

This appears to be a lazy, 0/10 for effort, cut-and-paste of the application [22/01715/OUT](#) made in 2022 for the same site.

There are several issues with the documentation. In general, it is out of date and has not been updated since the last submission. Park View is largely ignored and no assessment to the impact on this community is included in any of the assessments.

Even the most cursory glance at the documents provided shows glaring omissions:

Land East of Park View, Utilities

No mention of mobile coverage, only hard-wired telecoms and broadband. Fails to address the complete lack of mobile coverage at Park View, and Woodstock in general. This would be an issue for the new site and no new housing should be permitted until this is addressed. This has been mentioned previously and have been told the issue is due to the proximity to the airport.

Travel plan

Wondering if whoever wrote this document has ever visited the area, looks like it has been (poorly) compiled by AI.

No mention of any impact on the proposed link road on Park View – particularly to Cowells Road/Henrietta Way. Site access is only referred to as via Upper Campsfield Road, which isn't correct if you have a second access via Park View.

Nearest bus stop is described as 800m away at Park View/A44. However, in the drawings in the same report, they have suggested bus stops on Cowells Road, which has never been supported by Stagecoach. Buses would have to navigate through the new Park View square, which isn't designed to support buses. The area is akin to the area outside the Town Hall in Woodstock and buses have been prevented from turning here since one crashed into a building and several pedestrian near-misses.

Train times from Oxford Park Way to London are shown as 57/104 mins. There are no services which show a travel time less than 108 mins with the average between 114/126 mins in the Chiltern timetable.

Mentions the heated swimming pool at Woodstock. This is only heated during school summer holidays and is not open the whole year. It's almost pointless having a pool here – they need to look at a successfully run outdoor pool – such as the Lido at High Wycombe. Oxford has dire / poor quality public swimming provision, unless you are a member of a gym.

So many holes in this document, it is frightening. Usual guff about travel co-ordinators, etc. but this will not happen – it hasn't in the 5 years have lived at Park View. Talks about car-sharing, but it is beyond naïve to suggest that this will happen – of course people can car-share, but in practice, they don't.

Again, no mention of road connecting to Park View – but this will happen and will have an impact on residents.

Design and Access Documentation

Overall, most of these documents fail to address the impact of the link road on the Park View community and its original design. Original planning documents for Park View were approved on the basis any future development on the land east of Woodstock, would be pedestrian/cycle. You can build communities without the need for the link road.

226403_PR10_DAS_REVISSED_JUNE_2025 v2i GREEN lr_Part9

This covers the impact of the proposed link road. There is no mention of the Park View community, only the potential impact on Blenheim as a World Heritage site which will be more than 1k from the link road, which directly connect to Park View.

226403_PR10_DAS_REVISSED_JUNE_2025 v2i GREEN lr_Part4

Out of date document. Refers to Park View as in its early stages of development with 1st phase completed. We are now in year 6 of development with the majority phases completed. Images fail to show green spaces adjacent to Cowells Road as children's play areas and their proximity to what will be very busy rat-runs.

I also note that none of the (many) previously submitted comments are listed – what has happened to these, and will these be taken into consideration?

The below are my comments on the original submission in 2022.

****I have no objection to new housing per se, but I do have concerns about the proposed new development, primarily regarding the link with Park View.**

On reading the various documents relating to this application, it became apparent that at no point in the application has Park View been considered. There is no mention of Cowells Road in any of the traffic assessments and the only mention of it is concerning a proposed link road connecting the two developments. Depending on what document you read, this could be a 'hoggin' pathway or a road of 6.7metres that is wide enough to accommodate buses.

Documents submitted to planning for Phases 1 and 2 of Park View make no mention of a link road for vehicles from development of the PR10 site, only pedestrian and cycle access. It is not until Phase 3 that one word (vehicle) was added to the site plans – indicating that an area is reserved for vehicle access should permission to build be obtained. Residents of the first two phases bought on the understanding that there would be no impact from traffic close to their homes; I wonder if this is being made clear to purchasers in Phase 3 and beyond.

