

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	James Gibson
Address	High Holme, Street Through Shenington, Shenington, Banbury, OX15 6NH
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I strongly object to this planning proposal for a housing development in Shenington. This development would be clearly visible from Shenlow hill, which is situated in the Cotswold AONB. This hilltop is frequently visited by people to appreciate the view or record the trig point pillar. This is evidenced by the 27 photos uploaded to the trigpointing.uk website. The development would also impact the dark skies and the overall tranquillity of the AONB. As the proposed development obviously would not conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB impacted it should be rejected. The village of Shenington already suffers from poor water pressure and occasional sewage overflows. The village's sewage is treated at Shutford STW. This site already spills sewage regularly, over 100 times in 2020, and so the additional load from the new houses will make the existing problem worse. The additional houses would cause the existing infrastructure to be pushed beyond its capacity and so no houses should be built until this has been addressed. There are 75 heritage assets, including 58 listed buildings, within the surrounding locale of the proposed development, which will be adversely impacted by the development. The setting of these listed buildings is one of the values from which these buildings derive their importance as heritage assets and so should be protected. Although, the negative impact on each individual listed building might be small the cumulative effect across such a large number of listed buildings will be significant and therefore must be considered. The planning proposal suggests that the ironstone wall will be repaired and that this is a major benefit of the scheme. However, I believe that the repair of the wall should be considered separately from the construction of the new housing as it isn't necessary for the new houses to be built to repair the ironstone wall. Furthermore, Historic England in its published "Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance" states that "Enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objectives, should be unacceptable unless a. it will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting b. it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place; c. it will secure the long-term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose; d. it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid; e. sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source; f. it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests; g. the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies." As the proposed development does not meet the criteria listed above, planning permission should be refused.</p>
Received Date	27/03/2022 16:47:17
Attachments	