

Comment for planning application 25/01510/OUT

Application Number	<input type="text" value="25/01510/OUT"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Land South Of Perdiswell Farm Shipton Road Shipton On Cherwell"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="Outline planning application for the erection of up to 500 dwellings and commercial floorspace (Use Class E) with associated access, open space and infrastructure - All Matters Reserved except for Access"/>
Case Officer	<input type="text" value="Jason Traves"/>
Organisation	<input type="text" value=""/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Owen Davies"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="9 Rosamund Drive,Woodstock,OX20 1YD"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<p>How is it that a new medical practice at the site of the old police station can be rejected for "not having the capacity for a potential larger population in the future", but the population is allowed to grow without any capacity in the infrastructure to support it? You cannot employ one argument without the other, and in ignoring this you prove the sentiment that locals have about this issue: the building of new houses has reached the point of absurdity in Woodstock.</p> <p>The population has doubled in size, but none of the infrastructure has. The GP was already at capacity before any of the new developments, but now it's overwhelmed, and has literally fallen apart. Both schools are oversubscribed. The co-op is not fit for the number of people who need to buy food, so everyone has to go further afield for a full shop. This is now 1000s of people without adequate, accessible food supply and services. There's limited health/leisure facilities. And there are no new local businesses outside of the existing ones on the highstreet. All of this forces people to drive away from town for essentials -- meaning not only is the soul of the small town disappearing, but the roads, which are already dangerously busy all through the day and causing massive delays during peak times, are going to be even busier. Most of the smaller roads in the area are barely suitable for two cars to pass one another.</p> <p>The town has not grown naturally. Services and jobs often lag behind houses or vice versa. You need a full-town plan to organically, safely grow it -- develop a small bit, grow the population a small amount, have time to spot issues in the infrastructure (waste, water supply, roads, services...). Fix those. Then continue. As it stands, the quantity of houses has grown exponentially over the last few years, without any time for the rest of the town to naturally follow. Which means every service is now lacking -- GP, schools, jobs, leisure, electricity blackouts in old Woodstock, parking, flooding on the newer development on Banbury road, sewage, the list goes on. And any suitable areas where you could build these new services are now being pushed further afield from the people who need it and will not form part of a cohesive town centre -- this plan will now push Woodstock up against the airport (which will be the only thing separating it from merging with Kidlington), Blenheim on the other side, leaving only fields to the North and West, some of which are unsuitable due to drainage issues. Any new surgery, which has been promised for years, is now going to be outside anywhere useful for the people who need it most, as the prime building areas are taken up with suburban sprawl -- no corner shops or town squares, no community spaces, no reason to stay or visit. That is suburban sprawl by definition.</p> <p>We do not need the houses. There are no new jobs in the town. The argument is that demand is high -- well yes, it's a small town, with a safe community, surrounded by beautiful countryside. Obviously demand is high. Those things making it desirable should be cherished and preserved. If the demand was due to other factors -- e.g. most cities have high housing demand because people want to move there for work and social life -- then it would be a completely different argument, and houses should be built. But Woodstock's demand is in its small-town, countryside charm. Remove that and you remove its reason for being.</p> <p>And all of this is even before the argument that the natural landscape and farming practices need to be preserved for generations to come, as they have been for hundreds of years prior. Once done, this cannot be undone, which wipes out years of generational care for our</p>

natural landscape. Growth is inherently unsustainable, and having already surpassed local housing targets, Blenheim Estates should return to a focus on maintaining its natural surroundings, as it has an obligation to do so as custodians of this land -- a UNESCO world heritage site.

The fact that this application is being put forward by a private company, seeking profit, says everything. This is not for the betterment of Woodstock, because every other issue is currently more pressing than housing. There is little to no profit from building necessary infrastructure, but there's plenty of quick profit in building houses. If this application came alongside a properly laid out, genuine plan for the growth of the town, then I think there would be little objection to it. People would even welcome it. Do what's right for the people who already live in Woodstock.

Received Date

18/06/2025 21:45:16

Attachments