If the connection between the two sites were for vehicle access, it would provide a 'rat run' for traffic particularly if there was congestion on the A44, Shipton Road or the A4095. It would also be a cut-through for delivery drivers, etc. as any Sat Nav would direct you through Park View and the new development. As most people blindly follow Sat Nav, there will be an increase in traffic and the AI that is built-in would 'learn' this route and continue to direct motorists this way. This link also contravenes County policy of encouraging use of main roads rather than diverting traffic through residential areas.

Given that the transport / traffic assessments do not take any of this into account, they cannot be deemed valid and should be undertaken again to include Cowells Road. We are already seeing people using Cowells Road to turn around as they cannot be bothered to drive up to the roundabout to access Blenheim and turning right into Woodstock from Cowells Road is not easy - particularly on event days; adding to this with a link road from /to 500 homes would have a huge impact on Blenheim Estates' 'flagship' development.

Residents of Park View arranged a meeting with Roger File, Property Director and COO at Blenheim to discuss our concerns, we were also fortunate to have Dominic Hare, CEO, attend this meeting. What became clear, was that they 'didn't think this would be a problem' or that 'no one would do this'!

All residents shared the concerns about increased traffic; we have a partially sighted resident who is very concerned at the current level of traffic and the speed of it and I can say that I wholeheartedly share their concern. We have a 91-year-old neighbour who regularly walks into town and many families with young children who have all bought homes in a neighbourhood that they thought would be safe.

Having lived here for almost two years, I can guarantee that this road will be a problem. In addition to the issues mentioned above, there is already an unofficial Park and Ride where the visitor parking should be, particularly on days when the event organisers charge for parking; this is particularly bad during Nocturne and at Christmas for the Illuminated Trail.

I absolutely love living in Woodstock and at Park view and think that Blenheim should be commended for building some wonderful homes. However, we have asked that they take these issues up with their Highways Consultant to find a better way of linking these communities; perhaps limiting to pedestrian and cycle access with emergency vehicle access only from Cowells Road. It is somewhat grating to read Blenheim marketing blurb about birdsong and carbon zero targets when they are seemingly oblivious to the impact extra traffic will have on their existing residents!

Other issues of concern are largely based on the infrastructure in and around Woodstock:

GP Provision

I understand that a site was purchased by Blenheim some years ago and there are ongoing discussions with the relevant parties (NHS, County and Town Councils) about how this can be developed, or another suitable site identified.

I would also add that the Pharmacy does need to be addressed as the lone Pharmacist seems to be overwhelmed. I have had to resort to using an online delivery service, but this is not an option for many.

Schools

We had to appeal so our child could go to Woodstock CE Primary. I know that the intention is for this to be expanded and for the nursery provision to move, but this will easily be taken up by existing residents; where will all the additional children go, will the catchment boundary change, etc? The Marlborough is already increasing its intake this year, but this will soon not be enough to meet the increased demand.

Section 106 funds

As these homes will be in Cherwell, will the money be spent in Cherwell? As this development is on the boundary, there be an expectation to use facilities in Woodstock as opposed to Kidlington, etc. Who will manage the lists for affordable housing and who will be given priority? It really does seem that Cherwell will use this to fulfil a housing need, yet Woodstock will be greatly impacted with potentially no benefit.

Sewerage / Water

I understand that there are already issues with these utilities, so what is proposed to ensure there is not further strain on the existing utilities? **

Having now lived at Park View for 5 years, it has become apparent that Blenheim Estate Homes have very little regard for their residents.

I have been a member of the Residents Group and have had access to members of the Senior Management Team at quarterly meetings. They are good at dealing with issues around the development but are not concerned at all about any impact of this proposed development. As I mentioned before, there is a general view of 'it won't be like that' or 'I don't think people will do that....'.

To compound this, they have sold their affordable housing to a company that has extremely poor reviews and their feedback so far from affected residents is very upsetting to hear. Not so long ago, Blenheim were waxing lyrical about how they were different from other developers and were managing these homes themselves.

There is another meeting with residents, but I am quite sure that this will be used to try and put a positive spin on things and put a big tick on the 'consulted residents' box.

Planning cannot be granted for the application given the many inaccuracies in what has been provided. All supporting documentation needs to be updated and proper assessments on travel, traffic, local amenities and infrastructure in the local area must be carried out.