

**Woodstock Town Council**  
**Formal Objection and Response**  
**Planning Application 25/01510/OUT (KID1)**  
**Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton-on-Cherwell**

From: Woodstock Town Council

To: Cherwell District Council – Planning & Development Management

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> January 2026

**Decision of Woodstock Town Council: OBJECTION**

## **Executive Summary**

Woodstock Town Council maintains a very strong objection to this development. While the application has been subject to revisions (notably within the Environmental Statement text and supporting Design & Access / parameter material), the Council's view is that the changes do not resolve the fundamental strategic issues. The principal grounds of this additional objection are summarised below.

- **Education**
  - **Education and school capacity:** no deliverable, agreed and sustainable solution is secured for primary school places. Woodstock CE Primary School is already at or above practical capacity, cannot be extended, and forecast demand exceeds capacity.
  - **Sustainable development and school travel:** Due to lack of capacity at Woodstock CE Primary School the development is likely to place many primary-age children beyond the statutory 2-mile walking distance. This would trigger ongoing home-to-school transport costs for Oxfordshire County Council and incentivise vehicular travel, contrary to the social, economic and environmental principles of sustainable development.
  - **Lack of contingency for primary school provision:** there is no reasonable, costed contingency plan for the scenario in which Begbroke primary school capacity (PR8) and/or expansion of William Fletcher Primary School is not delivered in the required timescales.
  - **Admissions and community impact:** accommodating Perdiswell Farm pupils would likely require altering designated areas so that Perdiswell Farm does not displace Old Woodstock/Hill Rise residents at Woodstock CE Primary School; this would require consultation under the School Admissions Code and would create a negative social impact by splitting closely adjacent communities between different schools.
- **Drainage, wastewater and sewage:** the Environmental Statement Addendum is considered vague on wastewater management; sewage disposal issues must be fully resolved before occupation. Upgrades should aim to eliminate (not merely reduce) raw sewage discharges during heavy rainfall, taking account of climate change and more frequent extreme events.
- **Transport and bus access via Park View:** the revised material indicates only buses will be able to access the site entrance from Park View, but the routing, service type and frequency are unclear. The Council is not satisfied that the proposed bus arrangements are credible or secured.

- **Heritage and landscape:** the development contributes to creeping urbanisation south of Woodstock, affects long-distance views, and—together with Park View—would further change the approach to Woodstock and the World Heritage Site from the south.
- **Cumulative impacts on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site:** there is a serious cumulative effect with the proposed Botley West Solar Farm. Taken together, large-scale housing to the north-east of Blenheim Park and extensive solar infrastructure to the south-west risks more than minimal harm to the setting of the World Heritage Site when “setting” is taken in its widest sense.
- **Revisions and planning control:** the Council considers that the revisions described (updated illustrative masterplan, parameter plans, ‘Green way,’ strengthened boundary narrative, bus gate to Park View, and ‘proving layout’ pages) are largely detail-led and do not materially alter the planning balance. Any parameter plan changes should be treated as material and require appropriate re-consultation and re-testing through updated evidence.

## Background and status of revisions

Woodstock Town Council (WTC) notes that revisions to the application appear to apply mainly to the text of the Environmental Statement accompanying the outline application, and that the layout and other details of the outline scheme appear broadly unchanged. The Council’s substantive objections, set out previously during consultation, remain applicable and are reinforced by the points below.

### 1. Education and school capacity

(based upon OCC Education consultee comments)

OCC Education has indicated that parts of the existing designated area that are expected to be negatively impacted include Wootton-by-Woodstock (where the primary school closed over a year ago), Begbroke and Old Woodstock. OCC identified the most significant concern as the Old Woodstock area, including the permitted Hill Rise development, where if residents are not able to secure places at Woodstock CE Primary School, children would be unable to attend school in their own community and would require vehicular transport to the nearest available school, at a cost to the County Council. OCC and WTC note that this is contrary to the social, economic and environmental principles of sustainable development.

