**From:** Dominic Woodfield   
**Sent:** 27 April 2017 12:56  
**To:** Matthew Parry  
**Cc:** Adrian Colwell; David Peckford; Planning; Charlotte Frizzell; Euesden, Olivia (NE); Matthew Jackson; Haidrun Breith; Neil Clennell; Nigel Bourn; Nick Bowles; Caroline Bulman; David Lowe; Charlotte Watkins  
**Subject:** Re: 15/00837/OUT - Gavray Drive West - Further Environmental Information from applicant

Dear Matthew

Please find attached my response to your latest e-mail and further formal representation on this application.   
  
I note that few of my more recent submissions or cc's to the 'planning' address have been uploaded to the public access file and I would ask that this be remedied please as they concern information of interest to those making submissions.

I am of course happy to continue to discuss the points raised, and no doubt the attached may raise further queries. I am also happy to meet you and/or David Lowe to discuss these ongoing concerns.    
  
I would also be grateful if in due course you could advise me of your current intentions as regards taking this to committee.

Best regards

Dominic

On 25 April 2017 at 09:54, Matthew Parry <[Matthew.Parry@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Parry@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dominic  
  
On the basis that:  
  
1. There are on-site recreational facilities proposed by the developer as well as financial contributions towards other local facilities;  
2. 180 new dwellings in the context of the hundreds of existing homes only a short distance from the LWS is unlikely to have a further significant indirect adverse effect on the LWS arising from increased unauthorised use;  
3. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that additional use would take place to a materially harmful level. We only have un-evidenced claims of potential increased trespass rather than direct adverse effects.  
4. We do not consider that we would have sufficiently strong grounds to demonstrate that the proposed development would materially harm the LWS and therefore justify requiring intervention.  
  
As a result, we do not propose to require securing management, transfer and/or financial contributions towards the LWS at this stage. This view has been formed through reviewing the supporting information, the representations received and discussions with our own ecologists.  
  
Kind regards  
  
Matthew Parry  
Principal Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Cherwell District Council  
Telephone: 01295 221837  
Email: [matthew.parry@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.parry@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)  
  
Details of applications are available to view through the Council's Online Planning Service at <http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications>  
Instructions on how to use the Public Access service to view, comment on and keep track of applications can be found at <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/viewplanningapp>  
  
Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)  
  
Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil  
  
-----Original Message-----  
From: Dominic Work   
Sent: 24 April 2017 13:09  
To: Matthew Parry  
Cc: Nick Bowles; [haidrunbreith@bbowt.org.uk](mailto:haidrunbreith@bbowt.org.uk); David Lowe; Planning  
Subject: Re: 15/00837/OUT - Gavray Drive West - Further Environmental Information from applicant  
  
Dear Matthew  
  
In the context of the many expert representations you've received expressing concern about the indirect effects of 180 units west of the brook on the LWS to the east, can you advise what contrary evidence you and other officers are drawing upon in coming to the view that "We do not consider that this current development would materially add to recreational pressure on the LWS in the context of existing use to justify such a requirement."  
  
I note that your comments fail to take into account several salient facts in any event;  
  
1).  The existing use of the LWS is relatively low key, and derived from local people stationed further afield than the proposed 180 dwellings.  
  
2). Such negative effects as occur from this existing use (such as littering) are in large part ameliorated by unofficial work parties that engage in activities such as litter picking. This underlines the importance and value of management in combatting such effects.  
  
3). Gallagher have made no effort to undertake such necessary management themselves, nor prevent de facto use to date, whether benign or undesirable. Why they should move to do so on the back of this development is not explained in your comments. Are you proposing a condition to fence the site and patrol it against trespass?  
  
4).  In any event, your comments about the source and route of existing use reveal a lack of understanding of the innate impracticality of fencing alone, and indeed how things work on the ground. A major conduit into the site is directly into the LWS across the Langford Brook adjacent to the railway. Rock armour put in place by Chiltern Railways on the banks of the stream here has been removed and thrown into the stream to create a dam/stepping stones. This demonstrates a) the vulnerability of the LWS along this interface even without the proposed development and b) the impracticality of your suggestion that the applicant could effectively secure the boundaries of the LWS in any event.  
  
I ask that you look again at your reasoning in light of the above.  
  
Best regards  
  
Dominic Woodfield  
  
Sent from my iPhone  
  
> On 20 Apr 2017, at 16:42, "Matthew Parry" <[Matthew.Parry@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Parry@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)> wrote:  
>  
> We do not consider that this current development would materially add to recreational pressure on the LWS in the context of existing use to justify such a requirement  
This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information.  
You should not disclose its contents to any other person.  
If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.  
  
Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses,  
it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses.  
You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).  
  
Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not  
impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action.

--

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
  
Dominic Woodfield CEcol CEnv MCIEEM  
Director  
  
Bioscan (UK) Ltd  
The Old Parlour  
Little Baldon Farm  
Little Baldon  
Oxford  
OX44 9PU