

Peter Martin Nov 4 2025 at 11:45AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Any development in what for many years has been a farmers field of crops would (1) alter Burford's historic character, transforming the western side into a suburban commuter sprawl. (2) The supporting access roads are unsuited to any increased traffic. Tanners Lane used by unaccompanied children to access the senior school, dog walkers and families to use the Recreation Ground, Playground, Scouts and a Nursery is too narrow for two way traffic, it lacks pavements and is already a dangerous rat run. Two way traffic is also impossible in Sheep Street, which virtually comes to a stop when a delivery vehicle arrives. (3) So many residents and visitors would lose one of the Towns most popular short countryside walks where they can escape and enjoy all that nature can provide. (4) It would be concreting over the site of the battle between the Kingdoms of Wessex and Mercia in 752, (5) the proposed site is a slope down which water already runs to flood the road, this would be exacerbated if the land was concreted or tarmacked over. (6) Burford is a major element of the Cotswold National Landscape (previously AONB)

•

Charlotte Baker Nov 4 2025 at 6:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Sheep Street only provides access for traffic from Cheltenham direction; even then the road has poor visibility due to the tree cover, bend and hill. The parked cars along Sheep Street make access more difficult. Anyone travelling from Oxford or Swindon would need to drive over Burford roundabout, and then either down the high street or past the school and down Tanners Lane, adding to the already heavy traffic. In addition to traffic problems, the GP surgery (including nurse and midwife services) would struggle to accommodate extra patients.

•

C. Hoge 3 Nov 8 2025 at 2:32PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly disagree with this site as a suitable location for 70 dwellings.

It goes against any expert recommendation that WODC published as supporting evidence:

1. Experts show that not attending a local primary school and being bused to a school miles away is a key element in increasing social inequalities. The Burford Primary has reached over capacity and children from the previous big development pushed by WODC in its last local plan, Costwold Gate, were not able to attend their local primary school this year. In addition there is no scope for extension. So unless a new primary school is built somewhere else, or WODC restricts the new site to people 55+, 70 homes in Burford would increase social inequalities.
2. The Burford surgery is not accepting any new patients and it is unclear if all Costwold Gate residents were able to register at the surgery. The surgery's list size is currently 7,860. Politicians enjoy telling us that each new development financially contributes under Section 106 which goes towards increasing capacity for local schools and surgery. As of today, the surgery has not seen a penny. 14% increase in patients, 0% increase in funds.
3. Traffic was highlighted as a weakness in the 'Town Center Strategy and Needs Assessment'. By adding 70 dwellings in Burford, the number of car added to Burford's small, narrow medieval

road will be roughly 150. In addition, WODC is proposing to add a car and coach park to this site with no direct access to the A40. WODC planners' wishful thinking is that the site and coach and car park would be access from the West of Sheep St. The intersection of Sheep Street with the A40 is a death trap with very limited visibility. But as most traffic comes from Oxford, it is a given that cars and coaches will access the site via the High Street or Tanners Lane which is a single lane road with pedestrians forced to walk on the road as there is no pavement.

4. The proposed site is on the field where the battle of 752 took place. Concreting Britain's past is not a good idea.

5. The Priory land is classified as ancient woodlands. The proposed site is directly opposite these woodlands. The concreting of the fields south of Sheep Street would result in the flooding and destruction of the ancient woodlands.

6. The site chosen is AONB land. AONB is not a view as WODC planners seem to believe, it is an area which includes not only fields but also towns. Costwolds National Landscape has warned many times about the problem of 'Erosion of the special character of the edges of settlements' transforming historic and beautiful villages into commuter suburban towns. The proposed development would increase the spread of Burford to the West by 50% and incorporate the hamlet of Upton into Burford urban setting. The law requires that WODC proves that the development is needed. Have WODC planners proved that the new site of 70 dwellings is 'meeting an identified local housing needs'? and if they did where is their evidence?

7. Burford and Woodstock have been classified as 'two towns with a significant tourist role' in the 'Town Centre Strategy and Needs Assessment'. Woodstock has Blenheim and will always have Blenheim to attract tourists. Burford only has its medieval charm and character.

Transforming Burford into some sort of suburban commuter town is going to have a negative impact on both the economy and the attractiveness of the town. Why would we want to go against the report recommendations for a more vibrant economy in Burford?

•

Anthony and Jane Hodgkison Nov 10 2025 at 10:55AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - BURFORD

Build build build! Traffic traffic traffic!

There is increasing evidence of stress and mental ill-health in the UK with more than 80% living in urban areas. Research at the University of Edinburgh (and also worldwide) shows that access to the countryside leads to wellbeing with mental and physical health benefits. It is also suggested that planners and developers should take account of the vital role of local green space.....if only!

The Green Lung of Burford is the Recreation Field, Tanners Lane, Sheep St, Upton and west to the A40. This area has now become very busy with people of all ages and abilities, and of course many dogs, walking and enjoying the freedom of our countryside.

Burford Surgery is the last building on Sheep Street and beyond this is the remnant of historical beauty which everybody loves, locals and visitors alike, and is truly the BEST. If this area is built on, future generations would not believe the violation, it is unforgivable.

Clearly the unavoidable and inevitable TRAFFIC INVASION arising from further development will destroy this edge of the town and will add to the current traffic chaos around Burford.

•

Blandine H Nov 10 2025 at 3:07PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I don't understand why anyone would think this plan is a good idea. Burford already has a huge traffic and parking problem with the high street at a virtual stand still almost every day during commuting hours and school pick-up. This development not only would exacerbate Burford's traffic and parking situation, but is also aiming to cement over AONB land. The school is over-subscribed, and the town's elderly (and non-driving) population relies on access to Burford Surgery for health care (which is also oversubscribed as is). The town's infrastructure as is simply cannot accommodate this kind of development, especially on this AONB land.

•

Harvey fry Nov 10 2025 at 3:12PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I think this would be terrible for Burford and should not go ahead. It is a small historic village... the last thing it needs is a mass of new builds on an already busy and narrow road. Please don't do it

•

Mark Hoge Nov 11 2025 at 4:34PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Infrastructure crisis- 1 Traffic is choking high street with buses diverted from Bibury and Bourton. 2. Primary school can't take students. 3. Surgery is closed to new patients. EXPAND INFRA FIRST

•

Mark H 1 Nov 11 2025 at 4:49PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This development is not needed and will destroy the historic charm of Burford and exacerbate existing traffic and pollution crisis. A town that is known as a permanent traffic jam (Mirror article) is not going to succeed as a best in class tourist destination or pleasant market town.

•

Andrew Price Nov 11 2025 at 7:41PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This proposal is flawed and has ignored far more suitable sites.

The site N would expand the width of the town by 40% - continuing the urban sprawl started by cotswold gate. This is precisely what policy says we should be avoiding. It has been placed as a preference to a brownfield development within the centre of town (site on Wltny STreet) and for

some reason suggests creating a car park in an AONB alongside 70 homes, 200+ cars is a way to preserve this precious asset.

Whilst the archaeological barriers are referenced (given the historic finds on the site which are on display in Burford) it seems incredible that this site's history isn't enough to preserve it for the future but we'd rather forget and concrete over it.

The suggestion that access is suitable was contested heavily by many parties with a similar site on the east of town (Cole's field) but seems to be glossed over here. It is a single track road at the pinch point of the site's location (where it also floods) and has absolutely zero space for on street parking.

AONB seems to be irrelevant and as such I assume we are expected to continue building on all open fields surrounding Burford over the coming years - bye by Burford as we know it.

•

Emma Price Nov 11 2025 at 7:51PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The suggestion to develop this land seems both ill thought through and completely unnecessary. There is no need for an additional 70 homes in Burford when there are a large number of properties available for purchase as is. Other sites for smaller developments which would be more suitable to a historic town such as Burford seem to have been glossed over at speed. Developing this piece of land would cause significant issues to the existing community - the Upton Road is single track at best and Sheep Street is already dangerously congested. Tanner's Lane is also single lane and dangerous enough with no footpath without an additional 100-200 cars using it. The Burford Surgery is already at capacity and would not be able to support additional patients. Both the primary and the secondary schools are over subscribed and would not be able to support additional pupils. Let us not also forget that Burford sits in an AONB and this development would threaten that beauty beyond belief.

•

Adam Reynolds Nov 11 2025 at 9:14PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I totally disagree with this proposed site. Burford is an area of outstanding natural beauty and prior to living in this most beautiful market town we used to come for wonderful walk, delightful cuisine and shopping. We moved here in 2022, believing we had a foot hold in one of the treasures of middle England.

Since arriving traffic has increased dramatically, road congestion is horrendous and to add further development of up to 80 houses just completely destroys the fabric of something so wonderful.

We live in one of the greatest historic small towns within the United Kingdom and further development will ruin what we have

•

L Lyle Nov 11 2025 at 9:49PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This AONB a peaceful stretch of countryside that defines the town's character and offers space for nature and community life. Any development here would bring irreversible harm to Burford and to everything that makes it such a special place to live and visit. Unsafe and unsuitable roads-The local roads simply cannot cope with extra traffic. Tanners Lane is already too narrow for two-way vehicles and has no pavements. Children use it every day to walk to the two schools, while other local residents rely on it to reach the Recreation Ground, the bowling green, football clubs and playground. It's already dangerous — adding more cars only add to this danger. Sheep Street, too, grinds to a halt when a more than one car or bus tries to drive down it. More development would only increase congestion and risk. A threat to Burford's historic charm and history-Turning this long-standing field of crops into housing would destroy the town's historic setting and replace it with suburban sprawl. Burford's beauty lies in its unique and picturesque landscape — once that's lost, it can never be regained. This land holds deep historic significance — it was the site of the 752 AD battle between the Kingdoms of Wessex and Mercia. To cover such ground in concrete would be to bury part of our shared heritage. Making flooding worse-The proposed site lies on a slope where rainwater already runs down into the road, causing flooding. Building over it with concrete or tarmac would make this problem far worse, threatening homes and access routes. Damaging the Cotswold National Landscape -Burford is at the heart of the Cotswold National Landscape (formerly the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). Development here would scar the views and damage the very qualities that draw people to Burford — its blend of history, landscape, and tranquillity. Facilities or the community – The Doctors Surgery and schools are already at capacity, with long waits to get a Dr's appointments and classrooms already facing large classroom sizes. This is more than a planning issue — it's about protecting Burford's identity, safety, and natural beauty for future generations. Once this land is built on, it's lost forever.

•

Suzanne Dando Reynolds Nov 11 2025 at 9:58PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We would like to express our strong objection to the proposal for the development in Burford of a large housing site between the doctor's surgery and the cemetery on Sheep Street, as outlined in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2021–2043.

It is deeply concerning that such a substantial development — involving the construction of at least 70 houses along with a coach and car park — is even under consideration, particularly given the recent large-scale expansion of the town with the Cotswold Gate development. We are already at capacity with our doctor's surgery and the schools.

The proposed location raises serious questions about suitability. The surrounding roads — including Sheep Street, Priory Lane, Tanners Lane, and the High Street — are already under strain from persistent congestion and heavy traffic, including a high volume of lorries and coaches. The infrastructure is simply not equipped to absorb the additional pressure that would come with dozens of new households and increased vehicle movements.

A development of 70 homes would inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle numbers — likely up to 140 additional cars, not including delivery vans, service vehicles, and visitor traffic. This would place a considerable strain on the town's narrow and already congested road network, particularly during peak hours.

Sheep Street in particular is already experiencing traffic problems with an increase in traffic flow and regular congestion as cars are parked on either side of the road. Tanners Lane lacks pavements altogether, forcing pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles to share the same narrow space. This is especially hazardous at school times, when parents with young children, prams, and buggies use the lane to reach the nursery. Older children also walk or cycle along Tanners Lane to and from the secondary school, while many others are driven the same way, further compounding the risks.

In addition to school traffic, the lane is well-used by dog walkers heading to the recreation ground, and it increasingly serves as a cut-through for drivers attempting to avoid congestion on the High Street — a growing problem in itself.

Equally concerning is the ongoing issue of coach traffic and the absence of effective traffic management across the town. Adding a new car and coach park, without first addressing the existing problems, risks making a difficult situation even worse. It's hard to see how access to the site could be safely or sensibly managed.

Burford is a historically significant town, cherished for its unique architecture and its location within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The character of the town is central to both its identity and its appeal — not only to residents but also to visitors and the wider community. To support development on this scale, in such a sensitive area, risks causing permanent damage to that character.

Additionally, to consider concreting over such an historic battlefield site, the famous 'Battle Edge' of 752, beggars belief. Instead, the Burford Town council and WODC should be celebrating this historic site, using it to educate our younger generations, and providing an interest to the many tourists who at this point have absolutely no idea of this piece of history, or indeed the ancient sarcophagus that sits hidden away in our churchyard which was excavated from that battle site in 1814. Shame on those who would prefer to just concrete over it and create a coach and car park, and provide 70 houses that Burford does not need, given we already have a substantial development with Cotswold Gate.

I hope WODC and Burford Town Council will listen closely to the concerns of Burford's residents and resist endorsing a plan that so clearly risks undermining the very qualities that make Burford such a special place.

I believe this proposed development is ill-suited to the location and would create serious and lasting problems for traffic flow, public safety, and local infrastructure. I urge you to reconsider the suitability of this site and prioritise the long-term well-being of this beautiful town and its residents.

•

Mark Coote Nov 12 2025 at 11:18AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposal to add additional housing on Sheep Street, Burford, is wholly ill-conceived. There simply isn't capacity for such a development in a part of town that already suffers from significant road congestion. The main arterial route through Burford is regularly grid-locked, with

traffic diverted onto side streets, including Sheep Street. Buses and emergency vehicles are already compromised in gaining access.

Extra housing will place unwarranted demands on local amenities such as schooling and GP access whose supply is already scarce.

Burford is an ancient town in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a development of this scale will compromise the integrity of these special characteristics forever.

This is a deeply flawed proposal which should never have seen the light of day.

•

Maria Edwards Nov 12 2025 at 11:30AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I have lived in Burford for the past 14 years - and as a permanent resident find the proposal to develop an historic greenfield field in the town contrary to common sense. I am bewildered that the land could even be considered suitable for housing - there are ample sites including brownfield land surrounding larger towns with facilities and services able to accommodate this number of future houses in West Oxfordshire. Burford is an historic medieval town, confined by narrow streets and a beautiful setting which is the very reason visitors and tourists choose to visit. The lack of understanding of the limitations of our narrow roads, and the traffic issues which cause problems daily for the emergency services, local buses and everyone trying to traverse the town - including our neighbouring villages of Fulbrook, Swinbrook, Taynton and Barrington who are also impacted. Unsuitably located housing would only exacerbate the huge pressures on the town. Sheep Street and Tanners Lane does not have the capacity to accommodate any more traffic or to be an access route for a large development. Residents cannot even find a space to park and a sensible solution is critical. Burford is known from far and wide as a traffic nightmare. Tourists will walk (they do all around the world) and will enjoy the view; all our children at our schools walk?! Large coaches need to be situated on the A40 to alleviate the problems or if not banned completely. Our greenfield land and setting is why tourists visit - they do not come to visit suburban landscapes. The residents of the town and surrounding villages are being completely ignored and having to live with poor thought out decisions which do not make sense. We all have a duty to leave a legacy in life and to preserve our heritage and not destroy our historic greenfields which make this country and areas of ANOB so special.

•

Mark Rathbone Nov 12 2025 at 12:07PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposal to concrete over greenfield heritage land along Sheep Street will irreversibly damage Burford as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. We have a town already under immense pressure due to poor traffic management, in part caused by the current mis-management of permitting large coaches to freely double park and idle around the town. Our neighbouring villages are suffering due to the chaos of the traffic in Burford. Sheep Street and Tanners Lane experience daily road congestion and adding further housing would only exacerbate the pressures on the narrow streets and town. Future housing should be suitably located in towns with adequate road infrastructure and services able to support them.

•

Gareth Jenkins Nov 12 2025 at 12:39PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

There are so many genuine reasons that this proposed site is not fit or appropriate for development. Area of natural beauty, infrastructure, traffic, pollution and safety to name a few.

•

Olivia Catesby Nov 12 2025 at 1:20PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly oppose this site for development due to concerns about community impact and environmental preservation.

My main concerns include:

1) Environmental and Historical Impact: The proposed site is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and historically significant, with concerns about urban sprawl and loss of character. Development would encroach on ancient woodlands and historical sites, contradicting planning regulations.

2) Traffic and Infrastructure: Increased traffic from the development would exacerbate existing congestion and pollution in Burford particularly on single lane side streets, of which Sheep St is one, without direct two way access to main routes.

3) Questionable Need for Development: The population has already increased significantly due to recent developments, and current housing availability in Burford does not justify further development.

4) Contradiction of Local Strategy: The development contradicts the Town Centre Strategy, which emphasizes preserving Burford's character and managing tourism-related traffic rather than expanding residential areas.

•

Ann Nov 12 2025 at 1:54PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Proposal for Burford.

A development of this size is totally inappropriate for this location. It would be lazy planning to build a new development of 70 houses on Prime Agricultural Land rather than utilise the available brown field and non-agricultural sites available in Burford. This site is neither sustainable nor accessible.

Cotswolds Natural Landscape.

The Sheep Street Valley to the West of Burford is nestled in the beautiful Cotswold National Landscape which encompasses the town. Many locals currently enjoy the stunning views across the valley when walking along the public right of way bordering the targeted fields, then loop back to town via Sheep Street. This natural landscape is as valuable as the many listed buildings Burford treasures and greatly enhances the well-being of those taking a short stroll away from its busy centre. To justify the destruction of Burford's green spaces by saying it can't

be seen from the A40 is appalling.

Accessibility

This site has no direct access to the A40 corridor. Approaching town, Sheep Street, with parking on both sides is single lane, with a narrow footpath. At peak times Sheep Street becomes congested and is chaos when a large vehicle cannot navigate an oncoming car. Tanners Lane is single track without a footpath. For the residents of the 30+ homes off Tanners Lane this is the only route into town by foot. It's also shared by children from the Burford Schools, dog walkers and cyclists avoiding the busy High Street. Much of Priory Lane also has no footpath, pedestrians navigate their way past parked cars ready to step between them when a vehicle approaches. The proposed substantial increase in traffic not only from cars, but delivery lorries, refuse lorries and potentially coaches from a car park and 70 houses on these already narrow lanes will grind the west of Burford to a halt and make access far more dangerous for pedestrians.

Facilities

Following the increased population resulting from the recent Shilton Road Development, the Doctors Surgery is full and not accepting new Patients. The Junior school is full and has needed to turn away local children this year. This proposal will increase reliance on cars as Burford only has limited bus services and no train station.

Heritage

The medieval Town of Burford has over 250 listed buildings and another major development like the one proposed would seriously and irrevocably impact on its heritage setting, urbanising its Western Edge.

What need does this meet?

Following the large housing development on the Shilton Road which includes 45 affordable homes, what need is there for another 70 homes on Prime Agricultural Land in the Cotswold National Landscape encompassing Burford. Why were the available smaller brown field sites not included in the consultation when these would have far less detrimental impact on the town? Although parking is a separate issue, it should be noted that there are other far more suitable parking options available to Burford.

Once Burford's iconic natural landscape is concreted over, it will not only be a loss to us but also generations to come. Surely, we should prioritise Brown Field sites. The residents and Town Council are currently the guardians of this historic town; it's a big responsibility.

•

M & C Robertson Nov 12 2025 at 1:57PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We strongly object to this proposed development approach to Sheep Street, Burford.

Sheep Street is within the Cotswold National Landscape which is a landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it. The statutory purpose of its designation is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area (CCB Position Statement).

Listed below are our major concerns that this development would create should it be approved:

1. Poor access to proposed development site.
2. Issues with current vehicle parking from junction of Sheep St, Tanners Lane and Priory Lane which continues beyond the surgery to the Priory back gate. Traffic can come to a standstill due to congestion especially at weekends.
3. Major concern over emergency services access along Sheep Street towards Upton.

4. Traffic and increased use of tourist buses using the narrow road from the A40 Upton junction as a rat run in and out of Sheep Street, Priory Lane and the High Street.
5. Development of housing will increase vehicular numbers estimated at 100+. This does not include any ancillary services such as couriers, utility services that will need access to the site.
6. How will Sheep Street, Tanners Lane and Priory Lane cope with increased traffic without backing up onto the High Street and A40 roundabout as well as A40 Upton/Bibury junction.
7. Pedestrian safety along Tanners and Priory Lane.
8. Infrastructure already stretched following the Cotswold Gate development. In particular schools and GP surgery.
9. Limited public transport to local Tier 1 towns, Witney & Carterton.
10. Employment for those living in affordable housing with a limited public transport system from Burford.

•

Paul 3 Nov 12 2025 at 2:53PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

PLEASE STOP AREA N BURFORD!!!

I am so disappointed with Area N for BURFORD. Where is the evidence of due diligence in the formulation of this proposal?

Ask yourselves a question - Why do people enjoy living in Burford?

It's a delightful medieval town, oozing bags of charm and history, with listed buildings and quaint narrow streets. You feel a warmth when you meet people, we like supporting our local businesses and you don't have to walk far to enjoy the glorious countryside surrounding the town.

So why the need to build this concrete block covering over 7 acres of prime agricultural land?

Let's not forget we're in Cotswolds AONB and there is an Ancient Woodland directly adjacent to the site. The woodland forms part of The Priory and is the only woodland in the Burford area for miles with that classification.

Do you remember our history, "Battle Edge", the battle that raged between the West Saxons and Mercian in 752AD. Yes, this is the same land you wish to develop!

The Woodland Trust, Cotswold Landscape and English Heritage are aware of your proposals and Time Team, no strangers to Burford and familiar with digging up the past and our history.

Notwithstanding the above, in an ideal world as a retired resident living in the town, I would enjoy being involved in the decision making and planning the future of Burford.

I conclude with my point on due diligence. Traffic chaos, schools oversubscribed, doctors'

surgery full to the brim, pedestrian and children's safety, poor road signage, policing and available brownfield sites in the town being dismissed!

I hope you will review this proposal and rescind Area N for Burford.

•

Yolanda Harrison 1 Nov 12 2025 at 3:00PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am strongly opposed to the proposed development on Sheep Street as mentioned above.

Here are my primary concerns:

1) Impact on Environment and Heritage: This location falls within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and holds considerable historical value. My worry centers on the spread of urbanisation and the erosion of the area's unique identity. Any building here would intrude upon ancient forests and heritage landmarks, which goes against established planning guidelines.

2) Drainage Issues: The intended area features a sharp incline in terrain.

3) Traffic and Supporting Systems: Adding more vehicles from this project would worsen the already heavy congestion and air quality problems in Burford, especially along narrow one-way roads like Sheep Street, which lack straightforward dual-lane connections to major thoroughfares.

4) Dubious Justification for Building: Burford's population has grown substantially from prior constructions, and the existing stock of homes in the town doesn't support the case for additional expansion.

5) Inconsistency with Regional Plan: This proposal clashes with the Town Centre Strategy, which prioritizes safeguarding Burford's distinctive charm and handling traffic tied to visitors, instead of pushing for more housing growth.

•

John Adam Harrison Nov 12 2025 at 3:15PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly disagree with this approach.

This is an AONB. This development should not be allowed because it conflicts entirely with that status.

There is historical interest at this site. It should not be voided through this proposed development.

The town is terribly overstretched as it is. There are already high levels of congestion in Burford

and consequently the surrounding villages. The primary school is over subscribed. The doctors surgery waiting lists are already unacceptable. The town simply should not be forced to support more homes.

There are good alternative locations on the a40 for the coach park that must be explored.

I strongly disagree with this proposal.

•

Peter Radford Nov 12 2025 at 3:35PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing to express my concern about the Local Plan for Burford, and specifically those for the construction of additional housing, car and coach park in an area adjacent to Tanners Lane and Sheep Street.

These proposals may meet some immediate targets, but I don't believe that they are in the town's long-term best interests.

