

Comment for planning application 22/00489/F

Application Number	22/00489/F
Location	Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road Stocking Lane Shenington
Proposal	Erection of 49 dwellings (17 of which (35%) will be affordable homes) with associated garages, parking and refuse storage, private gardens and communal open space/play space, hard and soft landscaping (including SUDs feature and means of enclosure, reinstatement of hedging and ironstone walling along Rattlecombe Road)
Case Officer	Robin Forrester
Organisation Name	Emma Tustian
Address	Paddock House,Shenington Road,Epwell,Banbury,OX15 6HQ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I have various objections to the proposed development. I'm astounded that anyone would think a housing estate of 49 houses is a reasonable proposal for a village the size of Shenington and Alkerton. 1) Location goes against the local plan which should have no development outside the village boundary. This will extend the village and take it right up to the edge of the beautiful AONB and edge of Cotswolds location. We have already have infill properties over the last few years, which are more individual properties and more in keeping with the village environs than this proposal which is basically a sprawling estate of houses that could sit on any housing estate in any town. 2) The village is a Category C for development, meaning it's unable to cope with substantial development. The size of the development is too large. With around 180 houses across both Shenington and Alkerton, another 49 houses will increase the village by too high a proportion, and change the look and community feel of the village. 3) Infrastructure can't cope with this number of properties and potential number of people. The doctors surgery only opens mornings (and 1 afternoon) and it can already be hard to get appointments. This estate could end up with an additional 150+ people moving to the village, assuming the majority will be couples, with many having children. This would swamp the surgery, potentially the school. There is no village shop, only one small pub, so for leisure and work, the majority of people will need to drive. 4) Increased danger on the roads for pedestrians and cyclists. This could potentially see an increase of traffic by 100 cars, and as stated in the submitted documents, around 238 additional car journeys a day. The roads are already in poor condition and upkeep is required on a regular basis for patchwork filling of potholes. Add in this number of cars, and this damage will only speed up and worsen. The roads are narrow with no pavements through Rattlecombe Road. At age 11, my son is already not allowed to cycle into the village due to the narrow, bendy, low visibility roads. Adding more cars will prevent more children and adults feeling safe on the road, whether pedestrians, cyclists or horse riders. This will also bring increased delivery vans and lorries and cause more congestion at busy commuting/school drop off and pick up times. 5) New developments should encourage the use of public transport. Like all small villages, public transport is virtually non existent and declining. 3 buses a day, with one of those school transport only. There is no bus service that caters for the working day, so anyone working will need to drive to work. There are virtually no jobs in the village, so people without cars will struggle. 6) The developers propose a play area however there is nothing on the plans to suggest this will take place or where it will be included. 7) The entrance to the estate is very close to the houses opposite where there is no off street parking, meaning turning in and out of the entrance could pose problems at busy times of the day. This will increase the issue of finding safe parking, and increase the danger to pedestrians walking along Rattlecombe Rd from The Level or Mill Lane. 8) Broadband access is still not great in the village, adding more houses will put more pressure on existing broadband users, as well as create issues with finding access for 49 new houses. 9) By adding a large edge of village estate of this size, the very look and feel of the village will change and no longer be in keeping with the historic feel. 10) It's stated in the proposal that there will be no impact on wildlife and no issue with pollution. Of course there will be change in the ecosystem for the current wildlife - with current field topography there will be more diverse wildlife than turning this area into a concreted build environment with more potential for rain run off as there's less grass for it to soak into. With added cars and people comes more air pollution. It may not be high compared with urban areas, but will obviously be worse than currently. 11) Previous applications for much smaller developments</p>

have been turned down. Infill developments have taken place since those times which is acceptable and more in keeping with the village. Cherwell is building substantial amounts of housing in larger villages and in Banbury, with thousands of properties in much more sensible areas which has less of a % increase than this proposed development. It's too large. 5, 10 houses maybe, but over that is increasing the village disproportionately where there are no suitable village facilities to cater for the needs of this number of people. I really hope that the council stand by the local plan and decline this proposal.

Received Date

19/03/2022 19:49:53

Attachments