

Response Date: 09/02/2023

**Application Number:** 22/01715/OUT

**Location:** Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton-on-Cherwell

**Proposal:** Erection of up to 500 dwellings and infrastructure

---

Bladon Parish Council's (BPC's) previous **objection** and comments on the above proposal still stands. BPC feels that the developer has not addressed all the objections originally raised by BPC and has remained silent on certain objections raised.

BPC feels that the application should be **refused** as it will create increased pressure on the local area without providing adequate mitigation and will remove the last green buffer between Bladon and Woodstock and Kidlington.

The developer is required to provide the infrastructure to mitigate the impact of their development and the application should be refused if the impact cannot be mitigated. A financial contribution does not mitigate the impact of the development if there is no feasible scheme for it to be spent on.

The offer of S106 contributions is only acceptable as mitigation if the developer is able to provide a viable and sustainable solution to offset the impacts the contributions are being offered towards. This means that the developer should provide a solution rather than just suggesting that paying a financial contribution is acceptable mitigation. If the developer is only required to make a financial contribution, the problem of providing a solution passes to the local authority. As no solution has been provided alongside an offer of S106 contribution, this is what will happen if this development is approved.

BPC requests that its original response still be considered. Should Cherwell District Council be minded to grant permission for the application, BPC requests that the mitigation detailed in the final part of BPC's original response, still be considered.

---

## Summary

BPC has reviewed the new supporting documents provided as part of the re-consultation and feels that the additional information provided does not adequately deal with the concerns raised by the parish.

The main objections raised by BPC were:

- 1) Location of the development having an adverse effect on the openness of the area, incursion into the open countryside and the coalescence of the two currently distinct settlements of Woodstock and Bladon.
- 2) Increased traffic through Bladon with no mitigation
- 3) Unacceptable impact on local infrastructure and services (used by Bladon residents) in Woodstock.

- 4) The ineligibility of local residents to apply for affordable housing on the development due to living in West Oxfordshire.

It should be noted that within the “Planning Response Note” the developer has decided to only acknowledge one of the objections that BPC has raised. Under para 1.52 they stated that the principal basis for the objection is the perceived traffic impact on Bladon village. They have not acknowledged BPC’s concerns regarding the effect on the open countryside, including coalescence, or the concerns regarding infrastructure and affordable housing.

BPC does acknowledge that in the developer’s response to other consultees’ comments, contained in the additional information provided, they do touch on some of the concerns raised by BPC, such as impact of the development on the landscape and some of the infrastructure concerns. BPC has grave concerns about the developer’s silence on the issue of coalescence and affordable housing.

Although the response from the developer – Blenheim – regarding the “perceived traffic impact on Bladon village” states “the change of flows cannot be material” and “In the context of the NPPF this cannot be considered as ‘severe’,” BPC would like to bring to the attention of Cherwell District Council the accumulative traffic impact from this proposal and the 5 other recent developments that Blenheim has either built (2 developments) or is proposing to build (3 developments) in Woodstock and Long Hanborough. This single developer – Blenheim – is building or proposing to build more than 1,500 extra houses within 2.5 miles of Bladon in a very short period of time.

For reference the first of these developments to be occupied was Hanborough Gate in the Winter of 2018 and the site was not completed until the middle of 2021. Park View is the second development which was first occupied early in 2020 and is still being marketed and not expected to be completed until 2025, so the full impact for this site is not yet being felt.

Based on the information provided, the forecasted increase in traffic movements from all of these developments at peak time along Grove Road is 23% from the 2019 baseline. This figure does not include any non-Blenheim developments that would also affect Grove Road.

Due to this accumulative impact not being considered, the 23% increase in peak traffic, from a single developer, is not being mitigated. It cannot be correct that a single developer can submit multiple applications in a small geographic area over a short period of time and not be liable to provide mitigation.

BPC requests that this accumulative impact be considered and the impact be mitigated.

Bladon Parish Council’s detailed comments on the additional information are covered in in the next section.

