

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	Christopher Bond
Address	The Old Smithy, Street Through Shenington, Shenington, Banbury, OX15 6NH
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Hello. The application is well considered and the initiative to include 35% affordable homes is great. To the extent there would be development in this village, this is the right location (given the current land usage, and the fact that no public rights of way are affected). However (1) the magnitude of this proposed development is significantly too large for the local infrastructure, (2) critical safety aspects have been overlooked, and (3) a shortfall of considerations around ESG / Environmental concerns is no longer okay given government emissions targets and the current climate emergency. In order: 1. The sewerage system is already insignificant through the village. Many existing homes are not connected to the mains, and are struggling to achieve this aim. As and when they do, and with the nearby local treatment already near capacity, this development breaches capacity. Electricity-wise the grid and power station are already operating too close to capacity for 49 additional units. Road and Public transport concerns are mentioned below, with the timetable of 3 daily buses (timetabled by Warwickshire) inadequate. 2. Critical safety concerns relate to the lack of pavement between the proposed site and the bus stop / pub / church. The application pictures and references a grassy verge. Have you tried walking on that for the muddy six months of the year? And it quickly becomes overgrown in the summer. Young children and adults alike cannot safely be expected to remain on the grassy verge to avoid the existing flow of traffic, let alone the additional 238 daily cars projected in the report, but are forced into the road at significant danger. The report mentions only 1 incident, but that will multiply and becomes serious with such a proposed increase of human traffic. 3. How is it okay to have as many as 2.12 cars per unit average, for an average of 2-3 bedrooms per unit? It should be an average of half this number. And how is it okay to not ensure that provisions for Electric vehicles are not forefront in the proposal for 100% of the car parking spaces? An extra 238 daily car journeys via combustion engine cars is not acceptable in 2022 with government emissions reductions targets. Public transport infrastructure is simply a non-starter with only 3 buses daily, so the proposal needs to re-examine how it can handle fully Electric vehicle provision serving the development. In order to solve the above and to ensure that the Conservation Area and Fringe Character Area is not breached, the development must surely be considered in the context of a maximum of 12 new units, with significant (100%) provision for Electric Vehicle Charging provision, at a magnitude of approximately 1 car parking spaces per unit rather than >2 car parking spaces per unit, and to maintain the similar 35% affordable homes proportion, in my opinion.</p>
Received Date	03/04/2022 07:06:07
Attachments	