

**Alan Hearne – 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022**

Given CDC has not met its own deadline for determining this application and, according to Alex Chrusiak's email to me of 28/11/2022, there is no revised determination/committee date, to call representations currently being made "late" seems unreasonable. In any event, I believe you have a legal obligation to take account of all representations made up to the time the application is determined. Given this, it would seem appropriate to put any email representations such as this, any further information from the applicants and all further consultation responses on your website. How else will those affected know what is being proposed?

This is a supplementary objection to this application by me as a long term resident of Woodstock. I believe it should be treated in the same way as all other objections you have not categorised as "late". I also believe that you should pay particular attention to representations from Woodstock residents, our Town Council and WODC, as the town would be significantly impacted by this scheme and we have no CDC councillor to represent our interests.

Following my EOI request 677678 you kindly released, among other documents, Linda's email to Pearce Gunne-Jones (representing the applicant) of 12 October 2022., summarising your views on the application.

Amongst other things this email considers (page 2) the land supply issue and the "tilted balance". In this context I would like to draw attention to footnote 9 of the current NPPF. The first part of this footnote, of course, deals with the 5 yr land supply. However, the second part goes on to deal with the Housing Delivery Test (HDT). Although CDC only currently has a 3.5 yr housing land supply for the period 2022-27, you easily meet the 3 yr HDT of 75%. In fact, the monitoring reports published on your website show you have achieved just over 100%. I believe this negates the need to tilt the balance in favour of development. At the very least it must affect the way the balance is applied.

Of course, we now know the Govt has announced it intends to change its policy requiring LAs to maintain 5 yr land supplies. Having announced this in principle on 5 December, draft revisions to the NPPF, as well as a draft consultation " Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy" were published on 23 December with the consultation period ending on 2 March. I understand it is the Govt's intention to publish new policy documents shortly after that.

Specifically in relation to the "tilted balance" referred to above, the draft amendments to footnote 9 in the NPPF weaken the 5yr supply point and make it easier to achieve the HDT. So my point would be strengthened if these amendments were to be finally adopted.

More generally, the approach by the Govt in these drafts represents a fundamental change to planning, including a significant downgrading of the importance of housing targets and 5yr land supply. In that context it cannot be appropriate, when you easily meet the HDT, to grant PP for 500 houses on land which has never been allocated for development, which was recently rejected by an independent inspector for inclusion in your Oxford Unmet Housing Need LP Review and was also rejected for development by your Council in 2015.

600 houses were allocated to Woodstock in the current WO LP. That was done after careful consideration and clearly represented the LP inspector's view of the sustainable limit to development of the town. Another 500 houses, wherever located and however well designed, would overwhelm the town and its already inadequate services. In fact, the location and design of this development is simply appalling. Although it's residents would look to Woodstock as their local town the reality is that to get from this separate bubble of development to the town centre or other facilities would require car journeys and parking, when, of course, there is already a gross shortage

of parking in town. The residents would not be able to register with the doctors in town, because they are already overwhelmed. The application makes no serious provision for any additional social facilities for the town and the early S106 discussions seem to suggest that contributions would not be made to rectifying these chronic shortfalls, because they will be made to Cherwell DC.

This application should be rejected. The applicants have already put forward this part of its land holding (in fact a much bigger area) for development as part of the next Cherwell DC LP review. If Blenheim really thinks it can create a sustainable development, compatible with the new Govt planning policy, on this site, let them test it in front of another independent LP inspector.

Dr Alan Hearne

The Old Town House  
9 Park Street  
Woodstock  
OX20 1SJ