More thought needs to go into considering whether Burford's unique, historical character and atmosphere can be preserved into the future; characteristics which make it one of the most popular places in the county to visit, to live, and to do business. If it is possible to preserve the essential character of the town for all those that have a stake in it (residents, visitors, shopkeepers, etc.), then great care must be taken not to respond to short-term goal-chasing by pushing more and more houses, cars and buses into Burford and the surrounding area. Chasing these short term goals will inevitably lead to the ultimate destruction of Burford's unique environment to the detriment of all the stake holders.

Decision makers have a huge responsibility to consider the long-term future of Burford and other similar ancient communities, and will ultimately be judged if they succumb to the pressure to only meet short-term targets.

Peter Radford
8 Sheep Street
Burford
11 November 2025

•

Margaret Radford Nov 12 2025 at 3:46PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

My objection to the latest plan for Burford is that to meet the requirements for housing and parking will require the destruction of trees and landscape to create more houses and a car park.

We enjoy its beauty only because previous generations valued it, looked after it, and maintained it for the benefit of those who would come after them. We, too, must do as they did and protect and preserve the beauty of Burford for future generations.

It is my duty and responsibility to object to this plan as this small part of England once gone will be gone forever.

Margaret Radford

•

Judith Lea Nov 12 2025 at 3:56PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford is known as a tourist town, with its charm and character drawing visitors. The town already struggles with traffic and parking, and more houses plus a car park could make things worse, especially with no direct access to the A40. Rather than protect Burford's appeal, this plan could harm it, and there are smarter, less damaging ways to provide affordable homes that would fit better with the local environment.

•

John Jack Nov 12 2025 at 4:55PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly disagree with the proposed approach.

Sheep Street lies within the Cotswold National Landscape, renowned for its outstanding natural beauty and historic character. The proposal to build 70 houses and a coach/car park on Sheep Street would cause lasting harm to the town's unique qualities, public safety, and infrastructure. Tourists do not flock to the idyllic Cotswolds to see suburbia!

The proposed land is a historic battlefield and greenfield site – enjoyed by residents, dog walkers and visitors alike. To concrete over would be sacrilegious – it will permanently damage the town's heritage and unique appeal.

This proposal has no regard to access whatsoever with surrounding roads such as Sheep Street, Tanners Lane, Priory Lane, and High Street already suffering from congestion and limited width. Persistent parking issues stretch from Sheep Street to The Priory back gate, with traffic grinding to a halt almost on a daily basis. The ability of emergency services to reach properties along Sheep Street towards Upton is already compromised, and the increased presence of tourist buses and heavy vehicles using these narrow routes as shortcuts has only worsened since I have lived in the town, both the congestion and safety concerns. Tanners Lane's lack of pavements forces pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles to share the road, which is especially hazardous during school times. Further housing would severely impact the road network and the daily gridlock experienced, especially at the High Street and A40 junctions.

Furthermore local amenities, including schools and the GP surgery, are already at capacity, worsened by the recent Cotswold Gate development. Large housing developments should be sited in towns that have the infrastructure, services and capacity to take them.

This proposal has been ill-conceived - we should be looking to preserve Burford's special character for future generations.

•

Suzi Nov 12 2025 at 5:22PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am aghast with this development proposal that Burford can ill-afford, bursting at the seams as it is with traffic, illegal parking, coaches, not to mention the infrastructure of our small medieval town that cannot absorb any more people.

Please can sense prevail with consideration to those of us who live here, and not just those who wish to visit. Let us find alternative solutions to benefit all of us.

•

Roger Sales Nov 12 2025 at 5:45PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This proposed development is totally out of proportion.

The extra housing would place impossible demands on local amenities such as schooling and the doctors surgery.

A development of 70 houses would lead to a huge increase in traffic on already overcrowded roads not just in Burford but in the adjoining towns and villages.

•

Carina Nov 12 2025 at 5:55PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

A development of this nature would be totally wrong for Burford. We are already we bursting at the seams with traffic.

A development of 70 house's is unbelievable when you consider no room at the Doctors Surgery or the School.

•

Seb Lyle Nov 12 2025 at 6:17PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I'm writing as a 19-year-old resident of Burford who feels really strongly about the proposed new housing development in our town. I have grown up here, and I'm proud to live in a place with rich history and character. I'm worried that building more modern homes in or around Burford will permanently change what makes it so special.

•

Julia watson Nov 12 2025 at 8:13PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am wholeheartedly against this proposed site and see no merit in it. As I understand it there is no known reason why a further 70+ homes are needed in Burford.

There is also no regard given for the AONB site which the town council and residents made very clear in other greenfield sites previously proposed should be a major red flag.

As I understand it it is also a historic site which should be preserved not concreted over.

I have seen brownfield and smaller scale suggestions in the previous draft and these seem far better judged than this urban sprawl.

•

Lyn reffell Nov 12 2025 at 8:34PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I disagree entirely with this proposal.

The site is in an AONB. It should therefore be preserved.

The site is the location of a historic battle. It should therefore be preserved.

The road is narrow and floods. Building a housing development means it is not appropriate.

The town has shown no need for a site of this size (especially after building Cotswold gate) and brownfield sites like the Burford laundry on Witney street would be far better recommendations.

•

Dr Ben John Nov 14 2025 at 12:14PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I object to this proposed development comprising site N in Burford. Which will fail to improve the infrastructure and quality of life of Burford residents. The authority has failed on the front of traffic management which is regularly gridlocked, and now proposes to build more houses on the edge of a main street in the heart of an ancient town.

The proposed site sits on the mid level of a sloping landscape as part of the greenbelt. Turning this land into a housing development will compromise run-off capacity with an increased risk of flooding the lower parts of the town with a significant number of older listed properties.

The building of 70 houses would also be a gross incursion into the AONB and the Conservation Area.

Tanners Lane and Sheep Street would also be severely compromised and turn into a major and congested traffic thoroughfare.

Burford cannot cope with the present level of traffic with the A40 and A361 frequently at standstill, let alone extra which the proposed development would generate.

Burford has only recently provided 45 extra affordable houses and a nursing home at the Cotswold Gate development, adding to Falkland Close, Cheadle Court and Frethern Close. The town has a high number of Airbnb and holiday let properties which take away affordable housing stock and erodes community cohesion.

There are also currently 197 properties for sale in the OX18 postcode - so why is the authority proposing 70 new houses?

Burford Town Council strongly opposed a similar scale proposal on Cole's Field in 2022. The topography of that site is identical to the current proposed site N and yet they have recommended this site to be considered just 3 years later.

I refer the council to read their own report (see link below) released by the former Mayor April 2022 before consuming the time of local residents to provide responses to an ill-considered proposal for the sake of building houses to comply with the current government's ideology of providing so-called affordable housing

Link below.

[link-](#)

final.pdf

Dr Ben John
Resident of Sheep Street

•

A Hoge Nov 15 2025 at 12:32PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposal fails to make any convincing argument for why this should go forward, particularly given the impact this will have on the surgery, schools, traffic, and the area itself. Any serious impact investigation would have flagged all of these issues immediately, and there would be no question as to the unsuitability of the development. Instead of using resources on a development no one wants, and exacerbating existing issues, the town should focus on bettering the living conditions of those who already live here.

A Hoge
29 Sheep St

•

Karen plant Nov 15 2025 at 6:34PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The council has not taken into account increased traffic along this road into the village, living on sheep street is challenging you can never park outside your property due to the rise in tourists, they hide soldier road does not cope with the extreme traffic at the moment. The coach's trying to access the park will be a nightmare with a narrow road leading to it and the traffic to the surgery will cause even more problems.

We need to keep the integrity of the buildings and there is not the infrastructure to cope with more people let alone traffic, why do we not think of how this impacts the local people who have lived there years and always put tourists first.

The time I have watched tourists pile off the bus, rush up the street take photos rush back on the bus so the idea these people contribute to the economy is not right and this will not improve with this plan it will make this worse, not any local people want it and I am sure we will fight it

•

Nicholas Matthews Nov 16 2025 at 3:21PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am strongly opposed to development of this site on two counts as detailed below

A the development will increase congestion, pollution and risk to pedestrians and cyclists.

Assuming 1-2 cars per household, a new development of 70 houses is likely to mean an additional 110 extra cars or thereabouts - plus delivery and service vehicles – meaning many more traffic movements in the town.

Some of those living in the new development will drive to work, school etc by departing town in a

westerly direction but most will probably travel in an easterly direction to the Burford Schools, Carterton, Witney, Oxford etc which will mean many more traffic movements in Sheep St and Tanners Lane than at present.

As it is, Sheep Street is already choked with visitors' and residents' cars, delivery vehicles, buses etc but does have footpaths so there is separation between pedestrians and vehicles.

In contrast Tanners Lane has no footpath and has vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists vying for the same space. This is particularly hazardous during the morning and afternoon school runs when parents with small children, prams and pushchairs use the lane to access the nursery. Many older children also use the lane on their way to and from the Secondary School (whilst many of their peers are driven to and from school along the same lane).

Other regular users of the lane are dog walkers on their way to the recreation ground or to the footpath at the north of Area N.

Finally, Tanners Lane and Priory Lane are regularly used as a rat run when the High St is congested – an increasingly frequent occurrence.

B Further pressure on the Primary School and Burford Surgery

The Primary School, is already oversubscribed. For a development of 80 houses it's likely that there will be at least an extra 10 children of Primary School age to accommodate.

The Surgery is also oversubscribed and not taking any new patients.

•

Lydia Weston Nov 16 2025 at 4:11PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am opposed to this development for all the reasons that have already been mentioned above.

•

S Lyle Nov 16 2025 at 6:05PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly oppose the construction of new housing in Burford. The town is already struggling with heavy traffic congestion, and further development would only worsen the situation. Local services—including the doctor's surgery and schools—are already stretched to capacity, making it difficult for residents to access the support they need. In addition, the proposed development would result in the loss of valuable green space, which is essential for wildlife, community wellbeing, and the character of the town.

•

R Lyle Nov 16 2025 at 6:22PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

As a student at Burford School, I don't believe that building more houses here is a good idea. The traffic is already bad enough, getting to school can feel unsafe at times. Losing more green space also really worries me. Those areas aren't just nice to look at, they're where I spend time with my friends, get fresh air, relax, and feel better mentally and physically. I also care about what Burford will be like in the future. If we keep building on every bit of field and adding even more pressure to the town, it's not going to be the same place for us or for the people who grow up here after us. I want Burford to stay a green, friendly, safe place for everyone now and for future generations.

•

Sue 2 Nov 16 2025 at 7:32PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Ref 70+ dwelling on sheep street Burford. I do not agree with further development as the Burford school and our GP surgery are unable to manage with the current population within Burford. We already wait several weeks to see / speak with our GP and request that the local authorities prioritise this situation for local residences and support with GPs and nurses to support Burford surgery.

Burford at times is unable to cope with the volume of traffic, the bridge has required repairs and was not intended for the volume of cars. The town is recognised as a historical site - and this charm and historical significance needs to be preserved.

And there are already plenty of houses to rent -or to - to buy in and around Burford so firstly utilise these properties.

•

Charlotte N Nov 18 2025 at 3:54PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

1. The development would harm Burford's historic character and the setting of its Conservation Area.
2. It would place unsustainable pressure on already overstretched local infrastructure and services. For example, doctors, schools and roads are already inundated.
3. The estate risks damaging the rural landscape and views associated with the Cotswolds AONB.
4. The scale of the proposal exceeds Burford's genuine local housing needs.
5. Building on open land increases flood risk and threatens local biodiversity.
6. Approving the scheme would set a harmful precedent for further expansion beyond the town's historic boundary.

The proposal represents unsustainable, inappropriate, and harmful development that conflicts with national and local planning policies, fails to protect Burford's historic and environmental significance, and places disproportionate stress on local infrastructure. The cumulative harm clearly outweighs any limited benefits.

•

K & T Lockyer Nov 18 2025 at 10:47PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

After living in Burford for the majority of both our childhoods and adult life, there has already been a dramatic change in the traffic and development of Burford. Gone are the days when we could actually hack our horses from one side of Burford to the other. I wouldn't even consider taking my children on their ponies from our land at the very end of Witney street to visit their grandparents just past the doctors surgery in Lower Upton. The cars already blocking every avenue of Burford is ridiculous. Through traffic have no consideration of residents and that includes tourists. It is not safe for my children to even cross the road at the traffic lights due to inappropriate parking on the zig lines. Dangerous junctions on and off the high street due to irresponsible parking and volume of traffic already passing through Burford.

The small public transport Burford does receive is then compromised due to again irresponsible parking and blockages on Tanners Lane and Sheep street as well as Priory Lane. What are you going to do about this to improve before allowing an additional 100+ cars and residents into the town.

We need to protect our surgery and schools not increase the burden for already over worked staff in both services.

Adding to this, surely we are meant to be increasing and preserving all the green space we have. Why do we need more housing, when there are plenty of properties in the county for sale and no one is purchasing them. This is already an expensive county why make it even more impossible for first time buyers etc to get on the ladder by adding more expensive housing.

I believe our future is protecting what we already have, a wealth of history and beauty in Burford which we need to preserve for our children to enjoy. Create green spaces and a place where our future generations feel the need to take care of and conserve. What a waste of money and resources building more housing!!!

•

Rosemary Chapman Nov 19 2025 at 12:34PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly disagree with the proposal to build 70 new homes on this AONB site, which is also of historic importance (the field being the site of a battle in A.D.752).

The access roads are already choked with traffic. The inevitable increase in traffic flow from 70 new dwellings would greatly exacerbate an already severe problem.

Tanners Lane is often a rat-run and dangerous enough at present - especially for school children, dog walkers, toddlers and young children accessing Burford School, the recreation ground, scout hut and pre-school. It is not suitable for two-way traffic.

Sheep Street is not suitable for coaches. Vehicles are parked on both sides of the road leaving only one lane open.

Burford's charm and appeal to visitors is largely due to its historic buildings. Areas like nearby Carterton have been and are far more suitable for modern builds. The beautiful field opposite Burford Garden Company has already been transformed from a green field with sheep grazing on it into a sizeable housing estate.

Burford's primary school and the surgery are already over-subscribed.

Sewage is sometimes discharged into the river. Another 70 dwellings would certainly stretch the current infrastructure, potentially leading to more pollution.

•

Pauline Martin Nov 19 2025 at 2:41PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing to register my opposition to any idea in the HELAA plan of using the land in Sheep Street to build 70 dwellings and possibly a car park in what is open countryside designated as a vital part of the Cotswold National Landscape. An estate of new houses and / or facilities for even more cars to choke our medieval planned roads, overload our infrastructure of supporting services and further threaten the safety of pedestrians, particularly in Tanners Lane, that doesn't have any pavements, is totally abhorrent to us as local residents.

I appreciate that the local traders welcome the trade that some, (but certainly not all who arrive in the many coaches who are 'doing the Cotswolds in a day' excursions), bring to the High Street. But surely the interests of residents who currently have immediate access to the local countryside that has been suggested for concreting over, are an equally important consideration.

Please, reject the proposal.

•

Emma Branch Nov 20 2025 at 3:34PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I completely disagree with ANY further housing development in Burford and particularly within area N /Sheep Street. I am utterly shocked this is even being 'proposed' as an option!! This beautiful and historical medieval town has already given way to two developments on Coles Field for Cottsway Homes and to the enormous development opposite The Burford Garden Company in the 9 years I have been a local estate agent. We struggle to sell these homes let alone build more! The traffic since the reintroduction of HGV's on the high street has already forced cars onto Sheep Street and Tanners Lane and awful traffic jams are a daily occurrence. I have witnessed many near misses with pedestrians and cyclists let alone parents walking children to both our primary and senior schools. I have recently sold two properties to parents who were unable to secure places at either the primary or secondary school because they are oversubscribed so I do not see how these houses can be supported by local education and I'm sure it will be the same for the doctors surgery'?

There are plenty of developments being built on the outskirts of Witney, Carterton, Milton and Bourton & Rissington , which are far more suitable and that can support the additional residents properly. Burford is NOT a suitable location - the town cannot cope with any expansion anywhere!!

With regards to tourism I am all for the benefits that our visitors bring to our local shops and establishments however I am frequently being told by visiting potential home purchasers that they are actually put off coming to Burford because the traffic is so bad and the roads are too congested. It is effecting our ability to sell property.

I would welcome a change to current coach parking to further out of town but Sheep Street is not the right location.

I believe there are other options available.

•

Mary Gay Nov 20 2025 at 3:59PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford. Area N

The suggestion to build on the farmland between the Drs Surgery and the cemetery in Burford does not comply with West Oxfordshire's stated approach to planning.

Problems with roads, traffic and access.

Tanners Lane is a single track LANE bordered at the top by town facilities, Scout hut, Play Group, Bowls Club, Allotments. There is also pedestrian access to the playing fields. Lower down it is edged with a number of properties. The narrowness of the lane precludes the possibility of a solely pedestrian access to the town. Therefore, residents have to run the gauntlet of sharing this road with cars to reach the town centre. This is also a major access road for the Doctors' surgery and the Primary School from the east, as well as pedestrian access to the playing fields and children's play area.

The gridlock occurring at peak times on the A361 through the centre of Burford results in much traffic diverting down Tanners Lane before continuing down Priory Lane. (Narrow and Contorted) Similarly, if the High Street is congested, traffic will divert at the bottom and proceed up Priory Lane before crossing Sheep Street to join Tanners Lane. Despite its constricted width, it is not narrow enough to deter some drivers from proceeding at alarming speeds, apparently regarding pedestrians as a nuisance to be barely tolerated. A few days ago we were faced with a car descending at ,easily 50 miles an hour, blaring its horn. It passed us with only centimetres to spare. Clearly there are plenty of careful drivers but any increase in traffic would pose an increased likelihood of a tragedy waiting to happen. In winter the road becomes narrower, due firstly to considerable leaf fall which becomes slippery with water running down the edges of the road and dangerous to navigate. This danger is enhanced as winter progresses and the water running down the hill becomes lethal ice.

Sheep street is also part of the same issue. Given the size of most vehicles it too cannot be regarded as a two way street. Similarly traffic approaching from the west both for access to the town and the Doctors Surgery and access across the river for Stow and Chipping Norton use this as a rat run further generating congestion. To suggest a plan which would seriously aggravate these current problems is beyond comprehension.

It is disappointing that Councillors who recently have been vehemently against a very similar suggestion for development on the other side of town (why is this I wonder?)are now completely changing tack. Please read the submission . I cannot see arguments which do not apply to this application.

Targeted Land

To develop this land, part of the Cotswold National Landscape, would be seriously compromised. The area runs along the borders of Burford Priory with its listed ancient woodlands and any development would destroy the special character of this edge of town. It would also obliterate the historic site of the Battle fought in 752AD.

Significantly, the higher edge of the targeted field is also a public footpath affording a short and easily accessible escape into an area of uplifting and restorative views across the landscape., which also hosts a large variety of wildlife.

With the current mental health crisis with which we are living, I think to destroy such an amenity would be self destructive for the future.

There would no longer be a view and environment to be enjoyed by the many, both now and in the future.

This may not be of importance to current Town Council Members who are even older than me but,

as the guardian of a very short part of the footpath I can confirm that it is used by people of all ages from all over the town and indeed from all over the world.

-

Sue and Martin Tighe Nov 20 2025 at 4:51PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

A development of this size in the AONB would be detrimental to the very fabric and attraction of Burford. On a more practical level it would put increased pressure on already strained infrastructure including health services and schools. We would also question whether Burford is the correct location for another large housing development given that employment opportunities are much more prevalent elsewhere in the County.

-

Nicholas Gay Nov 21 2025 at 9:45AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing to lodge my concerns about the inclusion of the land in Sheep Street, Burford (Question 32 Area N) in the 2043 development plan and to question to the need for further development in Burford in the near time frame.

The recent Cotswold Gate development on the edge of Burford increased the population by approximately 25% and this is still being absorbed. Properties in that development remain unsold.

It has also put a significant strain on the infrastructure in the Town which is discussed further below.

Roads

The key roads around the proposed land are Tanners Lane and Sheep Street. Tanners Lane has no footpath and is used daily by school children walking to Burford School, Parents taking their small children to the Primary School, dog walkers and elderly people. The road has become a “rat

run “ in the morning and afternoon and though a 20 mph zone, it is not enforced. Most traffic travels at around 30 + miles an hour with a significant minority travelling at 40 to 50 mph. I have stood in the road many time to try and slow these people down. The development of the proposed land will only make this significantly worse.

The story in Sheep Street is similar, though there is a footpath.

Both streets are designated as two way but neither operate as such in practice. Sheep Street is blocked nearly every time a lorry, van coach tries to pass along it if a car is coming in the opposite direction. In Tanners Lane one vehicle must pull very much into the bank to allow an oncoming vehicle to pass.

Adding further traffic through the suggested Sheep Street development will add to both the danger to pedestrians on Tanners Lane and the congestion on both streets significantly.

Amenities and Infrastructure

Burford has both a Primary School and a Secondary School. Both of these are full and currently closed to new entrants. The GP practice frequently has to turn away new patients and booking appointments can take weeks. My last face to face appointments were a month and six weeks from time of booking.

It has been said that S 106 can be used to require developers to contribute to infrastructure for the Town. In the case of the amount contributed in respect of Cotswold Gate, the vast majority was siphoned off to another part of Oxfordshire. Similarly, S 106 if actually directed to the impacted area only provides capital costs and not the needed operating costs to fund doctors, nurses and teachers.

Similarly, Burford's water supply has been subject to disruption at least twice in the last few years.

It is in need of modernisation. Further development in the Town will aggravate this situation. A similar situation applies to sewage, where significant pollution of the River Windrush has taken place through the discharge of raw sewage. This problem will be worsened by further development in Burford.

Environment

The development is also on land which used to be called Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This has a wider meaning than the limited version that the WODC seeks to use. The true meaning of the term encompasses fields, slopes or wooded areas together with villages and historical

settlements. Burford is also a conservation area. Taken together, the proposed inclusion of the area in the 2043 Local Plan seeks to cause significant environmental damage to a protected area.

•

Sarah Randall Nov 21 2025 at 5:58PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am against the proposal of site N being used for development.

Why this persistence in developing on AONB? An historically important, beautiful piece of land that can be enjoyed by practically everyone in the town, it is a short looped walk that most residents, young and old, can enjoy.

Any development of this would be ignoring all the arguments, reasons why AONBs were created in the first place, may as well just concrete over all the fields whilst you are at it WODC! How can it be ok for the authorities to throw this beautiful piece of land away, when ironically if you are making a planning application you need to fill in an impact statement weighing up any damage you are doing to local wildlife and views? How would this damage ever be able to be reconciled by a planning officer? And to insult the intelligence of most of the residents by suggesting a car park within the development would lessen the traffic/parking issues? What about the extra cars the homes would bring?

The traffic is frequently at a standstill along these single lane roads, there is no footpath from

the proposed area and Tanners Lane also does not have a footpath, which means the pedestrians would have even more traffic to contend with.

The infrastructure? How will the already struggling Doctor Surgery, schooling, sewage, water main etc etc cope? Let us not even think about even more road maintenance with the extra traffic!

Such a shame our supposed elected representatives feel the need to bow down to these constant pressures for more housing that we simply do not need. Cotswold Gate is still not fully populated, why do we need more houses? Has anyone thought to consider the many derelict homes and business units across the county that should be re purposed instead of this obsession of concreting over AONBs.

Our elected representatives should be defending these stunning Cotswold towns and villages from further development - enough is enough. Once it's gone, it's gone. You only need to travel into neighbouring counties to see the havoc that has been wreaked on ancient woodlands (Great Missenden for example) and the destruction of old, characterful towns and cities (St Albans, for example) by these ill conceived ideas, all done of course with the best intentions, blah blah blah.

-

Paul Randall Nov 21 2025 at 6:33PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I disagree with the proposed inclusion of site N.

