

# 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>	Linda Griffiths
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Michael Gorick
<b>Address</b>	118A Grove Road,Bladon
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>1 I object to this application and it should again be rejected including, but not exclusively, on the following grounds.</p> <p>2 There is no reasonable or logical case for reconsidering this application as there is no change to the circumstances surrounding the previously understood to be permanently rejected application.</p> <p>3 NO factual evidence is available to support claimed benefits to Woodstock and Bladon. This together with other beneficial claims is aspirational and therefore invalid.</p> <p>4 The application is not in general supported by the local community.</p> <p>5 Previous developments have not proved to improve benefits according to local traders so there is no reason to accept this claim.</p> <p>6 The main beneficiaries are to Blenheim raising cash. The benefits in the proposal are therefore misleading &amp; not genuinely in the public interest.</p> <p>7 The proposals are not supported by the infrastructure which is already under severe pressure, (doctors, roads, schools, libraries, etc.).</p> <p>8 As far as the writer is aware the substantial target for housing development in West Oxfordshire has been achieved. The proposal however affects Woodstock and Bladon far more than other areas of Cherwell who is yet to succeed in their own target. This anomaly should be taken into account in the interest of democratic cooperation.</p> <p>9 Harm would be caused to the approach to Woodstock and Bladon which is a condition of a world Heritage site.</p> <p>10 The proposal only achieves further urbanisation and creeping development such as this ruins the much valued and visited Cotswold landscape.</p> <p>11 The park and ride facility is an unusual and odd site for such a facility which would normally be located at a transport hub or to relieve pressure on a city centre. It would lead to increased traffic pollution and safety problems on top of the recent developments especially overloading the unsuitable village road through the A4095 which is already NOT suitable as an A road. The fact that it is adjacent to the growing and increasing airport where there have already been planning development problems also arouses disclosure questions.</p> <p>12 Proposals that Hanborough station is to have increased rail connections which is cited but without explanation to support the proposal. This proposal will add to road congestion problems on the A 4095 .</p> <p>13 Blenheim claims the proposed site has no value or significant scenic value. This is incorrect as the greenfield site produces corn and other crops as well as sitting on a Roman archeological site.</p> <p>14 Blenheim's claim that they are contributing to global warming reduction is unsubstantiated. e.g their proposed plantings will not compensate for the destruction of existing vegetation by replacing it with "concrete and tarmac".</p> <p>The production of building materials for the proposed development far outweighs any partial reintroduction of proposed tree planting and landscaping creating an urban environment.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	01/08/2022 19:09:43
<b>Attachments</b>	