

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	Linda Griffiths
Organisation Name	Jo Lamb
Address	7 Park Street, Woodstock, OX20 1SJ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour

Comments

As a resident of Woodstock I OBJECT strongly to this outline proposal by Blenheim Estates for 500 more houses, on several grounds:

1. Taken together with Blenheim's other development proposals on Woodstock's periphery, a total 1230 houses will OVERWHELM Woodstock. A recent Inspector's report stated that the most houses Woodstock could accommodate was 600. Blenheim are proposing to double this. The overall result would be a doubling of the size of Woodstock's population.
2. Woodstock already lacks suitable INFRASTRUCTURE to accommodate the numbers proposed. This would add to the difficulties experienced already with an inadequate surgery, educational provision, parking and congestion, sewage to name but a few.
3. Setting the houses further back from the A44, might succeed in preserving some archeological remains. However, it would result in an isolated housing estate with no accessible social hub in which to build a sense of community. Volunteering a Community Development Officer is all very fine but there are no facilities to encourage socialisation. This housing enclave is more likely to become a mere commuter suburb of Oxford and Kidlington. It's residents will be car dependent. It is unrealistic to expect families to walk or cycle everywhere. They won't! The houses are sited too far away from essential resources. The residents will likely experience social isolation and loneliness resulting from lack of social integration.
4. It would seem the main beneficiary from S106 payments in this instance would be Kidlington and Gosford. It is their leisure centre which would receive payments for upgrading. Woodstock's swimming pool is not mentioned by Blenheim, yet it is Woodstock which will be expected to absorb the likely consequences of the sudden injection of so high numbers of people on the border of this small historic market town. Presumably the developer would encourage trips by car from this site to Kidlington's upgraded Leisure centre?
5. The proposed road link through Park View to Woodstock will merely encourage what can only be termed a vehicular "rat run" through the centre of Park View's housing. This contravenes efforts to reduce CO2 emissions which is meant to be current Government policy to combat Climate Change.
6. The early morning school drop off to the Marlborough and Primary schools, already results in chaos and congestion along the Shipton Road. This is set to increase with the volumes of housing being proposed overall by Blenheim.
7. Blenheim's proposal includes a traffic report on the possible adverse effect of increases in congestion due to additional cars using the main arterial roads. However, these observational surveys, which concluded that the additional housing would not cause significantly more congestion, did not take place during the time of any of Blenheim's many Event Days. Visitor numbers to Blenheim are about 1million persons per annum. For a busy Event (eg Horse trials), visitor numbers of around 26,000 people per day are expected. At the last count (pre-Covid), there were about 194 Event days during a year. The roads around Woodstock are already swamped with traffic at these times. More houses and more cars will be unsustainable to our community.
8. How affordable is "affordable"? Probably, not as much as it could be.

If Blenheim already own the land and therefore do not have these acquisition costs to subtract from their profit levels, surely there should be more flexibility for them to increase the numbers of, and/or the affordability of, their houses for local people. If more houses are required, then it is more truly affordable homes which are really what is needed. 50% maybe? There has to be capacity for this because Blenheim already owns the land.

9. The potential loss to the local environment is too obvious to delineate. It is both an agricultural loss and an environmental one. It will also provide another argument in the future to join Woodstock to Begbroke, Yarnton and thence to Kidlington. This is a disaster for our Green spaces. It would be irreversible.

In CONCLUSION :

Woodstock would be overwhelmed by these proposals if they are allowed. This small market town is caught in a pincer movement between the needs of Cherwell District Council and those of West Oxfordshire District Council, both seeking to overload as many of their Government imposed house building obligations as possible on to Woodstock. The development is unsustainable for this community in so many ways. If allowed, Blenheim (with Cherwell's backing in this instance), will be destroying the historic identity of Woodstock for future generations seeking to live here. This would be a tragedy.

I OBJECT wholeheartedly.

NB:

Although I am a Town Councillor and Deputy Mayor of Woodstock, I write this Comment in my personal capacity only.

Received Date

30/07/2022 16:33:45

Attachments