

# 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>	Patricia Redpath
<b>Address</b>	Formerly 22 Shipton Road, Woodstock, Oxon OX20 1LL,(now Criffel, Nettlestone Green, Seaview, IOW PO34 5Y)
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour

**Comments**  
22/01715/OUT  
Land South Of Perdiswell Farm Shipton Road Shipton On Cherwell; Erection of up to 500 dwellings with associated access, open space and infrastructure

This is the latest of a number of attempts to gain permission for housing on this site referred to as "Woodstock" but actually located in the parish of Shipton - on - Cherwell.

The Initial application in 2014 (14/02004/OUT) was refused by Cherwell District that:

"1. The proposed development would result in unnecessary an undesirable new housing development in open countryside in that the application site is not allocated for development in either the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-31, the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, or the submission West Oxon Local Plan 2031..does not accord with the Council's development strategy of focussing development at Banbury and Bicester and allowing only limited development in rural areas. 2. This substantial development proposal would result in a significant loss of open countryside and have a substantial and adverse impact upon the character and appearance of that countryside .

Since that refusal the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 has been approved - still with no reference to this site and the Cherwell Partial Review Plan has been approved - also without inclusion - in fact removal - of this particular site.

The reasons given therefore in paragraph 1 of the refusal of application 14/02004/OUT that the proposal does not fit into the relevant Local Plans still apply and this factor MUST be given full consideration.

The Partial Review of the Cherwell Plan was necessary to cover what were claimed to be the "unmet needs of Oxford" amounting to a total of 4,400 additional dwellings with a requirement that the sites be within easy access of Oxford.

Due therefore to its proximity to Oxford, Blenheim Estate again put forward this site (known in the Plan documentation as PR10) which was then included in the Cherwell submission for 500 dwellings.

However, the Inspector reviewing the submission removed the site and in consideration of its effect on Woodstock stated that:

"the south east boundary of Woodstock is well-defined. Its further extension in a south-easterly direction would appear incongruous and damage the character and appearance of the area. While not on its own a significant issue, this incongruity would cause some harm to the setting, and thereby the significance of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site that lies to the west of the proposed allocation. The challenges of developing the site in an acceptable way are evident in the rather contorted way in which housing on the site would be arranged in relation to green space and the need for screening woodland as shown on the Policy PR10 Policies Map."

The housing numbers included for PR10 were subsequently redirected to the other sites, so the fact remains that there will still be 4,400 homes built between Woodstock and Oxford adding to the transport and other infrastructure problems of the area and with this 500 in addition!

In summary then - twice within the last 10 years this site has been rejected for sound reasons demonstrating that it is inappropriate for development.

Locally Blenheim Estate justifies this submission on the grounds that Cherwell does not have a five-year housing supply. This is unlike the situation in 2014/15. However, government legislation recognises that such a situation must not override site suitability.

Furthermore, Blenheim have repeatedly claimed to local activists that there will be a boundary review and that the site will be re allocated to West Oxfordshire (and Woodstock).

Putting aside the complications in changing a District boundary, I would question how this would help. If the only reasons for promoting this application is a lack of five-year supply for Cherwell, what good does it do to approve 500 houses for West Oxfordshire - particularly in the knowledge that West Oxfordshire has opposed development of this site and was rigorous at the Cherwell Partial Review Inquiry?

The problems associated with further development will have been well voiced in other representations against this proposal, all related to infrastructure. But, in considering this application the committee would be well advised to also review the comments made by the Inspector at the West Oxfordshire 2031 Inquiry. The Inspector goes into detail about the desirability of housing in Woodstock and the potential for development to cause harm to the setting of the World Heritage Site. P49 of his findings headed "Housing allocations in Woodstock" summarise:

"In my judgement the benefit of providing for around 600 dwellings (less than 4% of the plan's overall housing requirement) in this sustainable location represents clear and convincing justification for the proposed housing development, bearing in mind the importance of the nearby heritage assets and the level of harm which would be likely to be caused to them."

Sadly, Blenheim Estate is already trying to increase this number to a total of 720. To add in a further 500 making a total of 1250 - more than twice his recommendation - would in my view be against this Inspector's findings that the town could accommodate a further 600. My final observation relates to the comments made by English Heritage in 2015 in regard to this site. There has been some consideration of the points made in the design of the site but in view of the strength of comment made by English Heritage it is questionable that this satisfies.

This new application is disingenuous and achieves nothing for the local community. Development of this site has twice been rejected and a separate Local Plan Inquiry in West Oxfordshire has recognised the limitations of the area for development.

Please refuse!

Trish Redpath  
(Former Woodstock Town Councillor and Mayor of Woodstock)

**Received Date**

26/07/2022 13:17:40

**Attachments**