

Comment for planning application 22/00489/F

Application Number	<input type="text" value="22/00489/F"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road Stocking Lane Shenington"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="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	<input type="text" value="Robin Forrester"/>
Organisation Name	<input type="text" value="Keith & Charlotte Howard"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="The New Barn,5 Rectory Farm,Kenhill Road,Shenington,Banbury,OX15 6NQ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="We object to this application. We live in a house within the Shenington with Alkerton Conservation Area, and our property sits adjacent to an important Scheduled Monument, The Lynchetts. The Conservation Area is established to have archaeological interest, and a good number of its buildings are listed. Such designations are significant markers of our responsibilities as stewards and custodians of settlements that date back at least to the eleventh-century Domesday Book. Given the long history we are, at best, temporary stewards and custodians of the village environment, an environment which the application seems to ignore entirely. We strongly believe that the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 should be adhered to. Shenington is a 'Category C' village, as set out in Policy Villages 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan. Category C settlements are considered suitable only for infilling and conversion. Any proposed development, including this one, would be in direct conflict with Policy Villages 1. The proposed site adjoins the Conservation Area on two sides (with the stone wall along part of one side being within the Conservation Area). It would, then, alter the setting of the Conservation Area, particularly on these two sides, resulting in the loss of the area's rural and open character. The proposed site is also on the edge of the Cotswold AONB, and much of the village housing is of Ironstone/Hornton stone (despite the images given in the application of supposedly typical houses constructed from different materials), matching neighbouring villages both within the AONB and on its borders. We note that the named house designs indicated on the application documents largely match those for Elan developments in cities and suburbs elsewhere, which strongly suggests there has been no consideration of the setting. We note that the developers state they have consulted residents. This statement is somewhat economical with the truth since all but two residents of our street, Kenhill Road - including us - were not consulted, and, so far as we can determine, no residents of Alkerton were consulted (despite the conservation area covering both historical settlements). This is hardly the action of a reputable company wanting to secure the trust of local residents. There are four other aspects in the application that we wish to comment on: First, the comments made about the public transport infrastructure are erroneous: the bus service, around four per day and none on Sundays, is vulnerable to being cut, not least since it is subsidized by Warwickshire County Council. It comes through Shenington because it serves Warwickshire residents in another village, Tysoe; the service is not run for the benefit of Oxfordshire residents (Shenington is, of course, in Oxfordshire) and does not run at times that would allow Shenington residents to commute to or from Banbury for work. Second, there is no shop in Shenington, and there are no obvious employment possibilities likely to emerge within or near the village for new residents. So this, considered alongside the vulnerable and schedule-unfriendly bus service, means the residents of every new house will require cars, and will need to use them on a daily basis. If every household has on average two cars, an additional 49 houses would result in 98 extra cars in the village. In addition to each resident needing access to a car, there will be cars of friends and relatives visiting the 49 new houses, plus additional daily delivery drivers. But the roads into and out of Shenington are not suitable for any increase in traffic. The roads are narrow, and there is poor visibility at junctions. There are dangerous and narrow corners on steep hills as one leaves the village, with no possibility of widening the carriageway. Current residents are well-aware of the pinch points, particularly on the hill down to and then up and out of Alkerton on the road to Banbury, where a car driver meeting a bus or truck can expect a delay compounding the ever-present accident risk. Third, the proposed vehicular access for the development is onto Rattlecombe Road, a narrow road with no space"/>

for a pedestrian footway. Rattlecombe Road has a number of houses immediately on the other side of the road to where the entrance/exit from the proposed development would be which are not set back from the road (except for some parking bays). The dangers to those who live in these houses will be considerably increased if the proposed development is allowed, and their amenity - every time vehicles enter or leave the new estate - will increase. There is no available land on which to add a footway unless the road is further narrowed, and this renders ingress or egress to the proposed development on foot dangerous and will increase the danger the many on foot who use Rattlecombe Road to access the public footpath running from Shenington to Epwell. Further, the elevation on which the stone wall sits (that is, the wall within the conservation area at the edge of the proposed development) indicates that ingress and egress to and from the proposed development by vehicles will be hampered by a lack of visibility. Fourth, Shenington has poor service infrastructure which already struggles, before the addition of more housing. Mains sewerage and drainage issues mean overflow and flooding by foul waste is common. The sewage treatment system, shared with other villages (and even though some existing village houses have no access to mains sewerage), already runs at capacity and is struggling to cope. The application gives very little evidence of having considered this, or, indeed, any drainage from the site. Again, the mains electrical supply is overloaded - we regularly experience power cuts - and Internet access slows at weekends and evenings when existing householders are online. We also understand that the village school and doctor's surgery are both oversubscribed. Simply put, Shenington does not have the infrastructure to support any new housing estate. For the above reasons, and as just one family among the community of stewards and custodians of our historic Ironstone village, we strongly object to this application.

Received Date

21/03/2022 14:28:31

Attachments