

Comments for Planning Application 14/02063/OUT

Application Summary

Application Number: 14/02063/OUT

Address: Land East Of Woodstock Oxford Road Woodstock Oxfordshire

Proposal: Hybrid Planning Application for a mixed-use development comprising: Outline Planning Application for up to 1,500 dwellings, including affordable housing and up to a 150 unit care village (C2) with associated publicly accessible ancillary facilities; site for a new primary school; up to 930sqm of retail space; up to 7,500sqm locally led employment (B1/B2/B8) including link and ride; site for a Football Association step 5 football facility with publicly accessible ancillary facilities; public open space; associated infrastructure, engineering and ancillary works, (all matters reserved except for means of access to the development); and Full planning application for the development of Phase 1 at the south western corner of the site for the erection of 29 residential dwellings (29 of the 1,500 described above) with associated open space, parking and landscaping; with vehicular access provided from Upper Campsfield Road (A4095), Shipton Road and Oxford Road (A44)

Case Officer: Catherine Tetlow

Customer Details

Name: Mr Declan Doran

Address: 2 Princes Ride, Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1UP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affect local ecology
- Design and layout
- Highways
- Landscape
- Neighbourliness
- Other - give details
- Policy / Principle

Comment: This proposed development is completely the wrong size and shape for the historic town of Woodstock. It would result more or less in a continuous line of development from Woodstock to Oxford, effectively making Woodstock a suburb of Oxford. The resulting pressure from this development and the other major developments being proposed in the area on the already seriously congested A44 into Oxford would be horrendous. The A44 narrows to a single lane from the Turnpike pub over the bridge to the roundabout before hitting the disaster zone of the Pear Tree and Wolvercote roundabouts. There are no proposals as far as I am aware to sort this out with the only proposed solution being more bus services which everyone knows will have

very little impact as most people are simply far too wedded to their cars. The development would appear to free up the current football club site in Woodstock which would then in turn come under pressure to be built on. An additional primary school is being proposed in close proximity to the existing. Why? Everyone knows it is more costly to run two schools rather than one. If the new primary school replaces the existing then the site of the old primary school in turn will come under pressure for development. There has been no mention of what would need to be done in terms of secondary school provision bearing in mind that the current secondary school has limited sensible possibilities with regard to expansion and as a result of recent and pending developments access is already very problematic. The proposed development should not be called Woodstock East as it lies South of Woodstock and the bulk of it is more or less in line with Bladon so probably Bladon East is more appropriate with any small development near Woodstock just being part of Woodstock with no special name. The reason the developers want Woodstock in the name is because it will enable them to charge more making the supposedly affordable homes even more unaffordable. The historic town of Woodstock should be allowed to evolve gradually in all directions rather than suddenly have a whole new town the same size again dumped on the side of it more or less overnight. 15 to 20 years is more or less overnight in evolutionary terms. Woodstock is still working on resolving the issues from recent developments with more pending e.g. schools, doctors, parking, traffic etc. This development simply cannot be allowed to go ahead in its proposed form. I object to the way the developers have approached this exercise by getting people to vent their feelings via their marketing exercise knowing that many people will think they have formally objected via the planning process when they haven't. The developers should be forced to write individually to all respondents making it clear and also explaining that if people do object and the plan is changed and resubmitted they will need to object again. Many developers submit an application to get the objections in and then pull the application before it goes to committee and resubmit a slightly different application to which many people don't comment on because they think they have already