - <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1021367>) should be more carefully considered. The archaeological area should represent an asset to preserve and protect from new developments. The Applicant's plans show criticalities that should trigger strong opposition to the proposed new development and endanger the archeologic area. Two are the main elements I believe demand attention:

The initial drawings show a primary road cutting through the area of high archaeological interest and the one of low archaeological interest.

If the work related to the primary road directly affects the archaeological site, it will be irreparably compromised. No mitigation can change that. Being the Roman Villa a Scheduled Monument, building on the site would require obtaining a Scheduled Monument Consent. Even just filing to receive such permission from the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport will trigger robust negative coverage against the development and the Applicant itself.

If the primary road is not designed to pass through the Roman Villa itself - the area recognized as a Scheduled Monument - building in its immediate adjacency on land where Roman pottery and tiles have been found would be highly controversial, in particular when there is a clear alternative to the proposed plan that is to connect the proposed new development to the area north of Park View into Shipton Road, maintaining only pedestrian and cycle connections in the proximity of the Roman Villa.

From the drawings, the development seems to interest an area that the table on page 51 of the ES\_Ch\_5\_Cultural\_Heritage.pdf document defines as an Area of archaeological potential; this site should be protected too for future and further study. Therefore, the number of houses planned should be reduced, and their location should be kept to the far East side of the Land East of Park View.

From the drawings, the proposed new development is supposed to start in the immediate adjacency of the Area of Archaeological Interest with a few small areas to the South and East sides of the new proposed development where new woodland would be planted. A more extended and ample forest protecting the archaeological site for all its length and not just contouring part of the new development would help safeguard the archaeological site from the new development and the anthropization of the area. Even if this arrangement implies a significant reduction in the number of houses the Applicant would be allowed to build, it will ensure better preservation of the archaeological area from unnecessary activities and better guarantee its conservation for future generations.

The Mitigation and monitoring section in ES\_Ch\_5\_Cultural\_Heritage.pdf is nurturing a wrong idea where conservation seems possible only via further development of the area. This is conceptually misleading. Suppose the concern is, as implied in note 5.154 on the predicted effect of the excavation process, that the archaeological remains will be destroyed through erosion and dewatering processes. In that case, this does not justify excavating and destroying

the remains as suggested but calls for other actions to valorize and conserve the Area.

In summarising, a far more reasonable arrangement should aim to:

A. Reduce the planned number of new houses. The 180 homes designed for the Hill Rise would already characterize a pervasive development and almost two-thirds of the Park View development. Still, it would significantly reduce the impact on Woodstock's infrastructure, which has already come under massive pressure in the last few years. Also, a reduced number of dwellings would significantly reduce the already significant environmental impact on the area because of both the building and subsequent activities. The new homes should be finally concentrated on the northeast side of the Land to the East of Park View to reduce the impact on the existing views.

B. Commit to protecting and maintaining the (1) Area of Archaeological Interest and its Scheduled Monument (high archaeological potential) and the (2) Areas of low archaeological potential defined in figure 5.10 ES\_5\_Ch\_Cultural\_Heritage.pdf, as well as the (3) Area of Archaeological Potential defined in figure 5.09 of the same document.

C. Edit the initial drawings by having the primary road planned to cut through the Area of high Archaeological potential into Park View to the area to the Northeast of Park View into Shipton Road, maintaining only pedestrian and cycle connections in the immediate proximity of the Roman Villa.

D. Protect the extended archaeological area by (1) planting a continuous, mature, deep, and long woodland area for all its extension, creating a natural buffering cushion between the Roman Villa and its extensive area of archaeological interest and the new proposed development; (2) avoiding any destructive excavation process in the areas defined by the (1) Area of Archaeological Interest and its Scheduled Monument (high archaeological potential) and the (2) Areas of low archaeological potential defined in figure 5.10 ES\_5\_Ch\_Cultural\_Heritage.pdf, as well as the (3) Area of Archaeological Potential defined in figure 5.09 of the same document.

**Received Date**

02/07/2022 13:33:27

**Attachments**