Has anyone considered the impact locally of vehicles trying to access this site to complete any proposed works? The reality of huge HGV and heavy plant vehicles excavating the site, delivering the many many tonnes of concrete, stone, tarmac, timber, roof tiles, floor insulations, loft insulations, fencing materials, interior materials that would be associated with developing approximately 70 houses? On a single lane that is congested every day with tourist coaches, cars, lorries, delivery vans.

Tanners Lane is a single track road with the absence of any pathway or room to install any pathway, foot traffic consisting of school children at relevant times and the ongoing flow of the locals and town visitors - how is it appropriate to attempt to further develop in this area? A major accident is waiting to happen under the current set up as it is, this is also impacted by the local hopper bus cutting up and down Tanners Lane - WHY? - because the High St is gridlocked.

I'm intrigued as to what amenities/services these potential new houses will link into? I was of the understanding that the existing sewage is full to bursting (hence the devastating pollution of the Windrush), also the current mains water supply that is intermittent. The flooding of the properties at the lower end of the town will surely only be exacerbated with any more development, perhaps the council are thinking they would like to spread the misery of the flooding to residents a bit further up the hill?

Cotswold Gate is still not fully occupied and building/road makeups have only been completed over the last few months after 2 -3 years! Although the materials used for this are supposedly in keeping with the area, it still stands out glaringly as a new development and a mass of concrete - do we really want this next to one of the most beautiful Grade1 listed properties in the country, let alone the town?

Our elected representatives need to take a stand, regardless of pressures from Government. There has to be a point where we stand up to government, councils, etc and say enough is enough. Although I live here and I'm biased, places like Burford have surely got to be preserved, ring fenced for our future generations to enjoy. The impact of destroying these stunning towns

and villages cannot be understated - it is non reversible. How can it be justified when we are met at every turn with environmental taxes and curbs for everything from how we heat our houses, drive our cars and get to work, yet it is perfectly acceptable to keep forcing these types of developments through.

•

Robert Nov 23 2025 at 3:27PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

living in Tanners Lane i really do not see how this proposal will work! Tanners lane is already congested with local people , tourists and parents dropping their children at the local primary school . plus it is used as a pathway by local children using it as access to the secondary school. dog walkers up to the dog field. and parents of young children to the play park. it has no footpath and classed as a single track road. it is not a suitable access road for 70 houses . not with standing the carnage of building these houses with lorries for materials or even tradesman in their vehicles . surely this has not been thought out . i can't even believe that highways would even entertain this proposal.

•

Yvonne Dearman Nov 23 2025 at 3:38PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I disagree with the proposal of the Sheeo street option for many reasons that have been covered in these comments . My main concern is traffic as the approach from both sides to the site is single unmarked roads and Tanners lane has no footpath at all whilst Sheep street only one side. Sheep street is already congested and can not manage another 70 homes. Flooding is also an issue as the rain water runs down to the site. A new site needs to be found at the top of the hill with direct access from the A40.

•

Lucy Mae Dearman Nov 23 2025 at 5:59PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

hi, my name is Lucy and i frequently walk up Tanners Lane to walk my dog and drive down Sheep street . both are incredibly difficult with the amount of traffic already using both roads. You could class Sheep Street a single road with cars parked both sides of the street. constantly i am having to reverse (mainly because 4 x 4 Range Rovers are bigger than my little Peugeot) to let vehicles by. it would seem ludicrous to accept anymore traffic than is absolutely necessary onto these roads

•

Beth Tarpey-Clark Nov 24 2025 at 9:12AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

My objections to this proposal

1. Desecration of ancient landscape , the site of an ancient battle, in an ANOB and Conservation area.

2. There is no room for more traffic. Burford is already gridlocked. What toll does all this traffic and pollution

have on our lovely unique ancient buildings? Isn't the point of protection to err protect?

3. What about the safety of the children and elderly residents who have to walk up and down Tanners Lane? It

is a key access lane for both schools. No footpath or room to construct one.

4. Where will all the household waste go? What about the surface water that will cascade down the sloping site

onto Sheep Street? How will that be dispersed? Where to?

5. Burford can't cope with or need any more housing development.

If absolutely necessary to develop this part of West Oxfordshire, consider enhancing Bradwell Village. Plenty

of space with very easy access to Burford and Carterton.

Construct a car / coach park with a shuttle bus to Burford. And/or develop a drop off point on the A40.

•

Sarah Millard Nov 24 2025 at 9:20AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the above draft Local Plan and appreciate the recognition of Burford's distinctive heritage, environmental setting, and infrastructure constraints. As such below are my objections to the proposed use of Area N - South of Sheep Street as set out in the October 2025 Local Plan Preferred Spatial Options paper.

1. Settlement Hierarchy

Burford's designation as a Tier 2 Service Centre accurately reflects its modest size, limited services, and the geographic constraints of the Cotswolds National Landscape. Any potential future growth should remain strictly proportionate, small in scale, and fully dependent on prior infrastructure provision within a holistic long term neighbourhood plan governed by the residents of Burford and in accordance with Cotswold National Landscape policy.

2. Highways and Access:

Access via Tanners Lane or Sheep Street is extremely narrow and congested, the Local Plan itself states that surrounding roads are "narrow and constrained" with limited pavements, poor visibility and significant parking pressure. There is no suitable or safe connection to the A40, and additional

housing traffic would worsen safety and congestion to residents in that area and in the already congested town centre.

3. Parking Pressures:

Burford faces chronic parking shortages for residents and visitors. Approving a housing development to secure funding for public parking is not a solution.

4. Water Supply and Pressure:

Residents regularly experience low water pressure and temporary supply interruptions when Thames Water rebalances the network. This is a very clear demonstration that the system already operates at capacity.

5. Sewerage and Drainage: The local network is old, with minimal investment and maintenance, consequently the town, including the proposed site South of Sheep Street, is vulnerable to surcharging and flooding during heavy rainfall.

6. Schools and Healthcare:

Burford Primary and Burford School are above or near capacity, and the GP surgery is overstretched. Again consideration needs to be given to education and health infrastructure before any potential expansion.

7. Landscape and Heritage:

The site lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape, adjacent to Burford Priory and the Conservation Area. Development here would erode the historic southern approach and diminish Burford's visual and cultural

integrity. The Cotswolds National Landscape is one of the most valued landscapes in the United Kingdom and as such the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out to protect to the same level as National Parks when it comes to scenic beauty, landscape character and heritage.

Development is restricted especially on open edges and rural approaches like Sheep Street.

Additional Comments:

The Council should re-examine alternative sites nearer the A40 corridor, where access and infrastructure capacity are stronger. By contrast, the land south of Sheep Street, should it come up for sale, potentially could deliver greater community and visitor benefit as a recreational park or green space, linking to the Windrush Valley. This would enhance biodiversity and flood resilience, promote health and wellbeing, and maintain Burford's cherished rural edge and heritage views for all to enjoy.

Visitors from all over the world recognise the beauty and historic importance of Burford, It is essential that West Oxfordshire District Council and Burford Town Council take a holistic and long-term view of Burford's future. I appreciate that housing targets are not set by WODC or BTC but

planning and housing development cannot be a numbers approach to ensure targets as set by Government in London are met. A sustainable plan for the town should integrate, transport and parking strategy, water, drainage and energy resilience, protection of the historic environment, local

economic vitality (independent shops and tourism), real affordable housing for local people, and green and recreational spaces.

A long term rolling plan would give residents, businesses, and potential developers a shared roadmap, ensuring that each phase of development strengthens, rather than strains, the town's infrastructure and character. A joined-up, infrastructure-first approach will ensure Burford evolves as a

balanced, liveable community, preserving its unique heritage while meeting future needs.

•

Jane Brylewski Nov 24 2025 at 3:47PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford is at a complete standstill traffic wise for much of the time and the A40 is likewise.

Building houses here is not sensible not only for traffic reasons, but the infrastructure is not able to keep up with the current demands put upon it. Eg. Sewage, doctors services to name just two.

•

John Middleton Nov 24 2025 at 3:52PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Housing need ;

Not needed as there are so many Airbnb's in the town and a large of number unsold houses at Burford Gate (app. the Garden Centre) ; these were mostly social housing and have morphed into residential through lack of local employment .

On a more positive note : Tannery yard and the old Caravan Park would be sensible development .

Area N would create enormous problems with traffic , 70 extra cars minimum plus all the service vehicles . On

Armistice day the A361 through the High St. is restricted while the Service is taking place round the War

Memorial . Traffic travelling South and North on the A361 has to use Tanners lane for about 30 minutes the

result chaos NB for HGV's . This proves Sheep St and Tanners Lane are NOT suitable for any large scale development . Do the current councillors really want to put their names to a plan that would ruin Burford .

Hopefully , full consideration will have been given to the unsuitable topography of the site from a drainage

point of view . There is a dip in the road , before the Lower Upton lane which regularly fills with water and

makes the footpath impassable. NOTE the same thing happens in Witney St after heavy rain .

The flood water

gets dragged along the road and then freezes causing several accidents .

The unique character of our medieval town should be safe guarded at all cost , but by all means improve the

free parking so all can enjoy its charm and support the local traders and hostelryes .

Any plan left on the map for future development will encourage one of the big builders to earmark it and leave

Area N open to bribery of a future council to release a larger part of the fields to the South right up to the A40 .

Just a million pound donation to the Council of the future (a free sports stadium !) and outline consent will be

available on the whole areaBE WARNED !

•

Trevor and Margaret Yates Nov 24 2025 at 3:57PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

My wife and I would like to register our objections to the above proposal based upon the following.

1. The development would be within an AONB and be detrimental to the Cotswold National Landscape.
2. Burford has recently experienced a major development at the Cotswold Gate which significantly increased to housing stock.
3. Traffic problems already blight Burford high street and this proposed developments would exasperate the problem increasing to pollution. A coach park would bring no benefit to Burford and adding to the problems. When offloading 40 or more visitors they tend

to follow a guide around the town before leaving. At best the only service they demand is tea and pee. Consider why Bourton on the Water and Bibury have band coaches parking in their area.

4. Schools in Burford are over-subscribed and some of the existing residents cannot enrol for these local services.

5. Doctors surgery had recently closed to new patients , any increase of this magnitude would be unsustainable.

6. The large development would significantly increase the water run off leading to potential problems with the Priory ancient woodland. Add run off would add to the flooding problems in Burford and further downstream in Witney. Currently, the land acts to absorb the rainfall and release the runoff over a period rather than a river of water runoff down the roads or drains.

•

Yasmin Scott Nov 24 2025 at 4:23PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 – AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons.

As a lifelong Burfordian—having attended the local preschool through to secondary school—and as someone who continues to work locally as an estate agent, I have a deep and long-standing understanding of the town, its character, and its needs. This development is not what Burford needs, nor is it proportionate to the scale and capacity of our community.

1. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

Burford has always, and continues to, suffer from severe parking pressures, particularly during busier times of the year. Even long-standing residents living in beautiful listed homes—many of which do not come with any parking at all—

struggle daily, and the situation is already beyond capacity. Additionally, the local primary school is extremely small with very limited capacity. It is simply not equipped to absorb the significant number of additional families that a development of this size would bring.

2. Impact on the Character of Burford

Burford is valued for its heritage, landscape, and unique small-town identity. A large-scale housing estate risks altering the character of the town in a way that cannot be reversed.

3. Lack of Local Need

In my professional capacity as an estate agent, I see the housing trends and demands in the local market daily. The proposed development does not align with the genuine housing needs of Burford residents. Large estates of this scale do not address affordability issues or community-appropriate housing; instead, they overwhelm the existing fabric of the area.

4. Environmental and Traffic Concerns

Additional traffic through already congested routes would increase safety risks and pollution levels. The environmental impact on surrounding green spaces also raises serious concerns. For these reasons, I strongly urge the council to reject the proposal.

•

Jo Allen Nov 24 2025 at 5:09PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I totally disagree with the plan to further extend Burford. It would lose its charm and historical features. It would take away the reasons why people choose to visit here, its authentic footprint will be ruined forever. It will also impact local residents as Dr's appointment will be harder to get and the schools are already too big.

•

Alan watson Nov 24 2025 at 5:33PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I disagree on the basis of

- ruining the AONB which, as I understand it, means there should be no major development unless a significant need is shown. I have seen no evidence of significant need and can't see one when so many homes are for sale and the town has no major commerce expansion.
- lack of access. Why build 70+ houses to empty out on to a single track road and congested streets of a medieval town. Surely there are better places to locate sites of this scale?
- lack of care from both town and district councils in prioritising small scale and brownfield developments which would best suit a centre such as Burford.

•

Sara Goodfellow Nov 24 2025 at 5:35PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I fiercely object to this proposal. The roads cannot take the current traffic let alone an additional 150 cars. Access is not even possible on Sheep Street which is narrow and congested! The school is already over subscribed as is the surgery and the houses opposite the Burford garden centre remain unsold.

•

Elizabeth Bennett Nov 24 2025 at 5:40PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

1. Traffic & Road Safety

The Sheep Street area - especially near the High Street - is already congested. 70 new homes could mean well over 100 additional cars, increasing:

- traffic bottlenecks
- safety risks for pedestrians, children, and older residents
- parking pressure in already narrow streets

2. Impact on Heritage & Character

Burford is a historic town with a unique character.

A large modern development risks eroding the historic landscape, causing lasting visual and environmental impact.

3. Environmental & Wildlife Impact

The proposed site may support:

- hedgerows
- natural drainage patterns

Development risks habitat loss, increased surface water runoff, and potential flooding issues elsewhere.

4. Drainage & Sewage Capacity

Small towns often have limited sewage and drainage capacity. An influx of 70 homes may overwhelm the existing system, increasing the risk of:

- wastewater issues
- stormwater overflow
- maintenance burden for the council

5. Strain on Parking Availability

Burford already suffers from limited parking, especially during peak tourist months. 70 new homes put additional burden on streets with no capacity to absorb it.

6. Increased Pollution

More vehicles mean:

- more air pollution
- more noise pollution
- greater impact on a town with already high visitor traffic

7. Visual Overdevelopment

The scale of the project may be inappropriate for the plot, creating a sense of overdevelopment that is not in keeping with Burford's scale or aesthetics.

8. Lack of Supporting Infrastructure Upgrades

Without parallel investment in:

- healthcare
- education
- roads
- utilities

The proposal is unsustainable and puts residents at a disadvantage.

9. Precedent for Further Expansion

Approving this could set a precedent for more large developments, accelerating the urbanisation of a small historic town.

-

I disagree with the proposed approach

We are disagreeing with this plan of expansion for Burford. There seems no logical reason for this site to be considered.

-

Gemma Reffell Nov 24 2025 at 5:51PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am against the proposal on the grounds of traffic, desecration of the AONB and lack of evidence / proof that a development of this scale is needed.

The council will hopefully realise what residents need and that this is not it!

Please listen to everyone's views as they all talk sense.

-

Roger Weston Nov 24 2025 at 5:58PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposed plan will be an eyesore in an AONB. It will be a ribbon development, hemmed in on all sides by narrow single lane roads. Drainage will be a problem. Traffic on Sheep Street will be catastrophic!

-

judith 1 Nov 24 2025 at 6:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Put simply, there is no identified need for housing and the development would destroy the Town which has been spared from Urban sprawl of the type proposed. No exceptional reasons have been identified to walk all over the protection afforded an AONB/Cotswold National Landscape. The site will be accessed primarily from the east and south no matter what planners may wishfully say. Sheep Street and Tanners Lane which are already hazardous will become dangerous particularly at school time. Pedestrians, including school children, dog walkers and cyclists are regular users.

Finally I am very concerned by the partisan way in which our WODC Councillor is promoting the scheme, which leads many to suspect his reasons. Surely he is hopelessly conflicted!

-

Nic Harrison Nov 24 2025 at 6:03PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We visit Burford regularly due to its historic charm and the fact that it is in a AONB. If the proposed area is developed, it will significantly ruin the appeal of the town to us as tourists. The traffic is already bad and I worry this will make it even worse. The history behind Battle Edge will forever be forgotten under ever increasing concrete. We must preserve our heritage!

-

Margaret Harrison Nov 24 2025 at 6:07PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am vehemently opposed to this site being developed for every single reason already listed above. AONB, narrow roads, increased traffic, loss of historic battlefield, another ribbon development! Disaster for what is one of few remaining gems of the Cotswolds.

•

Heidi Denee Nov 24 2025 at 6:09PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

It will destroy an AONB! This is pure lunacy. There are other very obvious sights that would be better suited!

•

Taisa Lane Nov 24 2025 at 6:15PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Building in such a special and beautiful AONB will be detrimental to the appeal of Burford for many tourists. It will become another Chipping Norton/Moreton in Marsh. The loss of such a historical battle field is deeply worrying. I cannot understand why this site has been put forward by Burford Town Council as it is definitely NOT in the interest of the local residents. There are other more obvious and practical sites!

•

Chris Lane Nov 24 2025 at 7:23PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

It will not be an AONB if this development goes ahead!!

•

Edward Harrison Nov 24 2025 at 7:28PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

An AONB will be destroyed! It will destroy the unique character of Burford. There are better alternative sites that will cause less environmental and historical damage.

•

Paul Wright Nov 25 2025 at 11:42AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons...

Do the BTC and WODC understand the real feelings of the local residents living in the town and outlying villages.

We don't need any more housing.

We understand both the Mayor and DC are in this together. The Mills family are connected with

the chairman of a well respected property agency in Oxfordshire, who in turn is dealing with a list of developers.

How can this site be viable with only 70 houses plus a public car park. The figures do not stack up?

No due diligence has been done with regards to ecological surveys or the highways agency.

The site is within Cotswolds Natural Landscape (AONB).

The lanes of Priory and Tanners have no public footpaths. This is an accident waiting to happen.

There is already congested roads in Burford, the best result is to have a housing and car park directly off the A40 giving easy access and not to ruin the Medieval heritage. You can easily screen this from the A40 with a few trees and landscaping.

The wood directly adjacent to the site is a classified "Ancient Woodland".

•

Rob Alexander Nov 25 2025 at 11:44AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I wish to register my objection to the proposal to site 70 houses on the site at the end of Sheep Street. We already have issues with traffic, parking and flooding in the town.

We cannot sustain such a large number of additional houses in Burford, in my opinion.

•

Shirley Russell Nov 25 2025 at 11:46AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

As a resident of Sheep Street I have to oppose the proposed development. I have parking at my house but to drive into Sheep Street Requires plenty of time and the courtesy of other drivers to let me out. Buses, delivery vans to The Lamb and Bay Tree, Cars driving to and from the Surgery going to and from the Surgery all add to the chaotic amount of traffic. Even a small increase in traffic would mean gridlock.

Residents of the proposed houses would have no access to a doctor or school both of which are already full.

The proposed use of this amenity which is one of the many attractions of Sheep Street shows a disturbing lack of appreciation by the planning team of the destruction of this agricultural land and the beauty of historic Burford.

Who are these houses for? There are still houses unsold on the estate opposite the Garden Centre

Please register my objections.

•

Stephen Newman Nov 25 2025 at 11:54AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Hello, I am a resident of Sheep Street in Burford & I strongly oppose this proposal for the development of 70 dwellings in respect of Consultation Question 32 Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. The main reasons for my opposition are as follows;

1 As a resident of Sheep Street I already have to contend with the high volume of traffic which flows both ways along Sheep Street. As cars are parked along both sides of Sheep Street, it is

effectively a single track road. As a result there are many times throughout the day especially, when moving along Sheep Street in a vehicle becomes chaotic, not to mention downright dangerous for pedestrians. Adding 70 dwellings with the resulting additional traffic, will only add to the congestion and exacerbate an already challenging and unacceptable situation.

2 The extra traffic will also impact on Priory lane, which is already a rat run through to the lower high street. There is a blind corner half way along priory lane, and it is only a matter of time before there is an accident in that location.

3 We live in an AONB. How can it possibly be acceptable to build 70 dwellings in this historic location ?. A previous planning application for 70 dwellings was refused on the other side of Burford. The justification for that refusal applies to this new proposal.

4 There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the population growth. The Cotswold Gate development has materially added to the towns population. Unless there is an additional school/doctors surgery, then how can the town be expected to cope with this growth.

5 I do not consider myself to be a NIMBY, as I am not against developments per se, so long as the infra structure keeps pace, but even if the issue of the lack of primary school places which I gather was over subscribed this year by circa 50% ! (perhaps similar issues exist at the Burford School too) and the doctors lack of capacity is resolved, why build on this specific and historic green belt site, when there are other less disruptive options available. Eg, surely it makes more sense to expand the Cotswold Gate development towards Carterton. And/or a much smaller development on brownfield site in Burford where the Laundry is located would be far more logical. Obviously that site would not create 70 dwellings, but it could create a meaningful quantity of social housing in flats. I hope you will consider my concerns should a formal planning application be submitted for this wholly inappropriate housing development.

One other aspect I would like to mention, is that I would be supportive of the suggestion to create a purpose built coach park on land at the top of Tanners Lane. The town badly needs to eliminate coaches from the high street, and the current 'coach park', located outside the Priory on Priory Lane is simply not fit for purpose and again creates danger. Indeed I recently witnessed a coach driver struggling to do a 3 point turn who proceeded to hit the primary school wall, causing the wall to visibly wobble & lean at least 1 foot, before falling back into place as the driver moved forward. Had school children been in that area at the point of impact it could have caused an injury.

•

John Yeomans Nov 25 2025 at 1:23PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons :

I do not believe that Burford needs this additional housing, as properties in the new Burford Gate development are still available.

The location of the proposed development will cause traffic chaos along Sheep St., Tanners Lane and Priory lane,.

Traffic in Burford is already far too heavy and there are regular gridlocks on the main road .

Additional parking should be provided by the A40 at the top of tanners lane.

The environmental impact from drainage from the development site down to the North side of Sheep St. will cause flooding an impact the Ancient woodland on the site of the Priory.

•
Paul Hardiman Nov 25 2025 at 3:53PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Re. consultation question 32 - Area N, West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 consultation

Following a meeting of local residents, with local councillors present, I want to oppose the proposal consultation question 32 – AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. As a concerned local resident, I strongly oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons:

1. The building of 70/80 homes on this site is not supported by the reality of the lived experience of Burford, i.e.

a. the current and potential poor infrastructure of roads: Sheep Street and Tanners Lane already function as single-track roads in effect. They are narrow with no space for footpaths and already very busy with a range of motor vehicle traffic as evidenced by a recent traffic survey.

b. the constrained access to school places: local schools are already oversubscribed and turning away local children

c. the challenge to GP surgery access that already cares for 7,860 patients

2. The CANOB is not a view from the A40; rather it is an environment that is experienced and lived in by locals and visitors together. This proposed development obliterates farmland and countryside; it threatens fields and ancient woodlands that that can never be enjoyed or regained once it's concreted over and damaged by flooding. It desecrates an historic battle site of archaeological value that is remembered and celebrated. This is a vital legacy matter for the Burford community, reliant on tourism to the town, and for the wider CANOB.

3. New houses in this area means increased traffic and so more congestion, reducing the quality of life of Burford residents and visitors. Parking is already limited and under pressure in Burford, but this is not addressed by building more homes; it's possible to focus exclusively on providing more parking on accessible brown sites.

4. Cotswold Gate estate remains incomplete and has properties that remain empty now. Where is the evidence that 70 new homes meet a proven local housing need? Development should not be driven by landowner and developer profit at the expense of Burford people and environment.

a. Cotswold Gate already increased Burford's population by 25% in four years; adding 70 more homes would mean a total 34% rise, which is not proportionate.

b. The new site qualifies as a major development; WODC must show exceptional need, which cannot simply be "more houses needed in West Oxfordshire.

c. Burford currently has 55 Airbnb listings and 24 homes for sale; several "affordable" homes are now on the market at £325–£435k, including eight at Cotswold Gate.

5. The Council is contradicting itself when the Coles Field conversation of 2023 and its objections is examined alongside this proposal. What has changed to now recommend this proposal?

a) In January 2023, BTC and WODC strongly opposed 70 homes at Cole's Field, citing harm to the AONB, the Conservation Area, access issues, and serious infrastructure limits. They declared they would lodge strong objections.

b) Now this development proposal supports a similar-sized development on the opposite side of town with the same issues. What has happened to reverse these previous statements on landscape impact, heritage harm, access, and infrastructure strain?

