

Errata:

Section 1

1.6 At start add: "In the past" (I do very little private sector work now)

1.8 application ref. should be 22/03240/OUT

Section 2

2.1 should say *Minster Lovell (Charterville) ~~is defined~~ is a historic rural village located broadly centrally within the district of West Oxfordshire ("the District") alongside and at the junction of the B4047, which was historically the main route east-west **from** Witney to Burford*

2.4 should say **mid-20th** century not *late 20th century* [and elsewhere at 3.24]

2.12 should say *The main access road into this large, very new housing estate ~~is Holloway Lane, with~~ that has very recently been built out by Bovis Homes **is Holloway Lane** and it is referred to as the Holloway Lane/ Bovis Homes estate* [NB it is also sometimes called Dovecote Place]

2.32 should say *settlement sustainability **report***

2.36 should say **directed** not **directly**

Section 3

3.8 should say*a requirement of 660dpa would resolve **most of** his concerns*

3.14 should say *augmented by a **small but** significant area within the western field*

3.22 should refer to WIT4 not WIT2

3.25 should say*established roadside planting (effectively a thick hedgerow) retained with gaps filled in ~~plans~~ and a wide grassed verge....*

Section 4

4.5 in the NB *take credit for* should be in parentheses, thus: NB *it appears to want to "take credit for" footway already provided.....*

4.27 Ignore/ delete - Clearly I meant to comment on the Heritage statement but I ran out of time

Section 5

5.24 delete Ripley Avenue, which I describe elsewhere as not part of (and the Local Plan report differentiates from) the block of 20th century housing referred to.

5.54 unfinished sentence – ignore [NB points picked up in Planning benefits section]

5.63-64 Ed Barrett spelt incorrectly as Ed Barratt

Section 6

6.6 paragraph numbers require updating to reflect current December 2023 NPPF

Section 7

7.9 should refer to para 225 of the NPPF

7.25 delete words ~~to the west of the Cote Ditch~~

Section 8

8.13 & 15 paragraph 74 should be updated to paragraph 77

8.21 In bullet point 5, it should statein practice ~~many of these large sites,~~ these remain a very large resource of potential future supply.....

8.24 should read:I regard the SDAs (including those that are now assessed as if no delivery will arise from them in the next 5 years; ~~and indeed, including the current appeal site and the Taylor Wimpey site in the NWSDA at least~~); minor windfalls; and major windfalls (including large planning approvals granted since 1 April 2023) as significant sources of the developable supply, that together exceed the Local Plan requirement and are potential sources of future oversupply, ~~particularly when assessed against the basic LHN of 570dpa and noting that the 5% buffer is moved forward from later in the plan period, which in this case is now only some 8 years~~

Section 9

9.9 square brackets should say *[I consider that this is mainly to minimise travel; and improve efficiency in terms of providing infrastructure and services, including retail and leisure **and to protect the setting of the District's many smaller historic settlements**].*

9.52 Bullet point 2 *only a little less accessible* should be in parentheses, thus: *I would again question the implication that the allocation of the Bovis Homes estate [in a different housing land supply context and under a different national policy regime relating to the 2012 NPPF] automatically creates a precedent for later development that is "only a little less accessible";*

9.60 delete final bullet point: ~~*Is the appeal proposal necessary to meet identified housing needs*~~ (policy H2)

9.79 bullet point 1 should say: *Despite adjoining the AONB and forming an important part of the skyline in views out from the ~~south~~ north and separating the cluster of housing to the west from the village.....*

NB in the context of this particular error, bullet point 3 of 9.71 already says of the site that: *It also provides an undeveloped visual gap in views from Burford Road and other nearby estate roads in the Holloway Lane estate; and in longer views from public viewpoints to the north and perhaps to the south, depending on intervening planting [which is all "blue line land"]*

9.77 add "for the LPA" after *perfectly justifiable* thusit seems to me perfectly justifiable **for the LPA** to assert that the proposal would **involve the loss of an area of open space or any other feature that makes an important contribution to the character or appearance of the area.**

9.78 add "about the site not being part of an important green open space" after "if I am right", thus: *However, if I am right **about the site not being part of an important green open space**, I consider that **the proposal would fail to protect or enhance the local landscape and the setting of the settlement***

9.83 bullet point 1 should say *In all views where the ~~eastern~~ western end of the Holloway Lane estate can be seen, I believe this represents a reasonable indicator of the likely effects of the appeal proposal, except that (1) the Holloway Lane estate has bungalows at the front, whereas the DAS suggests that the whole appeal proposal would be 2-storey with larger landmark buildings at the access; (2) as such, the appeal proposal would have tall buildings closer to the road/ the viewer from the ~~south~~ north, making it more visually prominent;*

9.84 bullet point 1 should say *I believe that views from close to the site and longer views from the ~~south~~ north would both be adversely affected.....*

9.89 the visually prominent harsh line of 2-storey on the western edge of the estate should say the visually prominent harsh line of 2-storey **dwelling**s on the western edge of the estate

9.90 point (5) should say "unconvinced" not "convinced", thus: (5) *I am entirely unconvinced that the solution to harshly incongruous obtrusive 2-storey housing is more housing*

Section 10

10.17 replace "at most moderate" with "at most modest" thus *I consider that this benefit should be given less weight than the moderate weight the report suggests and again consider at most ~~moderate~~ **modest** more appropriate* [NB this is consistent with the table at 10.36]