

Comment for planning application 22/01715/OUT

Application Number	22/01715/OUT
Location	Land South Of Perdiswell Farm Shipton Road Shipton On Cherwell
Proposal	Erection of up to 500 dwellings with associated access, open space and infrastructure
Case Officer	Samantha Taylor

Organisation Name	Rowland Butt
Address	10 Flemings Road,,Woodstock, ,Oxfordshire,OX20 1NA
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour

Comments

I strongly object to this massive and unwarranted development. Before listing the objections, an important fact needs to be established. The site is in the parish of Shipton on Cherwell , within the Cherwell District Council. The site abuts Woodstock Parish and in fact intends to link into the 300 Park View development under construction. It is vital that the proposal is viewed in that context. The effect falls directly on Woodstock and has no relevance whatsoever to Shipton on Cherwell. The supporting documents of the planning application erroneously make comparisons with Shipton on Cherwell, which are meaningless. Another major flaw in the documents when reviewing the impact on education and health is the absence of the 600 dwellings in the WODC adopted Local Plan. The site references in the LP are shown in Table 9.5b, page 222, reference numbers EW4 (120), EW5 (180) & the Park View site under construction (300). Any true comparisons should be viewed with the effect of the proposed 500 dwellings combined with the 600 aforementioned. The increase of population and household is double that of the quoted percentage increases. The above numbers are exacerbated by Blenheim applying for PP for more units than allocated in the LP with EW 4 increased to (180) and EW 5 increased to (250), which is another 130 potential houses, which are missing from the submission calculations.

My objection is for the following reasons: -

ES Ch 4 Community Social is the main source of the facts used in the objections 1 to 4. All data and references are taken from ES Ch 4. The comparisons only relate to Woodstock.

1. Woodstock Population. (4.4 & 4.8). 3100 at 2011 census. (4.9) Office for National statistics (ONS 2021) 9% increase to 3369. (4.36) Average household 2.4. Blenheim calculation $500 \times 2.4 = 1200$, ignoring 600 in WODC Local Plan (LP) $\times 2.4 = 1440$. Therefore $1440 + 1200$ divided by 3369 = 78% population increase i, not 36% quoted by Blenheim.
2. Housing. (4.38/9). 1418 households at 2011 census plus 58 & 41 =1517 to bring up to 2021. Therefore $500 + (600 - 41) = 1059$ divided by 1517 = 70% household increase, not 33% quoted by Blenheim.
3. Education. Early Years (4.16 to 4.18). Medium to high sensitivity to changes in population, much depends on current planning application (4.18). Primary (4.19 to 4.21) high sensitivity to changes in population. Secondary (4.22 to 4.23) , medium sensitivity to changes in population. All of the above projections are based on increases in provision of school places, which have yet to be determined. This proposal would put a severe strain on local education.
4. Healthcare. (4.25 to 4.27) currently 0.32 full-time equivalent GP's per 1000 population. In England it is 0.58. "Existing provision is below the national average", in fact almost 50% below. (4.26) "GP provision in Woodstock is considered to be of high sensitivity to changes in population", this is before 600 houses are built as per the WODC LP and the 500 in this planning application. This is totally unsustainable. (4.27) the same applies to Dentistry. The local Pharmacy is already under significant pressure. It should also be noted that the Woodstock Surgery serves surrounding villages, so the ratios quoted above are under reporting the true situation, making matters far worse.
5. Parking. Woodstock already has a parking problem, another 500 households on top of the 600 in the WODC LP is a recipe for chaos. Blenheim think people will walk or cycle in to town, perhaps for the fit and able with time on their hands, but not for the elderly, infirm or with young children. Google maps show a 20 minute walk from the Bladon roundabout,

(which is a useful reference point for the site) to the Town Hall. Blenheim's 15 minute walk time is opportunistic at best .

6. Transport. Another 500 households on top of 600 in the LP adding to an already congested road network, particularly for commuters to Oxford and beyond and that is without taking in to account the extensive developments in Long Hanborough, Freeland and North Leigh.

7. Design. Noted three-storey units. Completely out of character to the surrounding area.

8. Detrimental impact on a World Heritage site and historic town.

9. Environment & Sustainability. Pushing out the town boundaries ever further encroaching in to open countryside and productive farm land. The current crisis in grain production caused by the war in Ukraine makes it essential that productive agricultural land is not lost and Sustainability should be taken in to account.

10. Comparison with Cherwell DC Local Plan. Applying Cherwell Plan Section C, C259 Policy , Village 1: Category A. Within this category fall Adderbury, Deddington and Hook Norton. These habitations are of similar size and character to Woodstock. The policy states "Type of Development- Minor Development, Infilling and Conversions." Not huge housing estates. Surely the same consideration should apply to this 500 house development on the edge of Woodstock, even though Woodstock falls outside Cherwell's boundaries? Did the Cherwell LP envisage such large greenfield developments on agricultural land adjacent to historic towns? Cherwell DC have an obligation to take these factors in to account.

11. Likewise Cherwell DC should take serious note of the WODC LP, which has limited 600 houses in Woodstock.

As a resident of Woodstock my perception is Blenheim pay scant regard to Woodstock and it's populace and the character of the historic town, despite its protestations to the contrary. Massive developments run contrary and far outweigh their "green" initiatives. I sincerely hope that that this application is rejected as the previous schemes back in 2014/5.

Received Date

22/07/2022 13:14:18

Attachments