## Detailed Comments on Additional Information

### 1 Location of the Development Having an Adverse Effect on the Surrounding Area

- 1.1 Additional information has been provided regarding the effect of the development on the World Heritage Site, the proposed landscaping and the scale and density of the development. This information also included responses from various statutory consultees.
- 1.2 Although BPC notes that both the Historic England and Cherwell's Landscape Officer do not have any objections to the revised proposal, it still feels that the development will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area.
- 1.3 It should be noted that there are plans along A44 corridor for more housing, and also a Park & Ride and Solar Farm, which will remove many of the adjacent green spaces along the A44. See Annex A for a map showing the developments along this corridor.
- 1.4 The proposed locations of the Park & Ride and the Solar Farm will create further urbanisation of the area and will remove the final open spaces along the A44 nearest Woodstock Roundabout.
- 1.5 Once the proposed developments along the A44 take place, the site would be the final green space before entering Woodstock.
- 1.6 The original green buffer zone was larger until the development known as Park View was built by the same landowner. This proposal is a further intrusion and will remove most of the remaining buffer.
- 1.7 Building upon this green space will remove the individual identity of the surrounding settlements and will create a coalescence of these settlements.
- 1.8 It is therefore important that this green buffer is protected and not built upon.
- 1.9 To protect Bladon from losing its unique identity and to maintain the green buffer between Woodstock and Kidlington, BPC asks that the application be **refused**.

### 2 Increased Traffic Through Bladon

- 2.1 Due to the traffic generation from the Park View development not being included in the original transport assessment calculations, a set of replacement data tables have been provided.
- 2.2 From the figures provided, it appears that Park View will generate 296 movements along Grove Road (Comparison of the changes in Tables 8.6 & 8.7) and 33 AM and 38 PM movements (Comparison of change of baseline data in Table 8.10)
- 2.3 Firstly, there appears to be an error replacement table 8.10.

- 2.4 The original data in Tables 7 and 9 of the Transport Assessment Part 1 confirm that 17% of the traffic will travel along Grove Road and that the peak increase in movements from the site is 268 AM and 273 PM. This equates to an additional **46** AM movements and **47** PM movements along Grove Road. This data has not been updated as part of the resubmission.
- 2.5 The figures in the revised table 8.10 only show an additional **37** AM and **38** PM movements. A reduction of 9 movements on both peaks. This error only occurs against this line of the table, all other lines compared to the previous table are correct. For example, A44 Manor Road has an AM increase of 10 (1112-1102) in the original table and still has an increase of 10 (1137-1127) in the revised table.
- 2.6 There is no reason that movements should have gone down as it was only the base that was adjusted and increased.
- 2.7 This error means the percentage quoted in para 1.56 of the Planning Response Note are understated by just under 1%.
- 2.8 In paras 1.55 & 1.56 of the Planning Response Note, the developer states that the change in flows cannot be material and falls below the threshold set out in the NPPF for requiring mitigation and that no further assessment is warranted. In context of the NPPF this cannot be considered as 'severe'.
- 2.9 It is not clear what threshold in the NPPF is being referred to as there are no figures contained within the NPPF.
- 2.10 It might be that the traffic generated from the development is not classed as 'severe' in its own right, however when taken into account with other developments that Blenheim alone has gained permission for or is attempting to gain permission for since 2017 then the impact is greatly increased.
- 2.11 BPC believes this accumulative impact from a single developer should be considered and the impact mitigated.
- 2.12 The table below shows the additional traffic generation from either Blenheim's proposed developments or recently built developments and the effect on Bladon.