Woodstock Town Council endorses this principle and, highlights the fact that like Hill Rise, if Perdiswell Farm children are not able to secure places at Woodstock CE Primary School, they would be unable to attend school in their own community and would require vehicular transport to their nearest available school—again contrary to sustainable development principles. It is disappointing that there will be insufficient capacity in Woodstock, as both the community and children benefit from the involvement of children and parents in community activities in which the school is located.

**Woodstock Town Council objection: School provision for this site is contrary to the social, economic and environmental principles of sustainable development.**

Furthermore OCC Education has stated that there is no confirmed timescale for delivery of the new Begbroke primary schools, nor for the expansion of William Fletcher Primary School (Yarnton). If the

necessary additional capacity is not available in time, the County Council may incur even more additional cost to transport Perdiswell Farm pupils to the next nearest available school.

Woodstock Town Council considers there is a strong likelihood that additional Begbroke primary school capacity will not be available by the time that the Perdiswell Farm development will start to be occupied. **WTC requests that OCC Education produce a plan for such an eventuality; without such a plan we believe that OCC should object to the development.** The ‘nearest available school’ should be identified and assurances given that Perdiswell Farm school children will have places available. It is likely that more than one school will be involved, so transport costs should also be calculated. It is likely that the nearest available school(s) will be over three miles away, which is untenable. OCC has also stated that Begbroke school provision may well lag behind Begbroke housing developments and that Woodstock Primary School might need to take schoolchildren from the Begbroke developments – which clearly may well not be possible.

**Woodstock Town Council objection: No reasonable contingency plan is provided for the situation where Begbroke schools will not be available within required timescales.**

OCC Education has stated that, while travel distance cannot be exactly measured until road layouts are confirmed, it is likely the nearest new school would be more than two miles but less than three miles for new homes. This means children under eight years old would qualify for free home-to-school transport, which would be an ongoing cost to the County Council, and would also discourage walking, increasing vehicular transport—again contrary to sustainable development.

**Woodstock Town Council objection: It is contrary to the social, economic and environmental principles of sustainable development that educational provision is not within the statutory 2-mile walking distance for younger children.**

OCC Education has stated that, because the proposed development is not of a scale which can include an on-site primary school, its school provision needs are dependent on the strategic allocation at Begbroke (PR8), which includes two sites for new primary schools. OCC suggests that one school will be entirely required for, and funded by, PR8, and that the other would provide an opportunity to create sufficient additional capacity to also meet the needs of this proposed development, with Perdiswell Farm funding additional primary and early years capacity in line with forecast pupil generation.

Woodstock Town Council notes that the two sites for new primary schools in Begbroke have been allocated to provide capacity for new Begbroke housing developments (PR8). There is no mention in the Cherwell Local Plan that these schools are being provided to satisfy demand from Perdiswell Farm. OCC Education’s statement that the second school would provide an opportunity to meet Perdiswell Farm needs appears to be a supposition, with no formal agreement from Cherwell District Council.

**Woodstock Town Council objection: No formal agreement exists that planned Begbroke schools will accommodate schoolchildren from the Perdiswell Farm site.**

**Additional Woodstock Town Council observations include:** the centre of the Perdiswell Farm development is approximately a 13-minute (safe) walking time from Woodstock Primary School; however, despite this proximity, school planning is likely to separate children from the Park View

development (300 houses) and Perdiswell Farm (500 houses) into different schools even though the developments are approximately 200 metres apart. For most intents and purposes—apart from school provision—the Perdiswell Farm development would function as a suburb of Woodstock, and splitting school communities will have a negative social impact.

### **Woodstock CE Primary School capacity evidence**

OCC’s stated plan is for Woodstock Primary School’s designated area to be just Woodstock Town, and OCC has noted that changing designated areas would be subject to consultation under the government’s Admissions Code. OCC has indicated that non-designated area schoolchildren may need to be displaced.