•

Gordon 3 Nov 25 2025 at 4:42PM

I would like to make a general comment

I would reluctantly go along with this provided that local infrastructure is improved to cope with the additional housing especially the surgery, the primary school, water supply and sewerage. The site is adjacent to the surgery and it would be ironic if new residents moved in and then found the surgery could not cope with additional patients. At present appointments can only be made two to three weeks in advance, by which time the patient may well be dead or have recovered on their own.

•

Geoffrey Haines Nov 25 2025 at 4:46PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons:

1. The location is in the Cotswold National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). The proposed development can be classed as “major” and the NPPF has special provision to protect the National Landscape from such developments. It can only be justified if the development is exceptional and in the public interest. There are no exceptional reasons given for these houses as there has been a major development at Cotswold Gate recently some of which still unsold. Houses do not constitute public interest.
2. The site is directly opposite an Ancient Woodland. Any development so close will be affected by water runoff from the site which slopes into this woodland
3. The site is on or near to the battle in 752AD between King Ethelbald of Mercia and King Cuthred of West Saxon. Our history should be preserved not desecrated or buried.
4. The proposed 70 houses will more treble the number of residences on Sheep Street. There is also a proposed car park on the site. This will increase traffic in both Sheep Street and Tanners Lane, the latter of which has no pavement. Tanners Lane is used throughout the day, with school children walking to Burford School and residents with dogs, pushchairs and prams all having to walk in the road. There is no space to build a path. The infrastructure cannot support this development
5. The primary school is oversubscribed due to the recent Cotswold Gate development. Children are thus being refused entry – 11 this year, who are now having to be driven to other schools.
6. There are other, smaller brownfield sites that were proposed earlier this year. These are suitable.

•

Paul Atkin Nov 25 2025 at 9:24PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The infrastructure of the town is insufficient to deal with the population already here, let alone of a proposed new estate set so close to the town centre. Sheep street is not fit for the level of proposed traffic, it isn't fit for that which already uses it. The primary school was oversubscribed by 50% this academic year. The surgery is already turning patients away from the town. I just feel there are far better options for development in the local area that wouldn't have such a negative impact on a town that is already too busy and under resourced.

•

Gordon Jolly Nov 25 2025 at 9:32PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

It is regrettable that this site is being proposed for possible development. It lies within the Cotswold National Landscape and therefore enjoys protection per paragraphs 189 and 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These specify that major developments (which the proposed 70 dwellings and off street parking represent) should be refused "... other than in exceptional circumstances ...". Given this the Preferred Spatial Options document is silent on what exceptional circumstances would justify this site being considered suitable for development. The document makes passing reference to the Cotswold National Landscape and is dismissive of any possible development's impact. The document also mentions the site's proximity to the Grade 1 listed Burford Priory, but again fails to discuss or justify the impact of any possible development. Paragraphs 202 to 221 of the NPPF detail a number of requirements and obligations that local planning authorities must comply with when considering developments which could effect the historic environment and heritage assets. Again the Preferred Spatial Options document is silent on how any impact(s) of possible development would be justified.

It is inconceivable that any planning applications submitted for development within Area N - South of Sheep Street, Burford would ever be approved and they should be refused on Natural Landscape and Historic / Heritage reasons alone. As such Area N - South of Sheep Street, Burford should not be included in the Local Plan 2043.

•

Jessica Atkin Nov 25 2025 at 9:38PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Why build more housing when houses remain available at Cotswold Gate?

Where is the need? Why create even more of a traffic problem when we haven't solved the current traffic issues in Burford currently?

Why put extra strain and pressure on public amenities when current Burford residents already struggle to access these?

Why prioritise the greed of landowners and property developers over the conservation and preservation of the Cotswold landscape, arguably the same landscape which attracts thousands of tourists a year, and maintains the local economy? Listen to residents, preserve Burford's soul.

•

Jessica Atkin 1 Nov 25 2025 at 10:05PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

When a good proportion of the proposed 70 houses remain empty (as is the case with Cotswold Gate), will there be yet another proposal to build further houses? When does it stop? When will common sense prevail? Please don't turn Burford into a high street surrounded by adjoined housing estates.

•

Karen GADD Nov 26 2025 at 12:46PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I must express my deep concern and strong opposition to this proposal. Developing this land would cause irreversible harm—practically, historically, and environmentally—and would fundamentally change the character of our community.

First and foremost, this development would place local people at risk.

The proposed 70 homes would more than triple the number of residences on Sheep Street, and with the addition of a car park, traffic through both Sheep Street and Tanners Lane would surge. Tanners Lane has no pavement and is used daily by schoolchildren walking to Burford School, as well as parents with prams, residents exercising dogs, and elderly pedestrians. They already have no choice but to walk in the road. Increasing traffic here would make an already hazardous situation genuinely dangerous. Our infrastructure is at its limit—this development would push it far beyond what is safe or sustainable.

The strain on essential community services is already visible.

Our primary school is oversubscribed, due largely to the recent Cotswold Gate development. Eleven local children were denied places this year and now must travel to schools outside the town. This erodes community cohesion and generates yet more traffic. Adding further housing without the capacity to support the growing number of families is not just impractical—it is unfair.

This land is also part of our shared history.

The site lies on or near the battlefield where King Ethelbald of Mercia and King Cuthred of Wessex clashed in 752 AD. This landscape is more than soil—it is a place of national memory. To build over it would be to lose a piece of our story forever. Once our heritage is buried, it cannot be reclaimed.

Wider landscape protection also cannot be ignored.

This land lies within the Cotswold National Landscape one of England's most treasured protected areas. The proposal constitutes a major development, exactly the kind that the NPPF seeks to restrict unless there are truly exceptional reasons and clear public interest. No such reasons have been provided. With the large Cotswold Gate development still not fully sold, it is evident that this is not an urgent or exceptional case. Housing numbers alone do not justify sacrificing a nationally protected landscape.

There are better options.

Earlier this year, several smaller brownfield sites were proposed sites that would provide

housing without destroying protected landscapes, threatening wildlife, or overwhelming our roads and services. These should be prioritised.

•

David Miles 12 Nov 26 2025 at 9:13PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford should be thankful it is only being expected to absorb another 70 houses when other villages and towns with often less facilities are expected to take hundreds or thousands.

•

Simon Cawte Nov 26 2025 at 9:15PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposed location is neither sustainable nor accessible and the vehicular movements that will inevitably arise from 70 dwellings which are likely to be constituted of households with 2 or more cars and multiple car journeys per day.

Whilst Burford has a modest commercial centre it is by no means an employment hub and the location is not meaningfully served by public transport. As a result residents will be disproportionately car-reliant and the existing roads are unable to safely support such an increase in traffic flow. Area N is accepted in the proposal as being served by roads which are “narrow” and “quite constrained” with Sheep Street specifically being noted as “narrow” and lacking visibility. This is if anything an understatement as the congestion and complexity of traffic through Burford and its arterial routes is already a known problem which presents a very real hazard to drivers and pedestrians. Sheep Street and neighbouring roads onto the High Street are hemmed by listed properties within what is a conservation area, it is therefore simply not possible to remodel these roads in a way to make them wide enough or capable of offering the visibility splays required. To inject hundreds of additional car movements per day into what is already a highly problematic transport bottleneck when there is no compulsion to do so would be directly at odds with the Council’s sustainability ambitions and community safety considerations.

•

Andrew Carter Nov 27 2025 at 6:26PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I disagree entirely with this proposal.

The site is in an AONB. It should therefore be preserved and absolutely not developed. The Upton road/Sheep Street is an extremely special entry road into Burford. A development on this site would be criminal.

The site is also the location of a historic battle. It should therefore be preserved.

To have x 70 more homes in Burford; The Upton Road/Sheep Street is already narrow. Not at all suitable to heavy traffic. This could also result in 100-140 additional cars which Burford cannot

take- there is already a huge traffic issue in the town- especially in the Summer months.

Sheep Street is narrow and the site can flood.flood

In addition, the proposed site is opposite a Listed house and ancient gardens. This ancient environment needs to be preserved.

Also facilities in Burford are already stretched- no more places at the local schools and also the GP surgery is now not taking on new patients.

•

Fiona Watson and Ashley Bunkall Nov 28 2025 at 9:52AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We wish to register our objection to the proposal to recommend the building of 70 houses on Area N (Consultation Question 32) for the following reasons:

1.0 The proposal would change the character of Burford as a historic medieval town, whose attraction is dependent on the uniform character of the buildings and quality of life.

2.0 Burford is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the preservation of which would be detrimentally affected by the number of buildings, volume of traffic and environmental consequences of the proposed development.

3.0 The proposed site is part of an attractive approach to the town from the east, which comprises open fields bounded by traditional stone walling and woodland before merging with historic buildings.

4.0 The proposal would significantly increase the volume of vehicular traffic in Sheep Street, which already is at an unacceptable level due to the commercial (The Lamb Hotel and The Bay Tree Hotel), medical (The Surgery) and residential occupants of Sheep Street, together with the vehicular traffic that uses Sheep Street as a means of access to the A40 and to Priory Lane.

5.0 The proposal would significantly increase demand for schools and the surgery, both of which are already at full capacity.

•

Grace Waterworth Nov 28 2025 at 10:11AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 - Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I do not agree with building a major development of 70 houses at site N in Burford. This green field is part of the Cotswold National Landscape and deserves special protection as stated in Policy 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

Site N on Sheep Street immediately adjoins the historic town and is opposite the ancient woodland which is part of the Grade 1 listed Priory.

A major development has only recently been completed at Shilton Road which is still not fully sold, meeting local housing needs.

Site N borders a public right of way which is regularly enjoyed by residents and visitors and is just a short walk from the centre of Burford. The loss of opportunity to walk through this stunning Cotswold National Landscape and replace it with housing would be detrimental to the

many who find access to this landscape uplifting and beneficial to their physical and mental health.

There is no direct access to the A40. Most of the additional traffic from a development of 70 houses would further congest narrow streets not designed for cars, due to their historic nature. Sheep Street upon entering town is single lane with cars parked both sides and there's much reversing and manoeuvring of cars at busy times. Tanners Lane is single track without a footpath and is the only means for those living on Tanners Lane to walk into town. Other regular users include children from the Burford Schools, parents with toddlers going to the Preschool or the recreational

ground and cyclists. Much of Priory Lane is also single track without a footpath and is particularly busy at school times with children being walked or driven to the junior school.

There is not a train station in Burford and the bus services take too long for commuting to work so another major development will result in even more cars on already congested local roads. The junior school is oversubscribed and the surgery stretched.

This small historic town with its constrained roads and set in the Cotswold National Landscape is not a suitable place for another large housing development. I would urge planners to consider smaller scale housing projects, utilising brownfield sites or repurposing existing buildings.

•

James Gallagher Nov 28 2025 at 10:28AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I would like to express my strong objection to the proposal for the development in Burford of a large housing site between the doctor's surgery and the cemetery on Sheep Street, as outlined in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2021–2043.

It is highly concerning that such a substantial development — involving the construction of at least 70 houses along with a coach and car park — is under consideration, given the recent large-scale expansion of the town with the Cotswold Gate development. The town is already at capacity with our doctor's surgery and the schools.

The surrounding roads — including Sheep Street, Priory Lane, Tanners Lane, and the High Street — are already under pressure from congestion and heavy traffic, including a high volume of lorries and coaches. The infrastructure is simply not equipped to absorb any additional pressure that would come with dozens of new households and increased vehicle movements.

A development of 70 homes would inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle including delivery vans, service vehicles, and visitor traffic. This would place a considerable strain on the town's narrow and already congested road network, particularly during peak hours.

Sheep Street in particular is already experiencing traffic problems with an increase in traffic flow and regular congestion as cars are parked on either side of the road. This is especially hazardous at school times, when parents with young children, prams, and buggies use the lane to reach the nursery. Older children also walk or cycle along Tanners Lane to and from the secondary school, while many others are driven the same way, further compounding the risks.

Also concerning are the ongoing issues of coach traffic and the absence of effective traffic management across the town. Adding a new car and coach park, without first addressing the existing problems, risks making a difficult situation even worse. It's hard to see how access to the site could be safely or sensibly managed.

Burford is a historically significant town, cherished for its unique architecture and its location within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The character of the town is central to both its identity and its appeal — not only to residents but also to visitors and the wider community. To support development on this scale, in such a sensitive area, risks causing permanent damage to this.

I hope WODC and Burford Town Council will listen closely to the concerns of Burford's residents and resist supporting a plan that so clearly risks undermining the very qualities that make Burford such a special place.

I believe this proposed development is ill-suited to the location and would create serious and lasting problems for traffic flow, public safety, and local infrastructure. I

urge you to reconsider the suitability of this site and prioritise the long-term well-being of this beautiful town and its residents.

•

Lizzie Florescu Nov 28 2025 at 10:32AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed development (by profit-driven property developers) to seventy new homes in an area which should be under the protection of the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) ie Sheep Street, Burford. Specifically, this is consultation question 32 - Area N, or West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043.

This famous and much cherished small Cotswold town does not have the appetite or the infrastructure to accommodate seventy new families. Each of these homes will have a strong thirst for water (washing machines, dishwashers, garden hoses, kitchen taps, showers etc) in an area which is under severe water pressure already. As you will know, in August 2025 a stretch of the river Thames near its source in the

Cotswolds dried up due to the change in our weather and rain patterns (five consecutive months of below average rainfall) and this was already a severe problem. The current water ecology problems in this beautiful and much loved Cotswold area are already caused by excess pollution from sewage discharge and excess plastic waste; add to this the incredibly wasteful years of building and construction and we have an environmental disaster in the making.

I know Burford well, and my family home is on Sheep Street, the area in question. Three generations of my family have loved Burford and would always strive to do what is best for the local community.

Profit and any financial gain does not factor into our attitudes towards Sheep Street. Sadly we have watched, day by day, the traffic problems of Burford become worse and worse recently.

Due to poor travel infrastructure and lack of traffic enforcement, there is a traffic and parking problem that everyone can see and everyone is aware of. Many properties on Sheep Street have two cars and the parking and

driving problem is immense. Every day it is a driving nightmare. To add to this by adding the potential

for 135 new cars, from seventy new houses, would be criminal.

Lastly, Sheep Street, Burford has been a much loved and admired part of England - both nationally and

internationally - for centuries. It is unique. It is our heritage. It should be protected and helped.

Currently it is under threat from over expansion due to greed. Please take a stand. Please fight the desecration and destruction of this natural landscape.

•

Rachel Gallagher Nov 28 2025 at 10:36AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I would like to express my strong objection to the proposal for the development in Burford of a large housing site between the doctor's surgery and the cemetery on Sheep Street, as outlined in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2021–2043.

It is highly concerning that such a substantial development — involving the construction of at least 70 houses along with a coach and car park — is under consideration, given the recent large-scale expansion of the town with the Cotswold Gate development. The town is already at capacity with

our doctor's surgery and the schools.

The surrounding roads — including Sheep Street, Priory Lane, Tanners Lane, and the High Street — are already under pressure from congestion and heavy traffic, including a high volume of lorries and coaches. The infrastructure is simply not equipped to absorb any additional pressure that

would come with dozens of new households and increased vehicle movements.

A development of 70 homes would inevitably lead to a substantial increase in vehicle including delivery vans, service vehicles, and visitor traffic. This would place a considerable strain on the town's narrow and already congested road network, particularly during peak hours.

Sheep Street in particular is already experiencing traffic problems with an increase in traffic flow and regular congestion as cars are parked on either side of the road. This is especially hazardous at school times, when

parents with young children, prams, and buggies use the lane to reach the nursery. Older children also walk or cycle along Tanners Lane to and from the secondary school, while many others are driven the same way, further compounding the risks.

Also concerning are the ongoing issues of coach traffic and the absence of effective traffic management across the town. Adding a new car and coach park, without first addressing the existing problems, risks making a difficult situation even worse. It's hard to see how access to the site could be safely or sensibly managed.

Burford is a historically significant town, cherished for its unique architecture and its location within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The character of the town is central to both its identity and its appeal — not only to residents but also to visitors and the wider community. To support development on this scale, in such a sensitive area, risks causing permanent damage to this.

I hope WODC and Burford Town Council will listen closely to the concerns of Burford's residents and resist supporting a plan that so clearly risks undermining the very qualities that make Burford such a special place.

I believe this proposed development is ill-suited to the location and would create serious and lasting problems for traffic flow, public safety, and local infrastructure. I urge you to reconsider the suitability of this site and prioritise the long-term well-being of this beautiful town and its residents.

•

Steffen Reichstadt Nov 28 2025 at 10:45AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Hello,

I refer to consultation question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal

as a development site for the following reasons:

- We (family of 4) live in Burford and there is already not enough space at the Primary School.

Our youngest is

currently on the waitlist and we are hoping that at the end of next year there will be room. But currently we cannot take her to the school in our own village and have to pay for a private school for her instead.

- There is too much traffic already and it is hard to get in and out of the village.

- Parking is overloaded down sheep street and a majority of houses on sheep street have no private off road parking so they have to park on the street. There is just no room for more people/cars.

- If there is a housing shortage maybe there should be tighter restrictions on AirBnbs and holiday lets. Those

aren't for the people of Burford. Those only support tourists.

-

Michael Davies Nov 28 2025 at 11:18AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I strongly object to this proposal to build 70 houses.

There is clearly no demand for such a large scale housing development when so many of the houses on the Cotswold Gate development stand empty.

The town is busy enough as it is with regular traffic jams on the main road through the town and along Sheep Street. Adding more traffic into this will be to the detriment of residents and visitors alike.

-

Lee Hardiman Nov 28 2025 at 12:36PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I do not agree that this development of houses is either suitable or desirable in this location.

While the need for a coach/car parking solution is evident, where is the evidence for the need for these houses in this area? People don't need to live in this part of Burford, and the development should not be driven by profiting from those who wish to live in Burford. The access is poor and will cause other traffic issues for Burford visitors and residents. It also threatens to irrevocably damage this area which is located in the AONB which damages the attractiveness of Burford.

This in turn adversely affects the driver for its local economy which is tourism.

-

Adam Baker Nov 28 2025 at 3:17PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford is a beautiful, ancient town in the Cotswold AONB with a significant number of listed buildings and a conservation area that covers virtually all of the town north of the A40. A key part

of its significance is that it is an exceptionally rare survival of a historic town that has avoided significant urban sprawl, at least on its north, west and east sides, which largely speaking adjoin open country without detracting from the historic town layout. Allowing this application will fundamentally change and erode this, by allowing one of its key edges to expand and sprawl. The proposed site is within the AONB and adjoins the Burford Conservation Area to two sides and the proposal is out of keeping with both these designations. A further huge concern is traffic as Burford is already very congested, forming the junction of the A424, A361 and A40: further development will only increase an already intolerable situation with traffic.

•

Pauline Greenacre Nov 28 2025 at 4:47PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I OPPOSE THIS PROPOSAL AS A DEVELOPMENT SITE

ACCESS. Tanners Lane is already hazardous with a large number of vehicles, cars,, buses, lorries, and taxis,

diverting to avoid The Hill (A 361). This puts residents, many school children and visitors to the recreation ground at grave risk. Jams therefore occur on Sheep Street and Priory Lane and the proposed development will only aggravate the situation.

SURGERY. 7000 patients for one Burford Surgery means long waits and periodic closure to new patients.

OUTSTANDING BEAUTY OF BURFORD. A tourist attraction would be compromised.

WATER SUPPLY AND DRAINAGE ISSUES

SCHOOLS AND WAITING LISTS

WOULD SUCH A DEVELOPMENT COMPLY WITH THE WEST OXFORDSHIRE STATED PLANNING OBJECTIVES?

•

Jeremy Stoke Nov 29 2025 at 11:25AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

My wife and I are regular visitors to Burford to see friends, do some shopping and enjoy the special charm that is Burford. The level of traffic has increased substantially since we first visited 20 years ago and is creating more congestion, pollution and the likelihood of a serious accident. More housing creates more cars, exacerbating parking and pollution issues. In addition adding a coach and car park is totally contrary to Burford and its environs as an Area of Natural Beauty (AONB). I fundamentally disagree with this proposal and support local residents in Sheep Street and the surrounding area who also strongly disagree. WODC please rethink this proposal and engage meaningfully with the local residents whose lives your decisions directly impact. Jeremy Stoke

•

Rod Molinare Nov 29 2025 at 10:50PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Sheep Street is far too restricted access for such a development. This housing proposal has already been rejected once in elsewhere in Burford. Whose pockets are being lined to continue to this speculative development which will destroy what makes Burford special?

•

nicolas CHAVANNE Nov 29 2025 at 10:51PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Unfortunately it will result in a desecration of a historical site and there is contradictory council feedback (Cole's Fields 70 dwellings in January 2021). It makes NO sense. In addition, it will result in increased traffic. It makes you wonder if there is money laundering going on with the developer. IT WILL RUIN SHEEP STREET. I OPPOSE IN THE STRONGEST TERMS

•

Jorge Pikunic Nov 29 2025 at 11:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

There is no benefit to the community to justify the negative impact that this development is going to have, particularly given the historic and natural value of the area. Yes it adds accommodation but the town doesn't have the infrastructure to support the scale of development. The Cole's Field development in 2023 was opposed - surely the council should also be against this.

•

Richard Parry Nov 30 2025 at 10:04AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The planning application is totally ill conceived. Coles Field which mirrors the Sheep Street site, was rejected because the infrastructure in Burford cannot handle housing developments of this size. If this application went ahead there would be another c.140 extra cars trying to navigate in Sheep Street. The traffic is bad enough with all the rat running that occurs every date with cars trying to cut through the lanes to avoid the congested roads. Greedy landowners just want to make their money with no regard to the destruction to land, landscape and environment, nor the chaos they will cause for the residents and visitors in the town. The land in question is totally unsuitable for development and should never have been proposed.

Richard and Anne

•

Paul Edwards Nov 30 2025 at 10:08AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposal of building an additional 70 homes in Sheep Street is folly. An already burgeoning traffic flow crisis can be witnessed daily and is a further step towards aiding the failing heartbeat, leading to gridlock and suffocating this unique town.

•

Phyllida Stoke Nov 30 2025 at 2:52PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I have been visiting Burford for many years and deeply value both its charm and existence as an historic entity. It is a living link with the past set in a designated Area of National Beauty, as earlier comments attest. By deliberately adding to what is already becoming a burdensome polluting traffic flow through constructing car and coach parks and then straining local welfare and schooling infrastructures beyond the limits with additional housing developments, WODC would ultimately destroy the very nature of Burford which visitors come to enjoy. I object to the development in the strongest possible terms and support the residents of Sheep Street on the grounds that it would desecrate a loved and historic town.

•

Chrissy Robertson Dec 1 2025 at 9:20AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to question 32 Area N and the West Oxfordshire local plan 2043.

I oppose this site: Cotswold Natural Landscape Historic site

We would lose the beauty of the west side of Burford

Burford schools are full due to development of Cotswold Gate Surgery full - due to development of Cotswold Gate

140+ additional cars would add to an already congested area

Little or no employment

Very limited public transport

Do we really need an additional housing development in Burford when there is already range of housing on the market, including properties at Cotswold Gate?

Should the building go ahead we would experience one/two years of traffic chaos which would destroy Sheep Street and surrounding single track roads leading from the A40, with large machinery, aggregate trucks, deliveries and services to the development site

•

Jessica Dearman Dec 1 2025 at 9:24AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 – AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons:

Firstly, Burford does not have the capacity to support additional housing. Essential local services, including the veterinary practice and GP surgery, are already operating at or beyond capacity. Introducing further homes would place unsustainable pressure on these facilities. Secondly, the existing road infrastructure is unsuitable for increased traffic. Sheep Street is a narrow, historic country lane and cannot safely or effectively accommodate additional vehicle movements. Burford already experiences significant congestion, particularly within its medieval street layout, and further development in this location would only worsen these issues.

