

WODC Local Plan 2043 Consultation

Mapping Community Objections to NPPF and Local Plan Policy

The table below links the principal objections raised by respondents of proposed Burford Area N development to the most relevant provisions of the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** and the likely policy framework within the **West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 / emerging Local Plan 2043**.

Objection Raised	Relevant NPPF Policy	Relevant Local Plan Themes
Severe traffic congestion on Sheep Street, Tanners Lane and High Street	NPPF Section 9 (<i>Promoting Sustainable Transport</i>), particularly paragraphs concerning highway safety and severe cumulative transport impacts	Transport, highway safety, accessibility, sustainable movement
Unsafe pedestrian conditions on Tanners Lane (no footpaths, school children, elderly users, recreation access)	NPPF Section 9 – safe and suitable access for all users	Road safety, active travel, pedestrian connectivity
GP surgery at capacity and unable to absorb growth	NPPF Section 8 (<i>Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities</i>) requiring sufficient health infrastructure	Community facilities and infrastructure capacity
Primary and secondary schools oversubscribed	NPPF Section 8 and infrastructure-led development principles	Education infrastructure and service provision
Pressure on water, sewage and drainage networks	NPPF Section 14 (<i>Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change</i>)	Infrastructure delivery, utilities capacity, flood resilience
Flood risk from developing a sloping greenfield site	NPPF Section 14, including flood risk and sustainable drainage requirements	Flood risk management, surface water management

Objection Raised	Relevant NPPF Policy	Relevant Local Plan Themes
Development within the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly AONB)	NPPF Paragraphs 189–190 (great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes)	Cotswolds National Landscape protection policies
Erosion of Burford's historic character and settlement edge	NPPF Section 16 (<i>Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment</i>)	Conservation Area setting, heritage protection
Impact on Burford Conservation Area and heritage assets	NPPF Paragraphs concerning harm to designated heritage assets and their setting	Heritage, conservation, town character
Historic battlefield / archaeological significance (Battle of 752)	NPPF Section 16 – archaeological remains and non-designated heritage assets	Archaeology and historic environment policies
Loss of valued countryside, recreation space and public walking routes	NPPF Section 8 and Section 15 (<i>Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment</i>)	Green infrastructure, public access, wellbeing
Impact on biodiversity and adjacent ancient woodland	NPPF Section 15, including protection of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland	Biodiversity, ecological enhancement, woodland protection
Urban sprawl and settlement coalescence with Upton	NPPF principles of sustainable patterns of development and landscape protection	Settlement boundary, landscape character, countryside protection
Lack of evidence of local housing need	NPPF requirement for evidence-based plan making	Housing need assessment and settlement strategy
Preference for brownfield alternatives	NPPF encouragement of effective use of previously developed land	Brownfield-first opportunities, sustainable site selection

Objection Raised	Relevant NPPF Policy	Relevant Local Plan Themes
Negative impacts on tourism and Burford's economic role as a historic market town	NPPF Sections 6 and 7 (economic growth and town vitality) balanced with heritage protection	Tourism economy, town centre strategy, place-making

Strongest Policy-Based Objections

From a planning perspective, the objections most closely aligned with established NPPF tests appear to be:

1. **National Landscape (AONB) harm** – the NPPF requires *great weight* to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape beauty in National Landscapes.
2. **Highway safety and severe transport impacts** – particularly where access roads are constrained and heavily used by pedestrians.
3. **Historic environment impacts** – including effects on the setting of Burford Conservation Area and the reported battlefield archaeology.
4. **Infrastructure capacity** – schools, healthcare, drainage and utilities.
5. **Flood risk and surface water runoff** from development of a sloping greenfield site.
6. **Ancient woodland and biodiversity impacts**, if evidence demonstrates likely adverse effects.

Overall Planning Conclusion

The consultation responses collectively argue that Area N conflicts with the core NPPF objectives of:

- Sustainable development,
- Protection of nationally important landscapes,
- Conservation of heritage assets,
- Safe and suitable access,
- Infrastructure-led growth, and
- Environmental enhancement.

The strongest planning case emerging from the responses is therefore not simply opposition to growth, but that **the site is fundamentally constrained by landscape, heritage, infrastructure, transport and environmental factors, making it an unsuitable location for a development of approximately 70 dwellings and associated parking facilities.**