**Woodstock CE Primary School has a maximum capacity of 420 places and cannot be extended. (OCC figures)**

Start of 2024/25 school year (OCC figures):

326 = on roll at start of 2024/5 school year

Predicted places required for new developments

- 30 = to come from Park View (OCC estimate)
- 57 = to come from Hill Rise (OCC estimate)
- 70 = to come from Banbury Rd (OCC estimate)

Hence Total 483 = predicted demand compared to 420 capacity (note 59 were out of designated area)

More recent figures (as cited):

355 = on roll as of November 2025

Predicted places required for new developments

- 30 = to come from Park View
- 57 = to come from Hill Rise (OCC estimate)
- 70 = to come from Banbury Rd (OCC estimate)

Hence a total predicted demand 512 compared to 420 capacity.

Woodstock Primary School is already in the position that it will not be able to cater for predicted demand. A large number of recently immigrated schoolchildren has been noted, and immigration may more than offset reduced birth-rate trends over the next ten years. No allowance appears to have been made for any possible increase in Woodstock’s school-age population, which is considered a likely scenario given housing proposals submitted to the emerging West Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan.

**Woodstock Town Council objection: Woodstock Primary School cannot cater for probable increases to Woodstock’s population growth, and no alternative contingent solution has been put forward by OCC.**

### 3. Transport and bus access via Park View

The Council notes that the Environmental Statement Addendum indicates that only buses will be able to access the entrance to the site from Park View. However, it is not clear from where buses would approach to reach this junction. The Council asks whether this is intended to be a regular service bus or only a bus serving school arrivals and departures. Currently, buses do not run through Park View.

**Woodstock Town Council requests clear confirmation of the routeing assumptions and frequency of any proposed services (including clarification of how any existing services—such as the S7—are intended to operate in practice), together with enforcement arrangements for any bus-only access, before planning permission is considered.**

### 4. Drainage, sewage and environmental protection

Woodstock Town Council notes extensive references within the Environmental Statement Addendum to sewage and water discharges (including points described as NTS 22 and 23). Given other development occurring in the area, it is vital that sewage disposal issues are fully resolved before any home can be inhabited.

**The Council considers that upgrading infrastructure merely to decrease the number of discharges of raw sewage at Hanborough should not be the ambition. Upgrading should aim to remove all discharges of raw sewage during heavy rainfall.** Developers must take account of climate change and the rising frequency of what were historically described as ‘one in a hundred year’ weather events. Any discharge of raw sewage is unacceptable in terms of human enjoyment of the countryside and is damaging to wildlife in local rivers.

Overall, WTC considers that the papers remain vague about management of wastewater and sewage, with the justification that this is an outline application. However, the text gives an underlying impression that the developers are not confident in their plans for wastewater disposal. **Woodstock Town Council believes that the application must be much more explicit in order to give confidence to the planning process and to local residents who experience the impact of sewage discharges when they occur.**

### 5. Heritage, landscape character and cumulative impacts (including Botley West)

Woodstock Town Council notes that the Environmental Statement Addendum repeats, in several places, points about Historic England’s queries regarding the cumulative effect of the proximity of the proposed Botley West Solar Farm and this proposal at Perdiswell Farm. These two proposals are close enough to be of direct concern to residents, visitors and tourists. The Council notes the existing presence of smaller solar farms in the area which have generally been modest, less obvious from homes and more readily screened by established hedgerows. Against this context, the scale and combined effect of Botley West and Perdiswell Farm is materially different.

The Council further notes that the landowners connected to Botley West and this Perdiswell Farm development are the same and are also associated with the Trust for the World Heritage Site of Blenheim.

While the two proposals may not be immediately adjacent, they come close to one another and will inevitably affect the setting of the World Heritage Site across the road from this development. There would be fields of solar panels to the south-west of Blenheim Park and, to the north-east of the Park, the homes of this development.