If new homes must be included in the Local Plan, the development should be accessed via the A40 only. Cars should not be required to drive through Burford town centre to reach the new homes, as this would intensify existing congestion and undermine the character and functioning of the town. There is no justification for locating a development on Sheep Street where access is especially constrained.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the inclusion of AREA N as a development site.
Thank you

•

John Monks Dec 1 2025 at 9:30AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Reference consultation question 32 - Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043.

I am writing to oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons:

Burford is year on year becoming a horrendous bottleneck for traffic

The roads and infrastructure can't support anymore traffic

The exit out of Burford is a single carriageway which often results in total gridlock for Burford and surrounding roads

Schools are full

GP surgery is full and with no extra funding to support the already increased population from the development by Burford Garden Centre

Roads approaching the proposed site are not suitable for additional traffic

Carpark for visitors is often full and is closed when flooded

Roads around the area have endless potholes from vehicle damage

There is no case for these additional properties

In addition (as of today) there are 1050 properties unsold in a radius of 10 miles from Burford.

628 of these are below £475K (410 less than £350K). Many of

these have been on the market for over 12 months. There is NO demand for these properties.

The only winners will be the developers.

Why ruin a beautiful town enjoyed by West Oxfordshire residents and tourists alike?

As elected representatives you should be serving the people who voted you in .

With the exception perhaps of a small number of affordable properties for locals no one in Burford supports this plan.

•

Louisa North Dec 1 2025 at 9:35AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

As a Burford resident I refer to the above and I oppose this proposal as a development site for these reasons:

1. It is surplus to requirements since Burford has many vacant unsold properties both old and new.

2. It would be a detrimental obstacle in the town which already has such traffic congestion and Sheep Street is ancient and narrow and already clogged full.

3. It is a distinguishing feature of Burford in this Area of Outstanding Beauty that there is a little still left of the gorgeous rural landscape by way of this particular chunk of land. It is why people choose to live here and do

without for example a train station and associated jobs for people. It functions as a close knit community in

which its residents support one another and that would not be the case if superfluous modern

building
developments suck up its air and beauty and destroy its character.

•

Rosemary Beer Dec 1 2025 at 9:46AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We are objecting to latest planning proposal in Burford (consultation question 32 - Area N” and “West

Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 consultation).

The traffic this will generate is the worst thing. Next to the Doctors surgery where the car park cannot accommodate many vehicles for patients. Sheep street is lined with cars parking, adding 70 houses worth of cars getting onto this street. How awful. Gone will be the days of strolling round on our dog walks in shady lanes.

Doctors are overloaded and we have to wait a long time for appointments now let alone all these extra people.

Why do you want to make everywhere concrete?

Schools are full, any new residents will be driving miles to get to a school. More traffic.....

Our narrow roads cannot take all this transport.

I am sure there are more suitable places with better roads and amenities that can be built on. Please not in Burford a place of outstanding natural beauty

•

judith 2 Dec 1 2025 at 12:02PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

ludicrous proposal, no infrastructure considered, Sheep Street becomes a through street just for access. This street already has difficulty coping with existing traffic, what has happened to protect our heritage? Look at the unsold properties, new build, in Burford? Just stop this madness, look after what we have before it is destroyed.

•

Dr P Evans Dec 1 2025 at 2:18PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to the consultation question 32-Area north of the West Oxfordshire local plan 2043. I oppose this proposal for the following reasons:

1. It will adversely affect the beautiful ancient street
2. It will add to already hectic traffic problems in the High St.
3. It is not necessary to place such a large development in virtually the town centre.

Thank you for noting my comments.

•

Robert Evans Dec 1 2025 at 2:20PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Consultation questions 32-Area N

I object strongly to West Oxfordshire local plan 2043 under the above heading.

Urbanisation ,traffic congestion ,tourist numbers ,new buildings,large vehicles - all these will destroy the historic charm of Sheep Street.

Clearly,the local council is under pressure to ease the unwanted downside of Burford's popularity with visitors,many of whom contribute to the prosperity of the town.However,one of the gems of Burford is Sheep Street and I feel strongly that it would prove unwise to destroy it's unique appeal.

Is a "park and ride"feasible from out of town?

I appeal to the local planners to prevent the spoiling of Sheep Street.

•

Yulia Smith Dec 1 2025 at 6:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

As someone who works on Burford high street, I think it is really a terrible idea, which wasn't thought through properly. We already struggling to find a parking space and traffic coming in and out of Burford is often a gridlock. Town is overcrowded with visitors and locals. There is no infrastructure ready to support another 70 houses. Impossible to get appointment with Burford surgery as it is at the moment. School is oversubscribed. Not to mention conservation areas and AONB.

•

Victoria Oldfield Dec 1 2025 at 6:18PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This is a terrible idea which would detrimentally impact the Burford conservation area and Cotswold National Landscape AONB.

The local schools are already oversubscribed and struggling. The council should be protecting the green belt, not encouraging developers to build it.

There are many other reasons, listed by others who have commented.

•

Angela Campbell Dec 2 2025 at 9:40AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Reference: Planning Consultation Question 32 / Area N / West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 Consultation

I am contacting you to formally register my opposition to:

1. Any proposed development site for an additional houses in Sheep Street Burford;
2. Any development in Tanners Lane off the A40 for bus parking or housing.

Neither are in any way beneficial to the residents of Burford who have selected to live in this town fully appreciating there is no rail station and no significant employment potential in the town. We have all been drawn to Burford on account of its history and proximity to a rural setting and feel responsible for ensuring we retain the authenticity of Burford as the effective

shareholders. The development opposite the Burford Garden Company is by no means fully occupied and already includes many vacant properties. Furthermore, the infrastructure here is already at breaking point with one GP practice already struggling to serve the existing community. In terms of the visiting tourists, they would not wish to visit if the very unique qualities of Burford are destroyed. The town is more than the High Street. As people who have invested in the area, we need to be involved in important decisions about its short term and long term future.

Living as I do in Sweeps Lane, Tanners Lane is also a rural and residential area that has no capacity for bus parking. The current residents would find it difficult to have full access to their homes and would impact surrounding areas including Sheep Street and the A40.

•

Caroline Dunstall Dec 2 2025 at 9:50AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 consultation

I would like to object to the proposed development of 79 houses on Sheep Street in Burford. All the cars would have to drive along Sheep Street and out onto the High Street, which is already massively congested and often queuing all the way up the hill. Or they would have to drive up Tanners Lane, which is single file in some places and also difficult.

Overall, the town really can't cope with more traffic. Many people already say they wouldn't live here because of the traffic, and visitors comment on the congestion and fumes. We have already had a very large new development on Shilton Road, the town is getting to a tipping point where the roads, surgery and schools simply can't cope.

•

NIGEL 1 Dec 2 2025 at 9:50AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This option is madness and will make local residents life even more difficult than it already is with regards to the increase in traffic. The local road widths are not suitable for large coaches to navigate the roads safely for other road users.

•

Dr Chris Hawkins Dec 2 2025 at 11:56AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I'm writing to object to the proposed development on Burford. The site is inappropriate for the proposed development. The existing road width is inadequate, local infrastructure won't cope with the increased traffic, it's next to a conservation area, it's just not the right area for the town.

•

David Tanner Dec 2 2025 at 11:58AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a

development site for the following reasons:

Burford already has far too much traffic, and the removal of the HGV ban was a serious error causing significant damage to local infrastructure and causing the High street to become a high risk area for RTAs.

Cotswold gate provided additional housing and the impact was significant on locals, and not all positive.

Schools and doctors already completely over subscribed. I have to wait a month to see a dr!

The planning Authority accepted the reasons to NOT build on Cole's Field and these same reasons exist for this proposal. It is NOT required.

•

David Neale Dec 2 2025 at 12:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to consultation question 32 - Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043.

I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons.

1. Sheep Street is bounded by classic buildings of architectural and historical interest and any modern development will hugely detract from this.
2. It has up to now been a relatively quiet street within the beautiful centre of Burford leading out into open countryside. It contributes greatly to the character of the town and is a factor in the attraction felt by tourists to visit the town. Changing its nature by increased traffic and the creation of a suburb will detract from this attraction.
3. The increased traffic flows caused by the proposed development will cause pollution, congestion and create a safety hazard.
4. The addition of 70+ houses to the area is entirely inappropriate as it will destroy the character of this pleasant and historic street.
5. To suggest that the AONB would not be impacted by the development as it would not be visible from the A40 is absurd. Views from the A40 are irrelevant as it is views from within the AONB and the town itself that are more important in addition to the effect that that has on the essence of the area.

I hope that you will not approve this development.

•

Tracey Dec 2 2025 at 7:58PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

1. Sheep St is an historic example of quality architecture over many centuries.
2. Sheep St eventually leads to greenfield farmland either side.
3. Traffic WILL increase throughout the High St & Sheep St. This will increase congestion, Pollution, Safety issues & driver/pedestrian frustration.
4. 70 houses will RUIN FOREVER an Historic area of Burford. Also it will cause Sheep St to be a Rat Run & Short cut to the A40.
5. How many Cars will 70 houses facilitate?
6. The infrastructure cannot cope with this URBAN SPRAWL eg. More traffic & more sewerage for Thames Water to pump into the Windrush
7. There are STILL houses available opposite Burford Garden Co
8. The price of Land now is so expensive the price of houses will reflect that & probably be

bought by speculators, 2nd homers or AirB&B's
I Strongly OBJECT to this development

•

Clive B Dec 2 2025 at 8:23PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I STRONGLY OBJECT to this development these are the main reasons:

1. Sheep St is an historic example of quality architecture over many centuries.
2. Sheep St eventually leads to greenfield farmland either side.
3. Traffic WILL increase throughout the High St & Sheep St. This will increase congestion, Pollution, Safety issues & driver/pedestrian frustration.
4. 70 houses will RUIN FOREVER an Historic area of Burford.
5. How many Cars will be used by the 70 households?
6. The infrastructure cannot cope with this URBAN SPRAWL eg. More traffic more sewerage for Thames Water to pump into the Windrush
7. There are STILL houses available opposite Burford Garden Co.
8. The price of Land now is so expensive the price of houses will reflect this & probably be bought by speculators, 2nd homers or AirB&B's - there are still plenty of houses for sale in Burford & surrounding areas!

Gen Comment:

Burford is a very special town which still retains much original architecture, it has all the facilities we need for its present size. It is one of the few towns with no High street commercial properties vacant. The reason people want to move here is because of what it is NOT what it could be like in 20 yrs time!

•

Deborah C-N Dec 3 2025 at 12:04PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Given Burford is already at breaking point in terms of our infrastructure capacity and the already very heavy traffic congestion, coupled with the considerations to building on greenbelt & in this instance historic land, it is utter madness to even be contemplating a new development of 70 houses. This flawed proposal needs to be binned forthwith.

•

Amelia C Dec 3 2025 at 12:19PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford is a very special place on multiple levels with its stunning architecture spanning the ages, its historical richness, and its general appeal for locals and tourists alike. If ill considered developments such as the one being proposed along Sheep Street is permitted, that status will be diminished forever. Please do not allow, its non sensical, develop somewhere more appropriate instead where the infrastructure can keep pace and which is not on the greenbelt.

•

Mary Gay 1 Dec 3 2025 at 3:22PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

In addition to my previous comments on the proposal to develop this area I would like to make you aware that

this field has also been used to land emergency helicopters. It provides a safe and easily accessible location close to the town centre and the doctors' surgery should the need arise. To develop this land would preclude any such possibility

-

Paul 5 Dec 3 2025 at 9:29PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The document rightly notes that there are a number of very constrained and narrow streets in the vicinity, but incorrectly supposes these can cope with additional traffic. They cannot cope with the current level of traffic, and we expect this to grow irrespective of housing in order to continue to support the many businesses already located in Burford. In addition, the primary school is already hugely oversubscribed (by ~20 places). The relocation of coaches away from the school is important, but it seems incredibly unlikely that a coach park could be built in the proposed location without severely damaging the character of the locality and likely the wider town. Replacing some high street parking with drop off and pick up points must be a less damaging way of achieving it.

-

Nick Welsh Dec 4 2025 at 8:41AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Regarding: Consultation question 32 - Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 consultation

I would like to register my objection, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposal for 70 houses along Sheep Street in Burford which includes the suggestion of a car and coach park, as part of the WODC's emerging Local Plan.

Burford is already at breaking point in terms of congestion. Our infrastructure can't cope – our schools are over full, raw sewage is regularly pumped into the Windrush because there is no capacity in the existing treatment works, our narrow country lanes can't take the traffic and the A40 is desperately busy for much of the day.

Additionally, our primary care surgery is overloaded.

My main areas of objection are:

Desecration of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

It would appear that WODC planners do not understand the concept of an AONB. By suggesting that this development would be "located in the Cotswolds National

Landscape but due to the slope of the land, would be well contained within the local landscape" they are really suggesting that the site will not be seen from the A40. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is not a view. It is an area which not only encompasses fields, slopes, or wooded areas, but also villages and historical settlements.

As Cotswolds National Landscape highlights, "This desire for new houses has already compromised the internal and external form of many settlements. Erosion of the special character of the edges of settlements is a particular problem, as towns and villages have become 'suburbanised' by development that is entirely inappropriate."

The site lies within the Cotswold National Landscape (AONB), giving it special protection under NPPF 2024 Policy 190. Proximity to the Burford Conservation Area, ancient woodland, and Grade I listed Priory House only increases the sensitivity of this site to development. Major development in a National Landscape is only allowed in exceptional circumstances and where in the public interest—a very high threshold which is rarely met. Inspectors have consistently refused similar developments in West Oxfordshire.

Desecration of Historic Site

The proposed site covers the fields on Sheep Street from the Surgery to the cemetery, where Battle Edge was fought in 752AD. Its historical importance is key to the area.

This site should be celebrated not developed. Additionally, the Priory land directly opposite is listed as Ancient Woodlands.

Increased traffic impact

Burford traffic is worsening, with more cars and coaches and increased air pollution from idling vehicles. Sheep Street and Tanners Lane function as single-lane roads; the proposal would substantially increase the number of cars using these streets.

Without direct A40 access, the development and parking will worsen congestion and push more traffic through existing rat-run routes.

The Town Council also suggests locating a coach and car park on the proposed site. I am concerned that it is unlawful to attach unrelated conditions (e.g., a car/coach park) to a housing allocation. Additionally, any “promises” by landowners/developers at this stage would be unenforceable. Therefore, car-parking discussions should remain totally separate from any housing proposals.

Our schools and primary care surgery are over subscribed

Burford Primary School is 50% oversubscribed and Burford Secondary School has turned away children; many from Cotswold Gate cannot attend their local school, and the primary school site cannot expand. OCC and WODC research shows oversubscribed schools increase inequality and weaken community as children must be transported elsewhere.

Burford primary care surgery is overloaded and oversubscribed at 7,860 patients.

Contradictory council

In January 2023, BTC and WODC strongly opposed 70 homes at Cole’s Field, citing harm to the AONB, the Conservation Area, access issues, and serious infrastructure limits. They declared they would lodge strong objections.

Now, however, they are both apparently supporting a similar-sized development proposal on the opposite side of town with the same critical issues. This reverses their previous statements on landscape impact, heritage harm, access, and infrastructure strain. I cannot understand what the logic is for this reversal.

Where is the need?

The recently completed Cotswold Gate development, south of the A40, has already increased Burford’s population by 25% in four years; adding 70 more homes would mean a total 34% rise, which is not proportionate.

As the Sheep Street site would qualify as a major development, WODC would need to show exceptional need, which cannot simply be “more houses needed in West Oxfordshire.” Burford currently has 55 Airbnb listings and 24 homes for sale; several “affordable” homes are now on the market at £325–£435k, including eight at Cotswold Gate.

Where is the evidence that 70 new homes meet a proven local housing need?

Development should not be driven by landowner and developer profit at the expense of Burford. Going against WODC supporting evidence Burford and Woodstock are identified as towns with economies centred on tourism, with Burford’s strength being its charm and character. Footfall

in Burford rose 31% from Jan 2023–Aug 2024, while Woodstock's fell 10%. WODC's own report highlights traffic and limited parking as Burford's main weaknesses.

Therefore, turning Burford into a commuter town and adding a development plus coach and car park on West Sheep Street (without A40 access) would increase traffic and harm the town's appeal and economy.

Instead of building outward on AONB land, WODC could meet housing targets by increasing affordable housing density (e.g., flats in three-storey buildings on brownfield sites) rather than expanding costly, car-dependent sprawl.

I would be very grateful if you would put forward my objections as part of the public consultation towards the WODC's emerging Local Plan.

•

Mrs J R Dickins Dec 4 2025 at 11:53AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I do not believe that any works are possible that would mitigate the extra traffic generated, by the proposed development, on the Fowler/ Charlbury junction. Its current usage already causes a problem at peak times and it should not be forgotten that the road does not just service the hamlet of Fowler, but is the main road from Witney and thus carries heavy traffic. There is also substantial equine and cycle traffic. Once onto the roads around Charlbury it should be noted that they in turn are already under considerable stress - some one way, with no possibility of 'improvement' /upgrading, mostly narrow and leading from that Hydac junction to a crossroads with very poor visibility. The alternative is through the very narrow streets of Charlbury itself. Although, landscaping has taken place to disguise the solar array to the West of the Road (it remains highly visible from the Finstock road and surrounding fields), any development at the site to the South of Hydac would intrude and be impossible to disguise.

It is not placed close to the station, which has a bridge with restricted weight limit and I see no suitable site closer too, that is not subject to flooding.

The facilities within Charlbury are already inadequate/under strain, which would result in additional traffic going through Finstock Heath to the narrow West End approach to Witney. Vehicles using that approach have to negotiate a road that at one point cannot service two vehicles alongside each other and then cross the single bridge over the river, which is, more often than not, congested.

•

Derek and Sue Dear Dec 5 2025 at 9:17AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Area North- Burford

We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the plan to further swell Burford by constructing seventy dwellings, plus a car and coach park, on an arable field adjoining Sheep Street. It is most distressing to consider the many negative impacts this will have on so many aspects of this once iconic Cotswold village.

Firstly, the access routes are entirely unsuitable from an eastern, southern and northern direction as they would require vehicles, including large coaches, to navigate their way along single lanes, The historic, largely medieval eastern stretch of Sheep Street is a bottleneck with

vehicles parked on both sides, requiring traffic to squeeze through in single file. Tanners Lane and Priory Lane are both single lane rat-runs with no pavements forcing cyclists and pedestrians to move warily to avoid accidents. These cramped lanes also accommodate a primary school and a nursery leading to heightened danger and gridlocked traffic.

This ill-considered scheme would carve out and concrete over a large area of prime and historic arable land. It would have an exceedingly detrimental impact on the local landscape and its rich biodiversity. It would compromise Burford's unrivalled panoramic setting and drive a coach and horses through the concept of protecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Additionally, the topography of the sloping site is inappropriate as it regularly floods along the north-westerly periphery and spills onto Sheep Street submersing areas of the street under water.

The provision of medical and schooling facilities in Burford is already stretched well beyond acceptable levels with no room for further escalation. The influx of the inhabitants of a further seventy dwellings will undoubtedly overwhelm these vital services.

Finally, this development represents an increased level of population in Burford that is clearly disproportionate. The ONS have predicted the UK population will grow by 11.4% between now and 2050 (From 70- 78million). If this proposal were to proceed the population of Burford would increase by 34% (including the recently completed Cotswold Gate Estate). So historic Burford would be penalised with a population growth of 34%. More than three times the UKwide increase within a shorter timeframe.

-

Rod Ruston Dec 5 2025 at 9:20AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

refer to consultation question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following...

On the basis of traffic alone and the congestion I am objecting to this proposal.

Safety implications, preserving the Cotswolds Natural Landscape are other factors.

-

Vanda Cox Dec 5 2025 at 9:25AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing in reference to Consultation Question 32 Area N of the West Oxfordshire Plan 2043 I wish to register my opposition to this proposal as a development site for the following reasons:

1. danger posed to children and elderly folk (and regular cyclists and walkers) due to the proximity to both the

local school, surgery, and popular walking and cycling routes.

2. Traffic volume - the development at Cotswold Gate has already resulted in a huge increase in local traffic and

there are bottlenecks at Burford roundabout and the traffic lights over the bridge at the bottom of Burford and

traffic jams every day. This poses a risk to locals as emergency vehicles struggle to get through such dense

traffic at peak times and in general. Sheep Street is already used as a rat run from the A 40 by

builders, tradesmen and locals and this would intensify if traffic volume increased further. Parking would also be an issue as the surgery and school have insufficient parking and patients/parents respectively have to find alternative parking in Sheep Street and around Burford. I live in Fulbrook and at certain times of the day it can take 30-45 minutes just to get through Burford - a distance of just a mile or so...Walking slowly would be quicker but this isn't possible when carrying elderly passengers or goods/shopping.

Air pollution would also be impacted negatively - impacting on locals and visitors alike (not to mention the planet).

3. The proposed development would result in the desecration of an AONB historic site. How can this be justified? This historic site attracts tourists and brings money to local businesses and encourages locals to exercise outside and stay fit into old age.

4 Housing volume in the area has increased dramatically in the town past 5 years - putting huge pressure on

services and infrastructure. The town has had periods without water supply and the frequency of this problem

would be likely to increase if the development proceeded.

I hope these considerations and those of other locals will lead the proposals to be abandoned.

•

Laura Vigano Dec 7 2025 at 11:51AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Ref to question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site:

1. Increased traffic, congestion and pollution, already disproportionate in respect to the 'historic medieval village' connotation of our town and narrow streets/lanes.

2. Surgery and school already above their capability to cater for present residents.

3. if approved, new residents will, most probably, have to commute, as I do not see so many employment opportunities in Burford. For sure they will not work in Burford. A better option would be to develop housing near to existing workplaces or near to locations with an adequate public transportation already in place.

4. New modern housing development similar to Cotswold Gate, are certainly not in line with the AONB definition.

•

Simon Gill Dec 8 2025 at 7:34AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The proposal to develop 70 houses on a greenfield site on the edge of such an historic town as Burford seems ridiculous, especially when it is compared to the Coles Field site on the other side of the town which was refused.

The proposal is wrong for many reasons but a few of them are:

1. 70 houses will mean c.140 vehicles potentially

2. these extra vehicles will access the site/development from the existing narrow country lane and from a highly congested Sheep St where the locals currently have difficulty parking due to its narrow nature and the ever-present delivery lorries and buses.

3. Burford High St has no more capacity for traffic and is probably one of the most congested

High Streets in the country. Residents in the surrounding villages of Fulbrook and Taynton have to queue to get across the bridge into Burford due to the high volume of traffic causing long tailback queues - Fulbrook particularly.

4. The local infrastructure cannot cope with the additional load such a development will bring.

5. Burford does not need any more stress on its services and fabric.

•

Jeanette Taheri Dec 8 2025 at 9:28AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to the above mentioned Planning Application of which I'm shocked and upset by the proposal .

Here are a few relevant pointers as to my concerns of my not supporting further development I'd like to be considered please .

Burford is already stretched to its limits within its infrastructure so indeed it could well be a disaster for many residents if further homes are to be built.

Over-development or overcrowding of the site - particularly where the proposal is out of character in the area.

Negative / adverse visual impact of the development - particularly on the landscape and or locality

Detrimental effect of proposed development on the character of the local area

In Conservation Areas - adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or heritage assets within it.

Effect of the development on the setting of a variety of Listed Buildings close to the proposed homes .

Please consider as to how it would have a negative affect on our residents and traders area where the magic lies in that sometimes less is more and Burford is one of those locations where less is more advantageous for all . Yes we need more coach etc parking but not at the cost of our historical treasures being destroyed to accommodate homes that should be built elsewhere without the issues we have , why add more stress on the town system both above and below ground !

Kind regards and thank you for reading

•

Katie Crang Dec 10 2025 at 1:41PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing in response to the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 consultation, specifically consultation question 32 – Area N. I wish to register my strong objection to the proposal to develop this site.

