

# Comment for planning application 22/00489/F

<b>Application Number</b>	22/00489/F
<b>Location</b>	Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road Stocking Lane Shenington
<b>Proposal</b>	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)
<b>Case Officer</b>	Robin Forrester
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Colm Gibson
<b>Address</b>	High Holme, Street Through Shenington, Shenington, Banbury, OX15 6NH
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Shenington is a quiet picturesque village, adjacent to the Cotswolds AONB, built of natural local ironstone, and with Conservation Area status to protect it. I object strongly to the proposed development because: - The site location is on relatively high ground, visible for miles around. The Developer's "External Finishes Schedules" document explains that a significant proportion of the finish will be combination of "White PVCu", and "Red engineering brick" - in stark contrast to existing buildings. The development would, therefore, do substantial damage to the character of the Conservation Area and the village as a whole. In my view, granting permission for houses that were so out of character would not be reasonable or rational. The development should not, therefore, be permitted. - The (only) road through village is not very wide, is relatively steep, has no pavements, and has a blind bend at the Alkerton end. There is no shop or Post office in the village, and many facilities are a significant distance away. The Application provides a table on page 66 of the "Planning and Affordability Statement" that states that it is a 9.3km walk to the Post Office (presumably an 18.6km round trip), a 9.6 km walk to the supermarket (a 19.2km round trip) and a 10.6km walk to the dentist (a 21.2km round trip). Residents would be dependent on cars, and the development would cause a material increase in traffic and traffic congestion at peak times. It would, therefore, have a substantial adverse impact on road safety and the nature of the village. The development should not, therefore, be permitted. - Shenington is a small rural village with limited utility infrastructure. Trying to add such a significant number of new houses will place further strain on these services, to the detriment of the existing residents. The increase in water demand from the proposed houses will adversely impact the water pressure received by the existing houses. There are already flooding issues at the bottom of the hill as a result of limited capacity in the drains and/or sewers. Connecting further houses at the top of the hill will exacerbate these issues. The development should not, therefore, be permitted. - The development would have a substantial adverse impact on the environment and biodiversity both during and after construction. Locating homes so far from many amenities will necessarily require a substantial use of vehicles by the people that would live there as they commute to and from work and to and from other facilities. This will increase noise and atmospheric pollution in the village, and runs counter to a low carbon agenda. The increase in traffic and the larger number of people around would also have an adverse impact on biodiversity, as it would deter many of the native animals that villagers have the pleasure of seeing in their gardens and the surrounding fields on a regular basis when everything is quiet. The development should not, therefore, be permitted on environmental grounds.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	20/03/2022 20:54:07
<b>Attachments</b>	