The horizon when approaching north along the A44 has already been changed by the rows of Park View homes being visible even before reaching the Bladon roundabout (A44 crossing the A4095). The Perdiswell application, located south-east of the almost completed 300 Park View homes, would become prominent in the view to the north-east when approaching Woodstock from the south. The presence of three-storey buildings in the middle of the development would contribute further to the visual presence of the dwellings and to the perception of urbanisation creeping south, linking the communities of Woodstock and Bladon.

The Addendum's mock-up views suggest the dwellings will be barely visible. The Council notes that many photographs are taken from the west side of the Bladon roundabout; because Park View homes are visible in the distance on relevant photographs, the Perdiswell development would be closer and thus more obvious. While the developers indicate that strategic planting will hide the development, this part of the District is notable for long-distance views across fields to the south and, in some places, views across Oxford to the hills beyond. The Council considers that 500 homes 'hiding in vegetation' would be highly invasive to enjoyment of the current landscape. A village of 500 households with over approximately 1,000 residents, plus commercial properties all masked by trees is a vastly different prospect to good agricultural land that provides a rural scene as well as needed home-grown crops at a time when the UK needs to grow more of its own food.

In relation to Botley West, the Council notes statements suggesting that once the solar farm is decommissioned the countryside will return to its former state. The Council does not accept this. Botley West proposes footpaths and hedges between high fences to hide panels; it is unclear whether such changes would be removed. More significantly, Botley West may take around two years to construct and does not yet have permission. It may take a similar time to decommission after 40 years, amounting to almost 45 years of impact for local people and for residents of these homes—many of whom may not see any claimed 'return' to open countryside.

**Accordingly, the Council considers that decommissioning is irrelevant to the assessment of this Perdiswell Farm proposal. Both proposals together would, as stated in the Council's original objection, cause more than minimal harm to the setting of the World Heritage Site if, as UNESCO guidance requires, 'setting' is considered in its widest sense and not solely whether Blenheim Park can see the development or vice versa.** The combined effect risks placing the World Heritage Site in the midst of urbanising and industrial development (including associated cabling and regular boosting posts, which the Council understands may be noisy) rather than the grand successor to the Royal Manor House located within its historic manor of ancient villages. **The Council is concerned this could**

**influence the attraction of the World Heritage Site for tourists, who provide substantial income to the District.**

Furthermore Woodstock Town Council is very much in agreement with the comments made by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) in its further response to the developer's "Response to Highway Authority," particularly in relation to Sustainable Transport and connectivity and Highways.' OCC Highways suggest that an access for pedestrians to Shipton Road is probably necessary and close to the Cowells Road junction is probably realistic. However, Woodstock Town Council must stress that, although shorter than access to schools than via Park View for the Perdiswell Farm residents, the Shipton Road in the area of Cowells Road has no footpath, it is fairly narrow for two cars and has two blind right angle bends in close proximity and where motorists are frequently having "close shaves" with cars coming from the other direction. Unless there is considerable work on the highway to make it safe and suitable for pedestrians it should not be considered a safe walk to the Schools.

## **6. Response to revised submission material (Planning Statement vs DAS updates)**

The Council has reviewed the Planning Statement submitted in support of the outline application and notes the applicant's subsequent summary of Design & Access Statement (DAS) updates describing changes made to the Illustrative Masterplan (IMP), parameter plans, and access/movement narrative.

The Council notes the following changes were stated as being provided in response to officer requests: updated IMP with consequential updates; updated parameter plans; addition of a 'Green way' section; updates to access and movement narrative including a strengthened boundary; a plan showing a 'bus gate' to Park View; and updated 'proving layout' pages.

Woodstock Town Council acknowledges that these changes may improve internal coherence of the illustrative material. However, the Council considers that they do not resolve the principal strategic concerns. The revisions appear detail-led rather than issue-led; the introduction of a bus gate and revised access approach may materially affect traffic distribution and therefore must be supported by updated transport evidence and enforceable delivery mechanisms; and any changes to parameter plans should be treated as material and should trigger appropriate re-consultation because they define the envelope for future reserved matters. The Council also considers that 'Green way' and boundary strengthening measures require clarity on function, ownership, management and enforceability if they are to provide meaningful mitigation.

