

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	Sarah Baldwin
Address	2 Cowells Road, Woodstock, OX20 1GB
Type of Comment	Comment
Type	neighbour

Comments

I have no objection to new housing per se, but I do have concerns about the proposed new development, primarily regarding the link with Park View.

On reading the various documents relating to this application, it became apparent that at no point in the application has Park View been considered. There is no mention of Cowells Road in any of the traffic assessments and the only mention of it is concerning a proposed link road connecting the two developments. Depending on what document you read, this could be a 'hoggin' pathway or a road of 6.7metres that is wide enough to accommodate buses.

Documents submitted to planning for Phases 1 and 2 of Park View make no mention of a link road for vehicles from development of the PR10 site, only pedestrian and cycle access. It is not until Phase 3 that one word (vehicle) was added to the site plans - indicating that an area is reserved for vehicle access should permission to build be obtained. Residents of the first two phases bought on the understanding that there would be no impact from traffic close to their homes; I wonder if this is being made clear to purchasers in Phase 3 and beyond.

If the connection between the two sites were for vehicle access, it would provide a 'rat run' for traffic particularly if there was congestion on the A44, Shipton Road or the A4095. It would also be a cut-through for delivery drivers, etc. as any Sat Nav would direct you through Park View and the new development. As most people blindly follow Sat Nav, there will be an increase in traffic and the AI that is built-in would 'learn' this route and continue to direct motorists this way. This clink also contravenes County policy of encouraging use of main roads rather than diverting traffic through residential areas.

Given that the transport / traffic assessments do not take any of this into account, they cannot be deemed valid and should be undertaken again to include Cowells Road. We are already seeing people using Cowells Road to turn around as they cannot be bothered to drive up to the roundabout to access Blenheim and turning right into Woodstock from Cowells Road is not easy - particularly on event days; adding to this with a link road from /to 500 homes would have a huge impact on Blenheim Estates' 'flagship' development.

Residents of Park View arranged a meeting with Roger File, Property Director and COO at Blenheim to discuss our concerns, we were also fortunate to have Dominic Hare, CEO, attend this meeting. What became clear, was that they 'didn't think this would be a problem' or that 'no one would do this'!

All residents shared the concerns about increased traffic; we have a partially sighted resident who is very concerned at the current level of traffic and the speed of it and I can say that I wholeheartedly share their concern. We have a 91-year-old neighbour who regularly walks into town and many families with young children who have all bought homes in a neighbourhood that they thought would be safe.

Having lived here for almost two years, I can guarantee that this road will be a problem. In addition to the issues mentioned above, there is already an unofficial Park and Ride where the visitor parking should be, particularly on days when the event organisers charge for parking; this is particularly bad during Nocturne and at Christmas for the Illuminated Trail.

I absolutely love living in Woodstock and at Park view and think that Blenheim should be commended for building some wonderful homes. However, we have asked that they take

these issues up with their Highways Consultant to find a better way of linking these communities; perhaps limiting to pedestrian and cycle access with emergency vehicle access only from Cowells Road. It is somewhat grating to read Blenheim marketing blurb about birdsong and carbon zero targets when they are seemingly oblivious to the impact extra traffic will have on their existing residents!

Other issues of concern are largely based on the infrastructure in and around Woodstock:

GP Provision

I understand that a site was purchased by Blenheim some years ago and there are ongoing discussions with the relevant parties (NHS, County and Town Councils) about how this can be developed, or another suitable site identified.

I would also add that the Pharmacy does need to be addressed as the lone Pharmacist seems to be overwhelmed. I have had to resort to using an online delivery service, but this is not an option for many.

Schools

We had to appeal so our child could go to Woodstock CE Primary. I know that the intention is for this to be expanded and for the nursery provision to move, but this will easily be taken up by existing residents; where will all the additional children go, will the catchment boundary change, etc? The Marlborough is already increasing its intake this year, but this will soon not be enough to meet the increased demand.

Section 106 funds

As these homes will be in Cherwell, will the money be spent in Cherwell? As this development is on the boundary, there be an expectation to use facilities in Woodstock as opposed to Kidlington, etc. Who will manage the lists for affordable housing and who will be given priority? It really does seem that Cherwell will use this to fulfil a housing need, yet Woodstock will be greatly impacted with potentially no benefit.

Sewerage / Water

I understand that there are already issues with these utilities, so what is proposed to ensure there is not further strain on the existing utilities?

Received Date

26/07/2022 19:02:48

Attachments