Additional Response from Bladon Parish Council  
22/01715/OUT Land South of Perdiswell Farm / Land East of Park View

Site	Application No.	Developed or Proposed	Number of Dwellings	% Traveling Along A4095 Bladon	AM Peak		PM Peak	
					Total Movements AM	Additional Movements Through Bladon	Total Movements AM	Additional Movements Through Bladon
A - Land South of Witney Road, Long Hanborough	14/1234/P/OP	Developed	169	53	64	34	78	42
B - Land East of Woodstock Oxford Road Woodstock	16/01364/OUT	Developed	300	19	158	33	177	38
C - Land North of Witney Road Long Hanborough	22/01330/OUT	Proposed - Approved	150	73	79	58	73	53
D - Land North of Banbury Road Woodstock	21/00217/OUT	Proposed	235	18	134	24	137	38
E - Land East of Hill Rise Woodstock	21/00189/FUL	Proposed - At Appeal	180	18	96	16	98	16
<b>Total</b>			<b>1034</b>		<b>531</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>187</b>

- 2.13 The increase in the table above combined with the increase from this proposal means that the total increase for AM peak will be 211 (165 + 46) and for PM peak will be 234 (187 +47).
- 2.14 To show the accumulative percentage increase these developments are liable to create, the 2027 baseline needs to be re-calculated back to the 2019 baseline.
- 2.15 It is confirmed in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix F: Transport Assessment that sites C, D and E have been included in the 2027 baseline data. It was also confirmed in the update to the TA that site B has been added to the revised baseline for 2027. It is assumed that site A has also been included in the 2019 baseline that has been adjusted to 2027.
- 2.16 The table below shows that the accumulative impact from these Blenheim developments is a 22.3% increase in the AM peak and a 22.5% increase in the PM peak.

	AM Peak	PM Peak
2027 Baseline Movements as per TA	1113	1226
Less Additional Movements from Table	165	187
<b>Revised Baseline</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>1039</b>
Addition Movements Caused by the Proposal	46	47
Addition Movements Caused by the Sites on the Table	165	187
<b>Total Additional Movement Unmitigated</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>234</b>
% Increase Caused by the Sites on Table	17.4	18.0
% Increase Caused by this Proposal	4.9	4.5
<b>Total % Increase</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>22.5</b>

- 2.17 It should be noted that the two developed sites (A and B) occupied their first house in 2019 and 2020 respectively, so the full impact of all of these developments will be fully felt in a very short time-period by Bladon residents.
- 2.18 BPC believes that this impact should not be ignored, and mitigation should be provided to ensure the safety of the residents of Bladon while walking and cycling in the village. This

could be achieved through the provision of a crossing and other traffic calming measures in the village.

- 2.19 This overall increase in traffic is not being acknowledged by the developer and as such is not being mitigated. Due to this lack of mitigation, BPC asks that the application be **refused**.

### **3 The Lack of Infrastructure Provision**

- 3.1 Woodstock Surgery is over capacity and although the developer has offered to provide an S106 contribution towards increasing capacity, this will only mitigate the impact if there is a viable scheme for the expansion.
- 3.2 If re-locating the GP surgery becomes unfeasible and a replacement solution is not available, then the impact of the development will not have been mitigated and the situation with over-capacity will become worse.
- 3.3 To prevent a further increase in the over-capacity at Woodstock GP surgery, the application should be **refused** unless a feasible project is in place to mitigate the increase in patients.
- 3.4 It should be noted the Long Hanborough GP surgery is already over capacity and is having to split up consultation rooms to be able to see more patients. They do not accept new patients from out of catchment, so the developer's "hope" that existing Woodstock GP patients will move to Long Hanborough GP surgery seems unfeasible.

### **4 The Ineligibility of Local Residents to Apply for Affordable Housing**

- 4.1 As covered in BPC's original response, the location of the site in Cherwell District means that neighbouring residents of Woodstock and Bladon as well as other local villages are likely to be ineligible to apply for affordable housing on the site. This is highlighted in BPC's original response.
- 4.2 The developer has not addressed this issue in any of the documentation provided.
- 4.3 There will be 175 affordable houses on the development, and none will be available to neighbouring residents outside of Cherwell District.
- 4.4 BPC would like to request that a process is put in place to enable residents of those neighbouring parishes to the site not within Cherwell District, to be eligible to apply for affordable housing on the site.

Annex A - Map of Developments

