

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Policy \(WODC\)](#)
Subject: Stonesfield Neighbourhood Plan.
Date: 19 February 2026 09:30:17

You don't often get email from s [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear WODC Planning,

I am writing to submit my comments on the Stonesfield Neighbourhood Plan, currently under Regulation 16 consultation. While I appreciate efforts to plan for the future of the village, I wish to formally object to the proposed Local Green Space (LGS) designations outlined in Appendix C of the Plan.

1. Lack of Exceptional Qualities – National planning policy requires LGS designation to be applied only to sites that are demonstrably special to the local community, for reasons of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, or wildlife. I do not consider many of the proposed sites meet these criteria, and the evidence provided in the Plan is limited. For example, William Buckland Way appears to be included primarily to prevent further development rather than for genuine community or landscape value. Manor House Field is currently under consideration for a planning application for 20+ houses, making its designation inconsistent with development needs. The field at the top of Brook Lane already has planning permission and is largely screened from public view by gates, hedging, and trees, yet has been included for unclear reasons.

2. Impact on Sustainable Development – LGS designation imposes strong restrictions on future development, which could prevent the village from addressing housing needs, community facilities, and other essential infrastructure. Blanket designation of these areas may hinder sustainable growth in Stonesfield.

3. Conflict of Interest and Questionable Impartiality – At the Stonesfield Parish Council meeting on 1st October 2025, it was revealed that two plots of land owned by Cllr. Genny Early (Green Party councillor for Stonesfield and Tackley) were excluded from LGS designation. Many residents expressed concerns over fairness and potential conflicts of interest, particularly as Cllr. Early had purchased additional land within the village last year, adjacent to a site proposed for a new housing development "Manor House Field". No satisfactory explanation for the exclusion of these lands was provided, and the process appears opaque. Furthermore, much of the supporting material for the proposed LGS designations was produced by members of SUSTO or their relatives, raising further questions about bias.

4. Alternative Protection Mechanisms – While some areas may be valuable open spaces, other planning tools—such as conservation area policies or wildlife protection designations—can protect them without unnecessarily restricting development.

In conclusion, I urge the examiner and West Oxfordshire District Council to reconsider the proposed LGS designations. Given the lack of clear justification, potential bias, conflicts of interest, and inconsistencies regarding specific sites, a more balanced approach protecting genuinely exceptional green spaces while allowing appropriate development elsewhere would better serve the long-term interests of the village and its residents.

Thank you for considering my comments.