I refer to consultation question 32 – Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043. I oppose this proposal as a development site for the following reasons:

1. Significant Impact on the Character of Burford

Burford is a historic market town with a unique charm and heritage that draws visitors from all over the country. The proposed development would place a modern, high-density estate on the edge of a landscape that has remained largely unchanged for generations.

This would materially alter the visual setting of the town and diminish the character that makes

Burford so special.

2. Increased Traffic and Road Safety Concerns

Burford already experiences heavy congestion, particularly on the A40 and through the town centre. Adding further housing will inevitably increase traffic flow through an area that is already under strain. The roads surrounding Area N are not designed for significant additional capacity, raising safety concerns for local residents, pedestrians, and school children.

3. Pressure on Local Services and Infrastructure

Essential services in Burford – including GP practices, schools, parking, and utilities – are already stretched. The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate how these services will be expanded to cope with the extra demand. Without guaranteed and funded improvements, this development risks overwhelming the local infrastructure.

4. Environmental and Landscape Impact

Area N borders sensitive landscape and wildlife areas that contribute to both the ecological richness of the region and the wellbeing of local people. Development would cause habitat disruption, loss of green space, and irreversible impact on natural surroundings that cannot simply be “replaced” elsewhere.

5. Inconsistency with Sustainable and Sensitive Development Principles

The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises sustainable growth, protection of heritage settings, and careful consideration of rural landscapes. Developing Area N does not align with these principles and fails to respect the long-term environmental and cultural value of Burford. For these reasons, I urge West Oxfordshire District Council to remove Area N from consideration as a development site in the Local Plan 2043.

Thank you for acknowledging my objection. I would appreciate confirmation that my comments have been formally recorded as part of this consultation.

•

Angela Piesse Dec 10 2025 at 1:44PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Angela Piesse adds her vote to oppose the proposed building in Burford

•

Penelope Burnett Dec 14 2025 at 3:06PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford is suffering from excess traffic and parking problems this having increased over the last 2 years.

The narrow roads cannot cope at the moment therefore any increase of housing within the town is not supportable by the community.

Any further developments must be situated at the top of Burford giving suitable and safe access to the A40.

•

Susan 3 Dec 15 2025 at 3:12PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

This proposal is directly contrary to the overall government and Council policy of reducing traffic congestion and energy consumption by locating new housing developments close to where the work is and increasing the use of public transport.

Neither of these objectives is met by the Sheep Street location. There is no reliable public transport from Burford - even to Witney, never mind Oxford (or Cheltenham). 70 new homes would mean over 100 new cars, many of them trying to get through Burford. There is no practical access to the A40 except up Tanners Lane or the High Street, one of which is dangerous for two way traffic and the other already jammed. The other end of Sheep St only offers access via a sharp and dangerous turn on to a road which has a constant traffic flow. And the commute into Oxford, already lengthy, would become impossibly long.

It is bordering on lunacy to further increase pressure on the roads and even longer travel times to work for occupants of such a development. Not to mention essential visits to hospitals - which already can take hours to reach. And not forgetting that it is on the site of the Battle of Burford and along one of the more beautiful views up and down the slopes to the Windrush.

•

C.H.Fieth Dec 16 2025 at 9:21AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to Consultation question 32 Local Plan 2043. I oppose this as a development for the following reasons

- 1.The destruction of the landscape encompassing Burford n.b. The fields on from the surgery
2. That Burford does not need more housing, having suffered much development in recent years
3. The impact on local services e.g. the surgery, primary school etc. which are already overstretched
4. Adding to the traffic problem in Burford, which is already horrendous
5. A development out of all proportion to the size of the town

•

Burford Town Council 1 Dec 16 2025 at 1:28PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

PLANNING – PREFERRED SPATIAL OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Burford town is within the Cotswolds National Landscape and is protected from large scale development by Policy 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Only in exceptional circumstances is there reason for contravening this policy to build proportionate sized developments in these designated areas.

WODC has not shown reasons of exceptional circumstances to warrant including Area N in the Preferred Spatial Options consultation, (Land Parcel BUR02a, HEELA 2025) and the Town Council requests that this land parcel be removed from the consultation with no submission into the Local Plan 2043.

Recommendations by WODC for the inclusion of Area N in the Preferred Spatial Options consultation include the shadowed nature of the site from a main A road, reasoning that this

allows development within the Cotswolds National Landscape.

The Cotswolds National Landscape must be protected in its entirety, and it is a major material consideration concerning the impact and degradation of a protected environmental area such as the Cotswold National Landscape.

Therefore, Burford Town Council requests again, that Area N (Land Parcel BUR02a, HEELA 2025) be removed from the Preferred Spatial Options consultation, and not to be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan 2043, due to its inappropriate location on a protected landscape. Further material considerations to support the removal of Area N in the Preferred Spatial Options consultation, (Land Parcel BUR02a, HEELA 2025) from the Local Plan 2043 include the following:

Traffic Capacity. Burford is currently struggling with several major traffic issues that are threatening the safety of residents on a daily basis. This has been highlighted to both the Police, Oxfordshire County Council and West Oxfordshire District Council. The medieval town with medieval lanes does

not have the structure to cope with the number of cars, coaches, HGVs and tractors that use the streets

of Burford and accidents are occurring. The situation has been classed as an emergency by the Town Council and has called upon the authorities to support the Council in dealing with these problems.

There is limited traffic infrastructure capacity along Sheep Street and Tanners Lane for a new development of 70 houses.

Drainage Capacity. Burford suffers from repeated, monthly sewerage dumping into the River Windrush that is caused by lack of proper drainage. Some of this sewerage comes from as far away as Upper Rissington, Gloucestershire, due to the recent large-scale development of houses there without

proper provision for sewerage. Area N sits next to a high density, heritage part of the town which the majority of houses there contain old drainage systems.

Infrastructure and Services Capacity. The primary school in Burford already has a waiting list for children and several families have been turned away this year. The surgery is at maximum capacity and in previous years has had to suspend all new patients. See Appendix 1 for primary school

statistics. There is no dentist or indoor leisure facilities.

RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO HEELA 2025

Future Development Locations

The Council is concerned with preserving the heritage of the town and not creating ribbon developments.

The Council agrees with the Local Plan to support sensitive, well-integrated development that meets local needs by prioritising the reuse of existing buildings and limited development within the built-up area.

The Town Council agrees to a small-scale classification for development comprising of small developments (up to 11 units).

The Council refutes assigning a medium sized growth development of 100 to 300 units at Burford as this seems to contradict the described profile of the town in the Local Plan 2043 in terms of retaining heritage feel and look and being in a conservation area. It is important that future developments do not create ribbon development towards other parishes and towns.

The Town Council now submits its recommendations to West Oxfordshire District Council in regard to considered land parcels that would meet the needs of Burford as a heritage town whilst providing sensitive, small-scale development on brownfield sites.

The following two land parcels have been approved by Burford Town Council as recommendations for inclusion in the Local Plan 2043.

BUR01 – Burford Laundry – Tannary Yard, Witney Street

BUR03 – Burford Wysdom, Caravan Park – A361/A40 Roundabout.

Burford Town Council voted against all other Land Parcels included in the HEELA 2025 and the Council requests WODC to not include any of these sites in the Local Plan 2043.

OVERALL RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL PLAN 2043 FOR BURFORD

The Town Council agrees with the Local Plan preferred approach in conservation led, community orientated and sustainability focused, aiming to safeguard the town's historic character while enhancing its function as a local service centre and high-quality visitor destination within the Cotswolds.

This would make Burford a special category that should not have medium or large-scale housing development. Small scale developments would generally only be classified as up to ten new houses per development.

The Council supports the below statement from the Local Plan.

1. Ensuring that all development within the Conservation Area and Cotswolds National Landscape respects and enhances local character, scale, materials, and historic plot patterns.
2. ii) Delivering sensitive public realm enhancements that include appropriate lighting, seating, greenery, and high-quality surfacing to improve pedestrian comfort and townscape quality.

Existing Developments

Burford has already seen an increase in development with Cotswold Gate, which has increased housing at Burford by 11%. There have also been smaller developments in the town, all of which have a portion of social housing, including Cheate Court, Frethern Close, Falkland Close and Cotswold

Gate. There have also been small scale builds over the years including Tanner's Lane.

The Main reason for such high property prices is due to number of holiday rentals in the town and a desire to live in such a heritage town that is well serviced with the number of pubs, cafes and shops.

Traffic, Parking and Transport Connectivity

The Council agrees with the following statement from the Local Plan 2043:

- Traffic congestion, especially along the A361 and across the Windrush heritage bridge that is single lane, is a long-standing concern.
- Coach congestion in Priory Lane
- Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements through the historic town centre are particularly problematic.
- The Plan should promote traffic mitigation, explore HGV management strategies, and enhance pedestrian, cycle, and public transport connectivity.
- Car parking and coach parking capacity remains under pressure and may require strategic solutions.

The Town Council receives weekly complaints from residents regarding the traffic problems in the town. It is one of the biggest threats to the towns sustainability and needs to be addressed from a higher, strategic level.

HGV's continue to be a big problem for the town. HGV's remain a real concern for residents and the impact it has on Burford as a historic town.

Coach parking has become a dangerous health and safety hazard to residents, including school children.

Burford Town Council believes that traffic and parking congestion is one of the biggest threats to

Burford and a frequent source of complaints from residents. A solution from a higher, strategic level is needed.

Traffic concerns are not just related to coach and car parking, it extends to excessive traffic, congestion, dangerous driving and illegal parking throughout the town.

Whatever strategic measures are eventually implemented, they must be policed and controlled to avoid the current dangerous situation for pedestrians and parked vehicles.

The Council witnesses weekly incidents or potential accidents due to illegal coach parking and dangerous driving. The coach park is next to the primary school and children are currently at risk of being hurt by traffic congestion.

The town also has safety issues concerning the A40 residents with fast moving cars putting resident pedestrians in danger when walking from Cotswold Gate and residencies along the A40 into town or waiting for the school bus. There has been a fatality of this nature in the past which initiated a

pedestrian path along the A40 in this area. More consideration must be had to speed limits along the A40 coming into Burford.

The Council supports the Local Plan in driving through enhancements to community facilities that promote health, wellbeing and social cohesion including public gathering spaces and youth and elderly services. The Council requests that WODC work closely with Councillors on a new possible community hub at the recreation ground following on from the removal of the existing pavilion (that needs to be demolished due to being unsafe, secure or fit for public use).

Green Infrastructure

For the sustainability actions stated in the Local Plan, there must be a budget provided by WODC to assist with these for Burford.

Tourism

Burford Town Council remit is currently to provide services for residents. Including tourism in the Local Plan 2043 for Burford, is a step change in the role of the Town Council and there is a need to make sure sufficient resources are provided to fulfil this role.

Encouraging tourism with more festivals, events and cultural programmes would mean increasing capacity within the Town Council. Funding from Cotswold Tourism and WODC to support administrative staff to handle such things would be welcome.

The Council agrees to encourage longer stay tourism of more than a day. The town has many hotels and B&Bs to provide for this.

Local Infrastructure and Sustainable Transport

The Council is in agreement with the following within the Burford Strategy:

Supporting low-carbon transport solutions, such as community transport, electric vehicle infrastructure and better visitor wayfinding.

Burford Council would be interested in working with WODC to look at a community bus for visitor transport to the town.

The Council is working in collaboration with WODC to install EV charging points.

We support WODC's desire to provide educational leisure and social care infrastructure.

Funding needs to be provided and maintained for this.

At present WODC does not work strategically with the Town Council and Oxfordshire County Council to make sure that issues such as traffic and congestion problems, tourism and preservation of historic buildings are addressed to make it a resilient, thriving rural hub within the District.

There is a lack of action and collaboration provided from County and District in terms of parking, coach parking, traffic congestion and retro fitting to historic buildings. WODC is also not providing any funding to Town Council for the restoration of the Tolsey Building which currently

needs

considerable repairs. The building is referred in the Local Plan (Section 7.6.9).

•

Nigel Barraclough Dec 16 2025 at 6:16PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

There is no need for more housing in Burford of the type that this proposed development will bring. There are already many, mainly empty, second homes and AirBnB properties in the town.

The site itself is not suitable for development as there is very limited access. Sheep Street does not permit two-way traffic except in the, now rare, situation of two small cars passing. Tanners Lane is already hazardous for pedestrians.

What is needed in Burford is affordable housing for those working in the town. Any such development would need to have a covenant precluding renting out properties.

The ideal position for any new development is adjoining the new Cotswold Gate site in Shilton Road. This would not impact the ANOB and would not cause traffic problems in the town.

•

Mary Fieth Dec 17 2025 at 11:40AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I refer to the above plan regarding possible development in Sheep's Street, Burford.

I oppose this plan most strongly for the following reasons:

Burford has already had considerable development with Cotswold Gate, which has increased the population of the town by 25%. There is also no need for further development as there are at present several houses in Cotswold Gate for sale.

Burford High Street is already choked with considerable traffic. Houses built on the proposed site would avoid the High Street by using Tanners Lane, which is narrow and totally unsuitable for increased traffic.

The schools in Burford are already full and the surgery would not be able to accept increased numbers.

The site itself is on a steep slope. In times of heavy rainfall, flooding would occur in Sheep's Street which would impact on the ancient woodland in the grounds of the Priory.

Burford has in the past, had to resist unfavourable planning, notably in Coles Field, to the east of the High Street. (The topography of the Coles Field site is very similar to that proposed in Plan 2043.) The Coles Field site was finally

rejected as it was found that considerable underground springs would make any development unstable. It is more than probable that the same would apply to the proposed site.

I appreciate that the country needs more affordable housing but I doubt if this development will answer that need. Affordable housing seems to be low on the planners' priorities. In any case, planning for the needs of the country

should not be achieved by destroying the ambience of a unique, historic medieval town.

•

John Jack 1 Dec 17 2025 at 2:21PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Burford Town Council are against development on site N and instead are supporting proportionate development on two brown field sites.

I complete agree with this approach and strongly object to any development on site N.

It is very difficult to understand how this site could be included thus far by WODC planners. The arguments against are strong and obvious, namely there is no exceptional need to develop in the Cotswold Landscape, traffic congestion on narrow streets would endanger all users and the scale is disproportionate to any any conceivable need.

I sincerely hope that no undue influence has been exerted by any politician with a vested interest, but many residents cannot think of a more plausible explanation for the partisan support shown by the WODC representative.

I further commend the report from C3 which was commissioned by residents and cogently sets out the overwhelming reasons why site N should be removed from the next version of the 2043 Local Plan and HELAA.

At a recent meeting in Burford attended by 150 residents, development of 70 dwellings together with a public car park on site N was overwhelmingly rejected. The paucity of the arguments put forward by Councillor Ashton was palpable.

Like many other residents who are unused to objecting, I am not against any development. We well understand the pressures imposed by national targets and we support proportionate development on the two brownfield sites supported by Burford Town Council.

•

Nick Small Dec 18 2025 at 9:29AM

I agree with the proposed approach

This site is identified for a nominal yield of 70 dwellings. This is certainly appropriate for town with the services and employment that Burford offers, which includes secondary education, and a certain amount of employment, with much more provided by a strong retail and hospitality offer. There is a significant issue with recruitment and retention of staff across many local enterprises, including support staff for the schools. The actual population of the town is lower than the employment it supports, meaning in-commuting is unavoidable.

The proposed site is closer to the town centre and economic life of the town than previous development that has taken place some way to the south, off Shilton Road, outside the National Landscape. The proposed allocation is visually well contained at the bottom of the valley side, and screened by woodland.

•

Oxford and Country Planning on behalf of Lucy Developments 1 Dec 18 2025 at 10:50AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Area N – South of Sheep Street, Burford

The Consultation Paper identifies land south of Sheep Street on the western edge of Burford as a potentially suitable allocation for around 70 dwellings.

Our client believes that an allocation of this scale in this location is inappropriate due to the

significant number of constraints, which are identified in paragraphs 8.22 - 8.26 of the Consultation Paper.

A key constraint is that the site is located within the Cotswolds National Landscape, which is a finite resource. The NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The NPPF also states that plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value.

Any future planning application on the scale of the proposed allocation would constitute major development. The NPPF is clear that when considering applications for development within National Landscapes, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional

circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest (paragraph 190).

National guidance also advises that consideration of such applications should include an assessment of the scope for developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need in some other way. Our client considers that there is scope for a development that will more suitably meet the housing needs for Burford outside of the National Landscape. This is discussed later in this submission.

The Cotswolds National Landscape Board has prepared a Landscape Strategy and Guidelines document to aid decision making about the suitability of proposed development within the Cotswolds.

Burford falls within the Broad Floodplain Valley Character Type as described in the Guidelines: [lct-16-broad-floodplain-valley-june-2016.pdf](#)

With respect to landscape sensitivity, the document refers to Wide views from the upper valley slopes and over the long stretches of the valley are possible, thus increasing the sensitivity of the valleys to large scale built development that might interrupt views or impact on their rural character. Furthermore The gently sloping valley sides have limited development capacity as they form an agricultural backdrop to views from the valley floor.

In relation to new development the Guidelines advise that developments e.g. extensions to settlements which will intrude negatively into the landscape and cannot be successfully mitigated should be avoided.

The proposed allocation forms part of the valley and setting of the town. A development of around 70 dwellings in this location would undoubtedly adversely affect the tranquil, rural character on what is a sensitive edge of the town.

Given the above, and that in the summary responses to the draft Spatial Strategy (Table 3 on p13)

There is strong support for protecting the Cotswolds National Landscape, we consider the proposed allocation is not a suitable location.

Furthermore, the site immediately adjoins the Burford Conservation Area. Not only is the site adjacent to its western edge (as stated in paragraph 8.24 of the Consultation Paper) but it also bounded by the Conservation Area along most of its northern boundary, as shown on the plan below.

This part of the Conservation Area forms part of the grounds to The Priory, a Grade I listed building, as shown on the extract from Historic England's map below.

Development in this location will impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets. As explained in the NPPF these assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to

the

quality of life of existing and future generations. Great weight should be given to the conservation of such assets.

It is also noted that at paragraph 8.25 of the Consultation Paper, archaeology within the site may present a barrier to development and will require further investigation to determine the historic significance of the area.

Finally, and again acknowledged by the Consultation Paper, the local road infrastructure is poor, as the roads are narrow and not designed to accommodate substantial increases in traffic volume. The extra vehicles associated with the new housing and proposed car park would further change the

character of the area, along with the introduction of any urbanising features such as lighting, kerbs and traffic calming measures.

In conclusion, the proposed allocation on land south of Sheep Street is constrained by a number significant factors. A new housing development of the size proposed, no matter how well designed, will appear as a somewhat incongruous modern addition to the historic edge of one of the most

attractive towns in the District, if not central/southern England.

Alternative proposed allocation - Land off the Shilton Road, Burford

Lucy Developments has previously submitted a proposed site for a residential development on land west of Shilton Road on the southern edge of Burford (see attached document). The site is situated on the southern edge of the town off the Shilton Road and near to the large garden centre. It is a

relatively flat, featureless, rectilinear area of farmland which extends to extends to approximately 6.4 hectares (almost 16 acres).

Our client considers this is a much better site for new housing for the town, being adjacent to existing

new housing, away from the historic core and outside the National Landscape designation.

There is also sufficient space within the site to provide a new health facility for Burford which would also complement the adjoining Cotswold Gate Care Home.

The District Council in its updated Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2025 considers the site (ref. BUR 008) is not suitable for housing and provides the following brief commentary:

Big open flat area of land flanked to north by new housing, to the north east by the B4020 and Burford Garden centre, to the south and west by open flat countryside. The site would extend the extent of the settlement along the B4020 to the south into a more exposed landscape setting.

It is accepted that the site would extend the settlement but that comment is equally applicable to the site off Sheep Street. As regards the landscape setting, this could be addressed through the careful integration of a substantial new planting block on the south edge of the site. This would establish a new strong landscaped edge to the southern approach to the town (this would be significantly greater

than the landscaping to the southern edge of the existing adjacent development).

The attached promotional document describes the development concept in more detail but the key benefits of the proposal are summarised on the following page.

Benefits of new development off the Shilton Road, Burford

- The provision of around 100 new market and affordable homes (dependent on density) on the edge of a Service Centre. There is a significant need for affordable housing in the area which would be provided in compliance with the proposed policy of 40%.

- Although not shown in the promotional document, our client would be open to discussions about providing land and accommodation for a new GP surgery and dedicated parking to supplement the current facility which is oversubscribed.
 - An attractive layout that uses a traditional perimeter block structure, with dwellings orientated to clearly define public and private space and to maximise surveillance over streets and public spaces. The southern and western edges of the built up area to be defined by a looser more spacious layout, reinforcing the edge of settlement character.
 - The scheme will be framed within a strong landscaped structure including a triangular block of woodland in the south east corner of the site. The creation of substantive new areas of planting will help integrate the development within the existing landscape and minimise visual impact, creating a 'softer' edge to the town.
 - Contributions towards new or enhanced community facilities and services (such as education, local bus service), as well as new public open space on site.
 - A reduction in the speed limit along the site frontage with the Shilton Road, with an extension of 30mph speed limit south of the site and relocation of traffic calming feature.
 - The opportunity to create pedestrian/cycle connections with the town and wider area.
 - Improvements in biodiversity, offering at least a 10% net gain.
 - Dwellings designed to make efficient use of resources, using renewable energy solutions.
- Lucy Developments would be grateful if the above comments could be considered by the District Council in developing the next stages of its Local Plan.

•

Mr Kieran McCormack and Mr Paul Gossiaux Dec 18 2025 at 2:35PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We refer to consultation question 32 Area N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043.

We oppose this proposal as a development site for 70+ dwellings on Sheep Street for the following reasons:

1) Burford schools and surgery are already oversubscribed. The complete Cotswold Gate project has already increased the Burford population by 24% over the last four years. The proposed Sheep Street development would result in a population increase to 34%.

Both Burford Primary and secondary turned away children from Cotswold Gate this academic year due to capacity constraints--additionally, the primary school is on a constrained site which cannot expand. Likewise, the Burford surgery has stopped accepting new patients due to capacity constraints.

According to OCC and WODC research, oversubscribed schools increase inequalities with children having to be bussed to other locations and destroying the feeling of community and inclusion.

2) Desecration and destruction of a national historic site and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONB'):

The proposed site covers the fields on Sheep Street, from the Burford surgery to the cemetery, where Battle Edge was fought in 729 AD. Its historical importance is key to the Burford area. This site should be preserved and celebrated--not destroyed and concreted over for the economic benefit of developers and short-sighted town merchants. The Priory land is listed as ancient woodlands; any concreting of the land south of Sheep Street would result in the flooding and disappearance of this ancient landscape.

3) Increased motor vehicle impact: Traffic in Burford is already horrendous and getting worse--along with a

non-stop increase in the number of coaches and HGVs. Both Sheep Street and Tanners Lane should be considered single lane roads. The proposed site for development expects adding approximately 150 cars on these two streets. With no direct access to the A40, this development site and car parks will further exacerbate traffic jams on Sheep Street, Tanners Lane, The Hill, and High Street--along with the current 'rat runs' that Barns Lane, Pytts Lane, and Witney Street have become.

Overall, we strongly object to the proposed development of 70+ dwellings on Sheep Street. This new project should be considered a major development, and WODC must provide evidence that there is an exceptional local housing need to do so. The usual, simplistic refrain that 'more houses are needed in West Oxfordshire' is neither sufficient nor acceptable to justify this project. Currently, there are approximately 55 properties in Burford listed as AirBnB along with 24 houses for sale, of which 5 previously 'affordable' houses are listed for sale between GBP 325,000 to 435,000, with 8 houses for sale at Cotswold Gate.

The proposed Sheep Street development will exacerbate Burford's fragile infrastructure capacity problems (water and sewage), schools and surgery oversubscription, and worsening motor vehicle traffic congestion.

Likewise, the impact on the 'Battle Edge' historic site and ancient woodlands of the Priory land would be catastrophic.