## **7. Conclusion and request to the Cherwell District Council**

For the reasons set out above, Woodstock Town Council maintains its original objection to planning application 25/01510/OUT (KID1).

Furthermore if Cherwell District, as the Local Planning Authority, is minded to proceed, Woodstock Town Council requests that Cherwell ensure that the plans are modified to provide:

- A deliverable and agreed education strategy, including an identified ‘nearest available school’ (or schools), confirmed places for Perdiswell Farm children, and a costed contingency plan if Begbroke capacity is delayed.
- Clarity on designated area proposals to ensure Perdiswell Farm does not displace children of Old Woodstock/Hill Rise residents, including evidence of how any Admissions Code consultation would be managed.
- Explicit, enforceable wastewater and sewage solutions before occupation, designed to eliminate raw sewage discharges, even during heavy rainfall and fully address increased climate change risk.
- Clear, evidenced and secured public transport proposals for any bus-only access via Park View (routing, frequency, service type, and enforcement).
- Updates of parameter plans and access/movement changes as they will potentially be material, undertake appropriate re-consultation, and ensure impacts are re-evaluated through updated evidence.
- A robust assessment of cumulative impacts, including the proposed Botley West Solar Farm, and also considers the setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site in its widest sense.

### **Additional Note: Cross-District Impacts, Infrastructure Dependency and Allocation of Developer Contributions**

Although this is not a comment on the outline application as it stands Woodstock Town Council wishes to draw particular attention to the cross-district implications of the proposed KID1 development, should it be approved. While the application site lies within Cherwell District Council, the functional reality is that the development would be heavily dependent on Woodstock, which lies within West Oxfordshire District Council, for the majority of its day-to-day services and infrastructure.

In practical terms, residents of the proposed development would rely on Woodstock as their primary service centre for education (including primary and secondary schooling), health services, leisure and recreation, retail and local shops, community facilities and amenities, and wider supporting infrastructure.

This functional relationship is already evident from the evidence submitted in support of the application and from Oxfordshire County Council’s consultee comments, particularly in relation to education and transport. For most intents and purposes, the development would operate as a suburban extension of Woodstock, notwithstanding the administrative boundary between Cherwell and West Oxfordshire.

Given this dependency, Woodstock Town Council considers it essential that Section 106 obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions associated with the development are explicitly structured and allocated to support infrastructure and services within and around Woodstock, where the impacts will be experienced.

The Council is concerned that, without clear recognition of this cross-boundary reality, there is a risk that developer contributions could be allocated solely within Cherwell District or applied in ways that

do not mitigate the real impacts on Woodstock and its residents. Such an outcome would be inconsistent with the principles of sustainable development and with the purpose of developer contributions, which are intended to mitigate the impacts of development where they actually arise.

Examples of S106 supported projects that could be considered for Woodstock are:

- Woodstock Outdoor Pool Improvements £500,000
- Gymnasium (Extension to Woodstock Outdoor Pool) £400,000
- Skate Park provision and 15 year maintenance £250,000
- Bowls and Tennis Club improvements £100,000
- Cost of purchasing land to house sport and recreation facilities £320,000

Woodstock Town Council therefore requests that:

- the role of Woodstock as the principal service centre for the development is formally recognised in the planning process.
- Section 106 and CIL contributions are explicitly capable of being directed to infrastructure and service provision in Woodstock notwithstanding district boundaries.
- that mechanisms for cross-district allocation of funding are clearly identified and secured through the legal agreements associated with any permission.
- and that Woodstock Town Council's role in identifying local priorities is recognised and the application of relevant funds is recognised and respected, in line with its statutory role as the local council closest to the affected community.

The Council notes that, should Local Government Reorganisation proceed as currently proposed, with the amalgamation of Cherwell and West Oxfordshire into a single unitary.