•

Guy Robinson Dec 18 2025 at 5:12PM

I would like to make a general comment

Proportionate HIA is needed to consider the potential impacts of the site on the character of the conservation area and the significance of other nearby assets, not least the Grade I Priory. Furthermore, the archaeological potential of the site needs to be understood. More evidence is needed at this stage in the form of desk-based assessment, and potentially field evaluation. We note there does not appear to be a conservation area appraisal and management plan for Burford, which heightens the need for more detailed consideration at this stage of the plan-making process.

We recommend HIA and prioritising the preparation of a Conservation Area Appraisal for Burford.

•

John Kenrick Dec 18 2025 at 6:25PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Reference Consultation Question 32 Area N

Burford is a very historic town with 264 listed buildings. It is a jewel in the Cotswolds and attracts visitors from worldwide bringing esteem and revenue to West Oxfordshire.

We are guardians of this heritage which we enjoy and we must take a long-term view to look after it for future generations.

Whilst there may be short-term pressures for more houses they should be built where there is a need, good communications and infrastructure that is capable of supporting the development.

For all the reasons well expressed by others, Burford does not have the capacity for additional houses in Area N.

Of particular concern is the increased traffic on the hill, A361 which in the last two years has had more queues in each direction.

The decision makers of today will be judged by the way they care for our heritage and our communities and the legacy that they pass on to the next generation.

•

Caroline Pope Dec 20 2025 at 11:49AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I agree with many of the comments objecting to this proposal to designate this Area N in the Plan already made and repeat and support them.

I would take particular issue with the proposal that says that there is moderate capacity for further traffic in Sheep Street. Sheep St which is an extremely beautiful and oft pictured, is already narrow, with parking on each side of the road. It can be hard for cars travelling in alternative directions to pass. Tanners Lane is not an option. It is narrow, single file in much of its stretch with no pavement. It can't be safely used.

And the traffic on the Hill and High Street is frequently at a complete standstill. More traffic isn't to be encouraged. No further development should be contemplated until a sustainable solution to the bottleneck caused by our beautiful medieval bridge only being single file. The traffic already leads to articulated Lorries ignoring signs and using Barns Lane and Pytts Lane. Only 2 weeks ago an articulated lorry got stuck at the cross roads between Witney St and Barns Lane. The whole street was blocked and the driver had to wait until the driver of a car parked legally in the street returned to her car and moved it so the lorry could complete the turn into Witney St. more local traffic will result in more such incidents as drivers try and avoid the long queues down the Hill and High Street,

The surgery is already fully subscribed and I have more than once had to wait a month for an appointment. The primary school is apparently over subscribed. The infrastructure of the town is already over stretched.

What the town actually need is more social housing, of the sort developers don't want to provide, as the so called "affordable" housing is unaffordable to many of those who work in the town in the shops and hospitality.

•

Alex Rogers Dec 20 2025 at 3:49PM

I would like to make a general comment

I would reserve opinion on this site subject to heritage appraisals and appraisal of impact on traffic which is already a major local and wider issue on the main road through Burford.

•

Friends of the West Oxfordshire Cotswolds Dec 21 2025 at 10:52AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The spatial strategy does not seem to approach this proposed allocation correctly. Consideration has not been given as to whether this would constitute Major Development and whether exceptional circumstances presently exist. This is a larger allocation than the identified Major Development originally proposed for Burford in the spatial plan for the 2031 Local Plan. The siting of Major Development in the immediate setting of the Grade 1 listed Priory is highly problematic.

-

Paul Boulton Dec 21 2025 at 12:54PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

It's difficult to determine the full impact of this proposal given the lack of detail, but I feel the infrastructure issues identified for the rejected Coles Field development equally apply here. Burford is probably better served by identifying more smaller developments dotted around the town, this provided that a suitable plan is created which addresses the infrastructure and heritage issues. The Cotswold National Landscape must be protected from large scale development wherever possible.

-

Community Campaigner David Dec 21 2025 at 8:56PM

I would like to make a general comment

Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation previously submitted regarding the value of significance Traditional Architecture Design Codes on strong economic, ecological and environmental grounds.

as previous points

-

Thomas Watkins Dec 21 2025 at 10:08PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I wish to express my strong objections to the development of 70 houses on Sheep Street in Burford.

Burford is a mediaeval town that is already wildly over capacity in terms of traffic, strains on the drainage infrastructure and access to the school and surgery. There is already far too much traffic coming into town and drivers pay scant respect to speed limits, plus finding a parking space for residents is frequently a difficult endeavour. I already fear for the safety of my children and other residents. The proposal does nothing to address these concerns.

Added to this, I am convinced that recent development has altered the water table in the Burford area. I've been a resident for decades and never had issues with flooding, but in recent years my cellar has started taking in water on a frequent basis, forcing me to undertake expensive mitigation. Paving over an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (and a historical battle site) will create more runoff and inevitably divert more water into Burford's already inadequate drainage.

I am particularly concerned about the traffic on Priory Lane, which is already completely

unsustainable will get much worse, with cars headed to the new development from the bridge end of town using the lane as a cut through to Sheep Street. West Ox DC is already well aware of the dangers on Priory Lane and its use by mega-buses. Adding yet more cars to the mix will only worsen the nightmare.

Creating another new development will alter the historical charm of the town, which is what brings people here in the first place.

•

The Cole Family Trust Dec 21 2025 at 10:40PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

We believe that there is scope for a development that would more suitably meet the future housing needs for Burford.

The WODC Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2025 considers the Site Reference BUR 006 - Orchard Rise.

As confirmed in the site description, the site is already surrounded on three sides (to the north, south and west) by relatively modern style residential housing. In looking at a plan or aerial view of Burford, it strikes as the obvious site for residential infill.

The site is within easy walking distance of the town centre and less than 1 km from a major bus stop, primary school, secondary school and chemist.

The site area of 5.2 ha, along with the adjoining 14.2 ha (Site Reference BUR 007 - Land East of Burford) in the same ownership, allows considerable scope for:-

Provision of Burford's future housing need for the currently proposed WODC Plan, to include a mix of new open market and affordable homes, with a spacious layout.

Significant landscaping, including substantive new areas of planting to minimise visual impact.

Vehicular site access from Witney Street or Barns Lane.

In conjunction with the above, we would be open to discussions about providing land for Burford's problematic Coach Parking and/or a new GP Surgery.

We consider the above site worthy of reconsideration by the District Council in developing its new Local Plan.

•

Peter Evans Dec 22 2025 at 6:45AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Wildlife and flooding were my initial concerns on seeing this plan. Reviewing some of the other comments, sewage capacity and train station access also become factors.

•

Peter Evans 1 Dec 22 2025 at 6:53AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

For clarification, my comment above is about the Tackley proposal

•

Anthony and Frances Corner Dec 22 2025 at 9:25AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Consultation question 32 - AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043.

We are longstanding Burford residents who have done much to support the community and the restoration of our historic property.

We are therefore extremely concerned about the proposed development and how it will undermine the character of what is a beautiful and community orientated town which sits at the entrance to the Cotswolds. It has already undergone significant residential development which we have supported however what is now being suggested will seriously affect the town, its residents, its character, and leave Burford exploited.

We oppose this potential development for the following reasons:

- This is an area of outstanding natural beauty with ancient and historic histories, all of which would be covered over and undermined including ancient woodland and the site of the 752 Battle Edge.
- In the planning regulation any planning in such areas should only be as a consequence of exceptional circumstance. No such exceptional circumstances exist and there has been no case made.
- The infrastructure to support any further housing is seriously lacking and has worrying health and safety implications.
- The doctors' surgery is oversubscribed.
- The primary school is unable to take the numbers already on its waiting list.
- We have severe problems with traffic and lorries and these cause long traffic queues and delays
- Footfall in Burford has already increased by some 31% between January 2023 and August 2024 further developments would make shopping and walking in Burford trickier especially for some of our more elderly residents
- The proposed area is already used by large numbers of pedestrians and dog walkers and any extra car and traffic will pose serious health and safety challenges.
- Burford has problems with its drainage and the Windrush river is known to have issues with sewage - any extra housing development will only exacerbate an already serious issue.

•

Liz and Adrian Jackson Dec 22 2025 at 11:20AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the proposed development of 70 houses with car and coach park along Sheep Street, Burford (AREA N of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043).

Heritage and Conservation Concerns

Burford has over 250 listed buildings including two Grade 1 structures, and the High Street has the highest percentage of listed properties in the country. The entire area sits within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation Area and the proposed site encompasses historically significant land where the Battle of Battle Edge was fought in 752AD between the kings of Wessex and Mercia, commemorated annually by the Dragon Procession. This site deserves celebration and protection, not development.

Inappropriate Development in Cotswolds National Landscape

The planning documents demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of what constitutes an AONB. As Cotswolds National Landscape states, development has already "compromised the internal and external form of many settlements" with "erosion of the special character of the edges of settlements" through inappropriate suburbanization. An AONB is not merely a view from the A40—it encompasses the entire area including fields, villages, and historical settlements that would be damaged by this proposal.

Severe Traffic and Infrastructure Impact

Burford's narrow streets were designed for horses and carts, not modern traffic including 15-meter coaches. Sheep Street and Tanners Lane function as single-lane roads that cannot accommodate approximately 150 additional vehicles from this development. Without direct A40 access, the proposal will dramatically worsen existing congestion and force more traffic through residential rat-runs. The suggested coach and car park would bring large vehicles into already overwhelmed infrastructure rather than providing parking at the top of the hill near the A40 where it is actually needed.

Overstretched Local Services

As a governor of Burford Primary School I know it is already oversubscribed and physically cannot expand its site. Burford Surgery is already serving 7,860 patients and cannot adequately support additional population growth.

Lack of Demonstrated Need

Cotswold Gate already increased Burford's population by 25% in just four years. Adding 70 homes would create a total 34% population increase, which is disproportionate for a small town. Currently, Burford has 55 Airbnb listings and 24 homes for sale, with several "affordable" homes at Cotswold Gate now marketed at £325,000-£435,000. Where is the evidence of genuine local housing need? As a major development in an AONB, WODC must demonstrate exceptional need beyond simply "more houses needed in West Oxfordshire."

Contradicts WODC's Own Evidence

WODC's supporting evidence identifies Burford's economy as tourism-centered, with its charm and character as key strengths. Footfall increased 31% from January 2023 to August 2024. The same report identifies traffic and limited parking as Burford's main weaknesses.

This proposal would directly undermine the town's economic strengths while exacerbating its identified weaknesses, transforming Burford into a car-dependent commuter town and damaging its tourism appeal.

Alternative Solutions

Rather than building on precious AONB greenfield land, housing targets could be met through increased density of affordable housing on brownfield sites within the town. The Town Council has unanimously opposed this development and identified two alternative brownfield sites. They have also sensibly proposed that no greenfield development be considered until a Neighbourhood Plan is completed.

Conclusion

This proposal would desecrate a historic battlefield site, damage an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, overwhelm already struggling infrastructure and services, increase traffic congestion, and harm Burford's character and tourism-based economy. Development should serve community needs, not developer profit at the expense of our heritage.

I urge you to reject this proposal and work with the Town Council on appropriate brownfield alternatives that respect Burford's unique character and environmental protections.

•

Carter Jonas on behalf of Mr N Mills 4 Dec 22 2025 at 11:45AM

I agree with the proposed approach

AREA N – South of Sheep Street, Burford

4.1 The Executors support, strongly, the allocation of its land South of Sheep Street, in Burford.

4.2 Land South of Sheep Street is a wholly sustainable location for new housing, with active travel linkages to the town centre, and a limited impact on the surrounding landscape, and conservation area –especially when compared with the alternative sites at the edge of the settlement.

4.3 The Executors are also to offer the town specific support with an local transport strategy, and vehicle parking options that will directly support the vision to “enhance local infrastructure and sustainable transport.”

4.4 The Executors are ready and willing to discuss options for an integrated transport strategy, and vehicle parking locations as part of the project to deliver new development on land South of Sheep Street, which will directly aid in “improving accessibility, movement, and environmental quality.”

4.5 The Executors are aware that there is an acute need for additional car parking space in Burford. There is a clear rationale in placing new parking on Land South of Sheep Street (to the west of Burford) it in this new location, and it would be better than extending the current car park off Guildenford. This is because capturing cars without the need for them all to use the High Street and small roads through the town will be an obvious and deliverable benefit.

4.6 The site is in Flood Zone 1, the area at lowest risk of flooding. The site is in the Cotswolds National Landscape and adjacent to the western boundary of the Burford Conservation Area. There are no known environmental designations on the site. The site is bordered to the north by Sheep Street, to the east by existing residential development and Burford Surgery, to the south by a public footpath and open land and to the west by arable land and a cemetery.

4.8 The site is in a highly sustainable location; it is located approximately 500m from Burford town centre and 480m from Burford primary school. A pavement along Sheep Street connects the site with Burford. A range of shops and services are within walking or cycling distance of the site. The site is also closely connected (along Tanners Lane) to the recreation grounds and Secondary School (both within 800m which is widely understood to be a 10-minute walk). Bus services also connect the town to Witney, Cheltenham, Oxford, Gloucester and surrounding villages.

4.9 The Executors agree that the field at the north of the land holding as presented in the spatial option document as “Area N” (or HELAA reference 161a) is a very appropriate site for development. The site has the potential to deliver:

- Up to 80 new homes (market and affordable) – which is slightly more than suggested in the consultation document.
- A new / extended car park for this part of Burford
- A strategy to support the growth of the adjacent GP surgery

4.10 The site is well contained and is better screened from the wider National Landscape than other potential site options around Burford and is also well connected to the services and facilities of Burford, especially the school, via a network of public footpaths.

•

A concerned resident Dec 22 2025 at 2:44PM

I would like to make a general comment

Interesting to see that Carter Jonas have made a late comment, supporting the site on behalf of the owner of the site. Also interesting that one of the daughters of the owner is married to a partner of Carter Jonas. Further, the Coles Family Trust is in the arena now, suggesting late last night a revisit to the field east of Burford.

-

Bridget Fox (Woodland Trust) Dec 22 2025 at 4:25PM

I would like to make a general comment

Burford Priory grounds contain Priory Woods ancient woodland, an irreplaceable habitat. This must be safeguarded from any harm or loss. Should the site to the south of Sheep Street be allocated, it is vital that Priory Woods is protected from any loss or harm including during the construction phase.

-

A VERY concerned Burford Resident Dec 22 2025 at 6:35PM

I would like to make a general comment

Interesting that Carter Jonas is writing a comment on behalf of the LATE Mr N. Mills who always reportedly told Burford residents that his land would never be developed as long as he was alive. Whose interest is WODC protecting? Property developers or residents?

-

David 1 Dec 22 2025 at 8:02PM

I agree with the proposed approach

A good modest development proposal which should be encouraged to balance the allocation of sites across the District. It provides some balance and equity to the overall spatial strategy because it locates some development away from the Principle Towns of Witney and Carterton. More development of this nature is needed to achieve a better balance within the spatial strategy across the whole District. Too much development is concentrated on the Principle Towns of Witney and Carterton (nearly 50% in or adjacent to Brize Norton Parish alone) and this will have a detrimental impact on those towns and the surrounding rural Villages and countryside. Smaller scale, more diverse and a greater number of developments across the whole of the District should be adopted.

-

Mark 4 Dec 22 2025 at 8:44PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Site N is OVERWHELMINGLY opposed by Burford town residents. The town council voted UNANIMOUSLY to oppose its inclusion. The only substantive support on this forum is from the likely developer, Carter Jonas. Decisions on what sites should be included and then developed is a question for the town not the financially interested parties.

-

John 1 Dec 22 2025 at 9:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

So now we have it - the estate of a wealthy landowner trying to maximise the value of their estate under the guise of helping Burford town residents, who at a recent public meeting roundly rejected the development of 80 houses and a town car park on site N south of Sheep Street.

The proposal from the Mills Executors and their offers of support are vague, completely unfeasible and meaningless.

I urge WODC planners to not be unduly influenced by politicians and to reject this proposal on sound planning principles as outlined in the numerous objections you have received in this consultation.

•

Suzanne and Adam Reynolds Dec 22 2025 at 11:49PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

I wish to register my strongest objection to the proposed development of 70-80 houses alongside a coach and car park situated on the south side of Sheep Street. This proposal represents an aggressive and disproportionate expansion that fundamentally undermines the character, setting, and purpose of a rural community.

The council's apparent determination to force this scheme through, despite unanimous and sustained opposition from local residents, demonstrates a troubling disregard for both community consultation and the principles of responsible stewardship of protected countryside.

Furthermore, the practical consequences of this development have been inadequately addressed. Burford already experiences severe traffic congestion, particularly during peak tourist seasons, and the introduction of a large housing estate combined with coach access will exacerbate an already critical situation.

Residents are left with the clear impression that commercial interests and wealthy landowners are being prioritised over environmental protection and community wellbeing, compounded by a worrying lack of transparency from a number of local councillors who appear willing to override local voices. This proposal sets a dangerous precedence, and should be rejected.

•

Nic Porter 3 Dec 23 2025 at 11:30AM

I disagree with the proposed approach

Answer: No. Strongly opposed.

The proposed allocation at Sheep Street is unsound in principle, flawed in evidence and disproportionate in impact.

(a) Conflict with National and Local Landscape Policy

The site lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape. Development at this location would erode the historic rural setting of Burford and introduce suburban form into a sensitive edge-of-settlement landscape.

Assertions within the consultation material that the site is "well contained" fundamentally misunderstand the purpose of landscape designation. Containment is not the test; harm to character and scenic quality is.

There is no lawful basis on which this allocation can be said to conserve, let alone enhance, the landscape as required by national policy.

(b) Absence of Exceptional Circumstances

No exceptional circumstances are identified which could justify development at this location. In particular:

there is no evidence of acute local housing need specific to Burford, no demonstration that alternative sites outside the National Landscape are unavailable, and no infrastructure strategy capable of mitigating the harm identified. This omission is fatal to the allocation.

(c) Infrastructure and Access Constraints

Sheep Street and its connecting routes are narrow, constrained and already subject to congestion. The proposal would introduce additional vehicular movements into an area wholly unsuited to such intensification. Moreover, local services — including healthcare and education — are already operating at or beyond capacity. The consultation materials rely on aspirational mitigation rather than deliverable infrastructure solutions.

(d) Cumulative and Disproportionate Impact

Burford has already absorbed significant growth in recent years. Further expansion on this scale represents a material and disproportionate increase relative to the town's size, character and infrastructure base. Planning is concerned with cumulative harm as much as individual impact. On that basis alone, this allocation should not proceed.

Question 5: Are there reasonable alternatives that should be considered?

Answer: Yes.

Reasonable alternatives plainly exist and must be prioritised, including: brownfield land within larger, less constrained settlements, regeneration-led development in locations with established transport infrastructure, and smaller-scale infill within settlement boundaries where harm is demonstrably minimal. The failure to exhaust such alternatives renders the Sheep Street proposal premature and legally questionable.

For the reasons set out above, the proposed allocation at Sheep Street, Burford should be removed from the Local Plan 2043. Its inclusion is inconsistent with national policy, unsupported by evidence and incompatible with the Council's statutory duties.

I respectfully request that this representation be given full and careful consideration and that it be recorded in the consultation response schedule.

•

Mary Gay 2 Dec 23 2025 at 12:22PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The late submission in support of development of this site by Carter Jonas with, as I understand, an employee with a vested financial interest, is as outrageous as it is misleading in its presentation of the "beneficial" effects it would have on the surroundings. Please reread the objections lodged by local residents about negotiating the difficulties of safely moving around this area on a daily basis and the negative impacts on the infrastructure and social amenities of Burford.

•

CNLB 9 Jan 2 2026 at 2:58PM

I would like to make a general comment

The Board considers that Area N is potentially a suitable location for non-strategic development but not as currently proposed. We consider that the proposed allocation constitutes major development, in the context of paragraph 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We recommend that only the eastern half of the site should be allocated.

•

Historic England 16 Jan 5 2026 at 12:58PM

I would like to make a general comment

Proportionate HIA is needed to consider the potential impacts of the site on the character of the conservation area and the significance of other nearby assets, not least the Grade I Priory. Furthermore, the archaeological potential of the site needs to be understood. More evidence is needed at this stage in the form of desk-based assessment, and potentially field evaluation. We note there does not appear to be a conservation area appraisal and management plan for Burford, which heightens the need for more detailed consideration at this stage of the plan-making process.

We recommend HIA and prioritising the preparation of a Conservation Area Appraisal for Burford.

•

Pulhams 34 Jan 5 2026 at 2:38PM

I agree with the proposed approach

Yes.

This site is identified for a nominal yield of 70 dwellings. This is certainly appropriate for town with the services and employment that Burford offers, which includes secondary education, and a certain amount of employment, with much more provided by a strong retail and hospitality offer. There is a significant issue with recruitment and retention of staff across many local enterprises, including support staff for the schools. The actual population of the town is lower than the employment it supports, meaning in-commuting is unavoidable.

The proposed site is closer to the town centre and economic life of the town than previous development that has taken place some way to the south, off Shilton Road, outside the National Landscape. The proposed allocation is visually well contained at the bottom of the valley side, and screened by woodland.

•

C3 Planning on behalf of 50 Burford residents Jan 5 2026 at 2:44PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

- The proposed allocation would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 because it would be incompatible with the great weight that has to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, particularly since NPPF paragraph 190 requires permission to be refused for major development in a National Landscape other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated

that development is in the public interest

- The Council has not demonstrated any exceptional circumstances and development in this location cannot be in the public interest. The need to make up a shortfall in West Oxfordshire District's five-year housing supply is not an exceptional circumstance for these purposes. The shortage of housing is a normal circumstance which should be resolved otherwise than by major development in the National Landscape. A number of Appeal decisions by Planning Inspectors confirm this. Further, it cannot be in the public interest to allocate a large site for major housing development in the National Landscape in circumstances where no local need for housing has been demonstrated and which would urbanise the only western entrance point into the town with the additional likely introduction of an awkward and inevitably suburbanising road junction on the A40 and one or more pedestrian crossings.
 - There would be substantial harm to the settings of multiple listed buildings and a material negative impact from the site being on the boundary with the Burford Conservation Area.
 - There would be a material additional strain on local infrastructure where local schools and primary care is already over-subscribed.
 - There would be unacceptable strain on the medieval lanes in the vicinity of the proposed site which are already overburdened and rendered dangerous (for car drivers and pedestrians) by local traffic problems from visitors to the town.
 - Burford is a 'jewel in the crown' of tourism in West Oxfordshire, but it is getting overwhelmed. The focus for the future of Burford should be to enhance the visitor and resident experience on a sustainable basis, for now and the future. Adding a significant number of new houses and expanding the western boundary of the historic built environment to this extent would be seriously detrimental.
- Please find attached our detailed report explaining the reasoning behind these objections to the allocation, together with the results of the traffic survey referred to in the report.

•

For Fulbrooks Sake 5 Jan 5 2026 at 4:01PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

FFS has two main comments on the suitability of the outline proposal for Area N, non-strategic development in Burford, on land south of Sheep Street, next to the already over stretched doctor's surgery.

Pressure on Health Services: As already indicated in responses made by residents in Fulbrook itself, and medical Professor Martin Vessey, CBE, MD, FRS, there has already been a major increase in the size of Fulbrook's neighbour, Burford, with the building of the large new estate opposite the Burford Garden Centre. This has caused increased pressure on all local services. As a retired medical professor, he is particularly concerned about ever increasing pressure on health services and he writes that the Sheep Street practice is so overworked that it is hard to access a consultation.

Traffic: WODC will now doubt be aware from many online letters of strong concerns about the severely worsening traffic conditions on the A361, A40 and A424 should such a development go ahead. (We refer again also to Professor Martin Vessey's letter of 30th July to Mr Thomson.) The existing traffic situation between Burford and Fulbrook via the ancient bridge over the River Windrush is already frequently intolerable in summer months, rush hours, and bank holidays with Burford and the road from Fulbrook choked into a state of frequent immobility. These roads certainly cannot take the further traffic which would be generated by development of the scale considered for Area N.

A similar comment could be made for the narrow access road of Sheep Street into the mediaeval High Street. Again, FFS would say that a Burford Settlement Strategy which contained “teeth”, i.e., mechanisms for ensuring that these historic places, their access, heritage landscape and settings need to be considered and protected is needed. Otherwise, the authenticity which the tourists come for will be completely lost to all our detriment and in many senses. It will no longer be a special place in which to live, work, enjoy, and accommodate visitors.

The proposal of nearly 30 years ago for a Burford by-pass, to the west of the town, from the A40, across the river to join the A 424, with an improved link road (B4437) from the A424 to A361 would seem (if feasible) the only way to conserve Burford in its current historically unique state. If a developer for the site next to the surgery could be held responsible for delivering that then potentially there could be a partial solution. The practicality and cost of such a scheme are of course significant. Willingness to make such an investment in critical infrastructure before any housing development would be a fair test of a developer’s real commitment to preserving and improving the area not just exploiting it. It seems to FFS the only way to mitigate the damage that would otherwise be done in reducing accessibility to and enjoyment of Burford as it is currently.

In fact, WODC’s own commissioned report (the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Baseline Report) dated 9 July 2025 recognises the inherent complexity of the junctions of the A40, A361 and A424. It states at paragraph 4.42:

“Burford is situated at the junction of the A40, A361 and A424 and is an important tourist destination as well as a local service centre. The narrow bridge over the River Windrush at the north of the town can cause considerable congestion, and the relatively high level of lorry traffic has a negative impact on the environment and historic character.”

FFS would again re-emphasise that these problems cannot just be left to the Local Plan. Some of these are immutable problems and some perhaps can only be alleviated with innovative and very substantial building of roads.

West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2025
As the HELAA is one of the key supporting documents to the Spatial Options Paper we would like to make a few comments on this assessment.

FFS welcomes that the HELAA has considered the sites put forward for consideration in the allocation process and has reached the view in the Commentary that three out of the four sites proposed for Fulbrook would:

“result in the loss of an area of open space that makes an important contribution to the character or appearance of the area and would fail to form a logical complement to the existing scale and pattern of development in the area.” (HELAA pages 190 onwards)

Previous detailed policy points have been made in correspondence with the Planning Officer at WODC by Fulbrook Parish Council in relation to two of these sites, and it is much appreciated that WODC’s system of assessment (with a site visit) has reached this conclusion, which is consistent with the criteria which WODC have previously established.

The village as a whole was unaware that the fourth site (“Home Farm”) had been suggested as suitable for development in the Local Plan process. In the HELAA the 0.4 ha site is deemed to be suitable for housing with an indicative capacity of 14 units.

The site owners have already recently received a second planning permission (upon appeal) for 4 houses on this site in addition to 4 houses already approved.

FFS would like WODC to clarify unambiguously whether this indicative capacity identified is intended (if it materialises into an application) to be a total assessment of 14 units in this space, and whether this total of 14 units would mean that the entirety of Fulbrook’s Tier?

-

Charlie Luxton Design on behalf of Oval Estates 19 Jan 6 2026 at 4:54PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

No, development of this site is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. There is no evidence that development in this location is in the public interest

-

Natural England 13 Jan 7 2026 at 3:23PM

I would like to make a general comment

Area N- South of Sheep Street, Burford

We note the Area N, Land to the south of Sheep Street, is adjacent to ancient woodland. Any development should ensure direct and indirect impacts to this habitat are avoided.

Where a plan area contains irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, there should be appropriate policies to ensure their protection. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees.

-

Oxfordshire County Council 28 Jan 7 2026 at 4:43PM

I would like to make a general comment

AREA N – South of Sheep Street, Burford

Minerals & Waste

This site allocation is over 400m from a Mineral Safeguarded area. We have no objection to this proposed allocation. Mitigation could be incorporated into any future design to limit any impact of potential future Mineral working.

Place Planning

The site will require integrating with walking routes to existing Burford. Whilst the main access could be from Sheep Street, consideration of increasing traffic on less suitable roads needs mitigation. More detail is required on using the site for town centre car parking.

Transport Strategy and Policy

The buses from Burford Town centre (233/234) no longer provide a link to Hanborough, only Witney and Carterton. For Woodstock a change in Witney is required. The text should be updated to reflect this change.

Landscape and Nature Recovery

This area as mapped is currently located immediately adjacent to a parcel of ancient woodland. This ecological feature will need to be carefully considered alongside the LNRS when considering inclusion of this allocation and the allocation boundary.

Archaeology

The allocation site is part of the site of Battle Edge, where the king of Mercia was defeated by the king of the West Saxons in 752AD. Finds of human remains have been recorded in the field. Archaeological investigation would be required ahead of any proposal for development.

CNLB 22 Jan 8 2026 at 4:18PM

I disagree with the proposed approach

The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board considers that the site is potentially a suitable location for non-strategic development, but not as currently proposed.

We acknowledge that the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment identifies that the site is suitable for housing.⁸² However, we consider that the allocation, as currently proposed:

- constitutes major development, in the context of paragraph 190 of the NPPF;
- is disproportionate to the settlement of Burford;
- would have a significant adverse visual impact (with regards to views looking north-west from the southern boundary of the site);
- would have a significant adverse effect on the setting of the Burford Conservation Area.

As such we do not support the allocation as currently proposed.

However, we consider that a smaller scale allocation that just the eastern half of the site, east of the entrance to Priory Wood, would potentially be acceptable (in the context of a Tier 2 settlement) subject to appropriate landscape mitigation and development criteria.

The quantum of housing would need to be reduced proportionately (i.e. at least halved).

Context

The Area N allocation is for a residential development of 70 dwellings on a site covering approximately 3.4ha, on the south side of Sheep Street, on the west side of Burford. It is located within the CNL, in Landscape Character Type (LCT) 16 (Broad Floodplain Valley). More specifically, it is located in Landscape Character Area 16B.

82 West Oxfordshire District Council (2025) West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2042. Housing and Economic Land

Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2025 (link). Site Ref: BUR 002a, digital page 70.

Figure 25. Burford Preferred Non-Strategic Development Location (Area N – South of Sheep Street, Burford)

Landscape character

Proportionality

As outlined above, in response to consultation question 2, the Board considers that a development at a CNL settlement would be disproportionate if it increased the number of dwellings in the settlement (or the area of the settlement) by more than 5%.

According to the 2021 census, the built-up area / parish of Burford has 688 dwellings.⁸³ A 5% increase on the baseline would be 34 dwellings. The proposed allocation of 70 dwellings is double that figure (10.2%). As such, we consider that the proposed allocation is:

- is disproportionate;
- conflicts with the guidance provided in the CNL Landscape Strategy & Guidelines that development in the CNL should be proportionate (and, by extension, it conflicts with Policy CE1 of the CNL Management Plan);
- conflicts with the requirement, in paragraph 189 of the NPPF, for the scale and extent of development in National Landscapes to be limited;
- constitutes major development, in the context of paragraph 190 of the NPPF, in terms of scale (please see below for further commentary on this issue).

⁸³ [link](#). Search for Burford.

54

Landscape character type

The CNL Landscape Character Assessment identifies 19 different landscape character types (LCTs) within the CNL. The allocation site is located in LCT 16 (Broad Floodplain Valley).⁸⁴ In the

West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment, it is in LCT 8 (Upper Windrush Valley) in semi-enclosed valley-side farmland.

Relevant key characteristics are the gentle, convex valley slopes and arable fields that are defined by hedgerows and some stone walls.

Development on the allocation site could result in some alteration to the landform, which would detract from the characteristic gentle, convex valley slopes. The agricultural / arable land use would also be lost. The stone wall along the southern boundary of the site would presumably be retained (and, ideally, restored).

The site is relatively contained, with woodland to the north and west, built development to the east and valley slopes to the south. As such, any impacts on landscape character would be relatively localised.

The West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment states that Priory Wood is a key landscape feature in relation to the settlement of Burford.⁸⁵ Development on the allocation site would potentially have a significant adverse effect the setting of Priory Wood (which forms part of the Burford Conservation Area). It could also potentially result in a deterioration of the ancient woodland of Priory Wood, although these impacts could be moderated.

Settlement form

The West Oxfordshire Design Guide identifies Banbury as being a linear settlement.⁸⁶ The Design Guide provides the following description of linear settlements:

- Linear settlements have a distinctive ribbon form and develop along both main roads and the smaller side roads that branch off these routes.

87

The Design Guide goes on to describe Burford as follows:

- Exceptionally well preserved medieval town located in the west of the District. Burford's main axis runs up the valley side away from the Windrush, and is intersected by a secondary axis that follows a hill terrace to give a cruciform plan. The High Street, which is lined by early houses, most of which are Listed, is especially distinctive.

88

The secondary axis, referred to above, is presumably along Sheep Street, to the west of the high street, and Witney Street, to the east of the high street. On this basis, the allocation site would be on this secondary axis. However, built development along Sheep Street currently only extends approximately 350m to the west of the high street (which it has done since at least the 1990s⁸⁹). The allocation would extend built development approximately 290m further west.⁸⁴ Cotswolds National Landscape (2004) Cotswolds National Landscape – Landscape Character Assessment

(link). 16 – Broad Floodplain Valley (link).

85 West Oxfordshire District Council (1998) West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment 1998 (link). Key Settlement

Burford. D: West of Burford (digital page 171)

86 West Oxfordshire District Council (2016) West Oxfordshire Design Guide. 5 – Settlement Type (link), page 6.

87 West Oxfordshire District Council (2016) West Oxfordshire Design Guide. 5 – Settlement Type (link), page 4.

88 West Oxfordshire District Council (2016) West Oxfordshire Design Guide. 5 – Settlement Type (link), page 13.

89 The current extent of built development along Sheep Street was present in a 1999 image of Burford on

Google Earth Pro.

along the high street. In other words, it would almost double the extent to which built development extends along Sheep Street from the high street.

On this basis, we consider that the proposed allocation does not reflect the settlement form and pattern at Burford. This conflict would be less severe if only the eastern half of the site (east of the entrance to Priory Wood) was allocated.

Dark skies

One of the ‘special qualities’ of the CNL is the area’s dark skies.⁹⁰ As such, it is important that development in the CNL, or in its setting, does not increase levels of light pollution, including sky glow, within the CNL.

The image below is an extract from CPRE’s Light Pollution and Dark Skies map. It shows that Burford already has fairly high levels of light pollution, with the town centre being in colour band 7 (‘pink’), which is the third highest level of brightness on the brightness scale. The effects of this light pollution extend to the allocation site, most of which is in colour band 6 (‘orange’), and beyond.

The development of the allocation site would increase light pollution levels to a limited degree. For example, colour bands 6 (‘orange’) and 5 (‘yellow’) are likely to extend further west as a result of the development, including to the hamlet of Upton. The relatively ‘contained’ nature of the site would help to moderate these impacts.

Overall, this is not likely to be a deciding factor in whether or not the allocation is acceptable. However, the Board’s suggestion of only allocating the eastern half of the site would help to further moderate these impacts as this would avoid the more exposed western slopes of the site.

If the allocation is taken forward, development should be required to comply with best practice guidance relating to lighting in protected landscapes, including the lighting guidance recently adopted by the Board. Consideration should be given to offsetting the impact of the additional lighting by ensuring that the whole of Burford complies with best practice guidance in this regard.

⁹⁰ Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2025) Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030

(link). Chapter 4 – The special qualities of the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Figure 26. Extract from CPRE’s Light Pollution and Dark Skies map showing light pollution levels at Burford (with the Cotswolds National Landscape boundary shown as a pink line)

Tranquillity

One of the ‘special qualities’ of the CNL is the area’s relative tranquillity.⁹¹ As such, it is important that development in the CNL, or in its setting, does not adversely impact on the tranquillity of the CNL.

⁹¹ Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2025) Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030

(link). Chapter 4 – The special qualities of the Cotswolds National Landscape.

A key consideration, in this regard, is the extent to which the proposed allocation would increase traffic movements on roads within – and / or along the boundary of – the CNL. As outlined in Section 4.5 of the Board’s Tranquillity Position Statement we consider that increases in traffic movements of 10% or more are significant and are likely to have an adverse impact on tranquillity.⁹²

Given that the proposed allocation would increase the number of dwellings in Burford by

approximately 10% it is unlikely that this threshold would be exceeded (given the contribution that through traffic also makes to the overall traffic movements).

On this basis, we do not consider that the impact of increased traffic movements is likely to be a deciding factor in whether or not the allocation is acceptable.

Visual impacts

The site has a footpath along the western and southern boundaries (PROW Code: 149/6/10). As one accesses this path from the north-west corner of the site on Sheep Street there are glimpsed views of the western half of the site through the vegetation.

Figure 27. View looking south-east, towards Area N, from the north-west corner of the site, at the junction of PROW 149/6/10 and Sheep Street.

As one heads south on the footpath, along the western boundary of the site, views of the site are restricted by the intervening vegetation. Views of the site open up as one reaches the south-west corner of the site.

92 Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2019) Tranquillity Position Statement (link). Section 4.5.

58

From here it can be seen that the site rises over a shallow ridge, in the middle of the site, before descending on the other side of the ridge towards Burford. There is very little impression of the relatively close proximity of the built development of Burford at this viewpoint with just a couple of chimneys and rooftops visible over the ridge.

Figure 28. View looking north-east, across Area N, from PROW149/6/10 at the south-west corner of the site

As one heads in an easterly direction on PROW 149/6/10 along the southern boundary of the site, the view across the whole site opens up. The woodland belt of Miletree Clump and the buildings on Little Rissington airfield can be seen, in the distance, to the north-west.

93 It is these views, looking north-west, that would be most adversely affected by the proposed allocation, particularly if housing is built on the upper slopes of the western half of the site. Views looking directly north, across the site, are restricted by the woodland of Priory Wood on the north side of Sheep Street. Conversely, this woodland would, presumably, also restrict views of the site in south-facing views from the north side of the valley, especially when viewed from lower elevations.

The housing along the west side of Tanners Lane, to the east, is clearly visible but the rest of Burford is not visible.

Figure 29. Panorama view, looking north across the site, from PROW 149/6/10, approximately half way along the southern boundary of the site

93 Given the limited number of public rights of way (PROW) between Burford and Upper Rissington there are unlikely to be many locations where the site could be seen in south-eastward facing views to the north-west of the site.

59

Figure 30. View, looking north-west across the site, from PROW 149/6/10, approximately half way along the southern boundary of the site, with the woodland belt of Miletree Clump the buildings on Little Rissington airfield visible in the distance

Views looking north-westwards across the site, from the south-east corner of the site are more limited, as shown below.

Figure 31. View looking north-west, across Area N, from PROW 149/6/10 at the south east corner of the site.

60

The site is also visible from Sheep Street, along the northern boundary of the site. In some sections there is very little vegetation along the northern boundary of the site, providing clear views across the site. In other sections, the intervening vegetation makes the views more intermittent. The entrance to Park Wood, which is within Burford Conservation Area, provides a notable viewpoint as there is seating on either side of the entrance. Just to the east of the Park Wood entrance, the approach to Burford is demarcated by signage and ‘traffic calming’ fencing. Figure 32. View looking south, across the site, from Sheep Street at the entrance to Park Wood. The entrance to Priory Wood is roughly the point where the topography of Sheep Street and of the allocation site changes. To the east, the site slopes down in a north easterly direction towards Burford, whereas to the west, the site slopes down in a north-westerly direction, away from Burford. So, if you are approaching the Park Wood entrance from the west, you are walking or driving up hill with very little perception of the settlement ahead, whereas when you head further east along Sheep Street, you are walking or driving downhill into Burford. Based on the above points, we consider that the visual impact on views from publicly accessible locations adjacent to the site are likely to be significant.

With regards to impacts on views from the wider area:

- It is unlikely that housing on the site would be seen from the A40 – if there is any potential intervisibility this should be addressed in the design of the site to ensure that there is no intervisibility.
 - There are glimpsed views of the site as one approaches Burford from the north west, on the A424, but the vast majority of visual receptors would be in motor vehicles so the views would be very brief.
 - There is very little, if any, intervisibility with publicly accessible viewpoints / locations at the bottom of the valley because of the intervening woodland at Priory Wood.
 - There are glimpsed views of the site as one approaches Burford from the north, on the footpaths on Westhall Hill, although the site is partly screened by intervening vegetation.
- Based on the above points, we consider that the impact on views across the wider area are likely to be very limited.

Historic environment

Cultural heritage (including the historic environment) is one of the factors that contributes to the natural beauty of the CNL. One of the ‘special qualities’ of the CNL is the ‘distinctive settlements, developed in the Cotswold vernacular with high architectural quality and integrity’.⁹⁴

94 Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2025) Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030

(link). Chapter 4 – The special qualities of the Cotswolds National Landscape.

61

CNL settlements, or parts of settlements, that are designated as Conservation Areas, are prime examples of this special quality. This includes the Burford Conservation Area.

Most of the section of Sheep Street that runs along the northern boundary of the site is included in the Burford Conservation Area, as is Priory Wood. The houses along Tanners Lane, to the east of the site, are also within the Conservation Area.

Figure 33. Burford Conservation Area⁹⁵

This section of Sheep Street is one of the few publicly accessible locations within the Conservation Area where one can look out across undeveloped farmland. As such, it makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. The opportunity to admire these views out of the Conservation Area are enhanced by the provision of south-facing seating (benches) at several locations along the north side of Sheep Street, including on each side of

the

entrance to Priory Wood.

Development on the allocation site would be detrimental to views out of the Conservation Area (i.e. from Sheep Street) and, to a lesser degree, to view into the Conservation Area (i.e. from the footpath on the southern boundary of the allocation site). This would be particularly significant if the whole site was developed. This is because, in this scenario, there would no longer be any direct views from the Conservation Area, along Sheep Street, onto open countryside.

Development on the site would not conserve or enhance the setting of the Conservation Area.

For these reasons, the allocation, as currently proposed, would conflict with the current policy on Conservation Areas in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (Policy EH10).⁹⁶ It would also conflict with Policy CE7 (Historic environment and cultural heritage) of the CNL Management Plan.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ [link](#)

⁹⁶ West Oxfordshire District Council (2018) West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 ([link](#)). Policy EH10 – Conservation

Areas. Page 136.

⁹⁷ Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2025) Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030

([link](#)). Policy CE7 (Historic environment and cultural heritage).

62

We consider this to be a significant adverse effect.

These impacts would be less significant, although still adverse, if only the eastern half of the site (i.e. east of the entrance to Priory Wood) was developed, as this would allow for some direct views from the Conservation Area onto open countryside to be retained. Currently, the western half of the northern boundary of the site has quite a few trees, which limit the views looking south across the open countryside. These trees (or at least some of them) should be removed to open up these views. The loss of these trees would have to be compensated for by planting additional trees

Biodiversity

Natural heritage (including biodiversity) is one of the factors that contributes to the natural beauty of the CNL. In particular, one of the CNL's 'special qualities' is the area's ancient broadleaved woodland.⁹⁸ This is a relevant consideration in this instance because the Defra MAGIC website shows that the Priory Wood, on the north side of Sheep Street, is ancient woodland.

Figure 34. Extract from Defra MAGIC map showing ancient woodland at Priory Wood

Development of the proposed allocation site wouldn't result in the direct loss of ancient woodland at Priory Wood. However, it could potentially result in the deterioration of the ancient woodland, for example, as a result of damaging the roots of trees in the ancient woodland which might spread under the road and under the allocation site.

Paragraph 193c of the NPPF states that:

- Development resulting in the ... deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

⁹⁹

This policy approach is reflected in Policy EH3 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan¹⁰⁰ and in Policy CE8 of the CNL Management Plan¹⁰¹

.

⁹⁸ Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2025) Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030

(link). Chapter 4 – The special qualities of the Cotswolds National Landscape.

99 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024) National Planning Policy Framework (link).

Paragraph 193c.

100 West Oxfordshire District Council (2018) West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (link). Policy EH3 – Biodiversity

and geodiversity. Page 114.

101 Cotswolds National Landscape Board (2025) Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030

(link). Policy CE8 (Nature recovery and biodiversity), sub-paragraph CE8.6.

63

The Government / Natural England / Forestry Commission guidance on ‘Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions’

102 makes the following

recommendations regarding buffer zones around ancient woodland.

- For ancient woodlands, the proposal should have a buffer zone of at least 15 metres from the boundary of the woodland to avoid root damage (known as the root protection area). Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, the proposal is likely to need a larger buffer zone. For example, the effect of air pollution from development that results in a significant increase in traffic.

- For ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree’s canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree’s diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area.

The guidance also states that ‘a buffer zone should consist of semi-natural habitats such as: woodland; [or] a mix of scrub, grassland, heathland and wetland’.

The boundary of the ancient woodland is approximately 12m from the boundary of the allocation site. Therefore, the first few metres along the northern boundary of the allocation site should consist of semi-natural habitat. On that basis, the built development would need to be set back from Sheep Street rather than edging directly onto it.

Major development

The Board considers this allocation to constitute major development in the context of paragraph 190 of the NPPF. The main reasons for this are as follows:

- The allocation has twice the number of dwellings that the Board would consider to be proportionate.
- It is seven times larger than the threshold for major development, in terms of number of dwellings, in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (i.e. 70 dwellings, compared to the threshold of 10 dwellings).¹⁰³
- It is three times larger than the threshold for major development, in terms of area (hectares), in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (i.e. three hectares, compared to the threshold of one hectare).¹⁰⁴
- It would have a significant, adverse visual impact, particularly in relation to views looking north-west from the footpath on the southern boundary of the site.
- It would have a significant adverse effect on the setting of the Burford Conservation Area.

No exceptional circumstances have been set out to justify this major development.

It is worth noting that, in the planning inspector’s report on the examination of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031, the planning inspector stated:

102 [link](#)planning-decisions#ancient-woodland

103 [link](#). This is a relevant consideration although it is not necessarily, in isolation, a deciding factor.

104 [link](#). This is a relevant consideration although it is not necessarily, in isolation, a deciding factor.

64

- In the absence of a specific housing need figure for the sub-area, it is not possible to identify that new dwellings, over and above existing completions and commitments, are as a matter of principle, necessary specifically in the context of the AONB or the Burford – Charlbury sub-area.

105

As such, this is a relevant consideration in relation to the question of whether exceptional circumstances apply to justify this allocation.

We consider that if the allocation was reduced in scale, such that it occupied the eastern half of the site, to the east of the entrance to Priory Wood, it would not constitute major development. This is because it would be more in line with the Board's 5% threshold and it would have a less significant adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area and on views that are currently experienced from the footpath on the southern boundary.

Conclusions and recommendations

The Board does not support the allocation as currently proposed.

This is primarily because we consider it to be major development, in the context of paragraph 190 of the NPPF. However, even if it was deemed not to constitute major development, the adverse visual impacts and the adverse impacts on the setting of the Conservation Area would provide sufficient justification for excluding the proposed allocation.

However, we consider that there is scope for a smaller quantum of development on this site.

The Board recommends that, if this allocation is progressed, only the eastern half of the site (east of the Priory Wood entrance) should be allocated, as shown below.

Figure 35. The Board's suggested boundary for the Area N allocation (with the boundary shown by the red line)

105 Planning Inspectorate (2018) Report on the Examination of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 ([link](#)).

Paragraph 219, page 55.

65

This would help to ensure that:

- the increase in the number of dwellings in Burford would be below the Board's 5% threshold;
- the allocation does not constitute major development, in the context of paragraph 190 of the NPPF;
- the north-westerly views, towards Upper Rissington, that are experienced from the footpath along the southern boundary of the site are not adversely affected;
- adverse impacts on the Conservation Area and its setting are minimised;
- adverse impacts on the ancient woodland at Priory Wood are minimised.

To avoid any deterioration of the ancient woodland at Priory Wood, the Local Plan should specify that development must comply with the Government / Natural England / Forestry Commission guidance on 'Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions'.¹⁰⁶

Any dry stone walls or hedgerows that form the boundary of the site should be restored.

If the District Council is minded to allocate the site in full, they should explicitly set out the exceptional circumstance that they think apply to justify this major development.