

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="A Jasko"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="Bell View,2 The Green,Shenington,Banbury,OX15 6NQ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="Please see attached document."/>
Received Date	<input type="text" value="04/04/2022 15:57:08"/>
Attachments	The following files have been uploaded: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AS - Planning Application – 2200489F.pdf

Planning Application – 22/00489/F

I object to the above planning application as I think the impacts to the village will outweigh the benefits, as follows:

An estate with 49 dwellings will result in a significant uplift in resident numbers (100+) and cars (100+). This will cause a dramatic rise in the village population (potentially 30% increase) and will put huge strain on existing village amenities and infrastructure, which has not been designed nor improved to accommodate this number of new residents.

In the last 5 years the village has received permission for 10 new 'infill' and 'conversion' properties, which is in line with its Category C status.

Impacts by cars

Car use is an essential part of village life, especially due to the cut in local bus services.

Car traffic, congestion on and off the main road near the new estate, especially at peak times would increase on a road that has no pavements and is used by walkers, children, horse riders, local buses and agricultural vehicles. This would have a negative impact on road safety, road noise and pollution for villagers, turning a rural village road into an urban main road.

The turning point into and out of the estate will create potholes and the road will need more maintenance because of the extra traffic – something the council already struggle with due to budget pressures.

Several driveways and garages have direct access onto Rattlecombe Road as well as some footpaths and there is some on street parking which narrows the width of the road. The width of the road, the lack of road markings, the '20 is Plenty' signs, 90 deg bends, steep slopes, pinch points all contribute to slowing traffic on a rural road. These factors, together with the number of new cars on the estate will result in slow processional traffic at these points which will compromise the ease of use & enjoyment of the main road currently experienced by walkers, horse riders, cyclists, buses, agricultural vehicles, children. The addition of street furniture on this road would devalue the street scene and is discouraged to protect the visual amenity of this historic road as stated in the conservation documents. Pavements would restrict the width of the road further.

Working from home is not possible in certain industries: construction, medical, retail, manufacturing (shop floor), transport, catering, care etc., and the current bus service does not support commuting hours. Commuting by bike is not realistic due to the fast Stratford Road or in the Autumn/Winter months, negating the argument that car use will be low due to various other 'transport options' (cycles are mainly used as a recreational activity). Working from home will also introduce new traffic pressures on the main road outside peak hours because of shopping trips and additional home deliveries. Increased heating demand due to working from home will require an increase in oil tanker deliveries to the estate – assuming properties are heated by oil as we do not have mains gas in the village.

Visitor Parking is limited in the village. The centre of the village at weekends is often congested with visitor's cars. Where will the estate's visitors park? Along the verges on Rattlecombe Road? Along the pavement on Stocking Lane? In the Centre of the Village (outside the pub)? On the Village Green?

“Appoint Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC). The aim of the TPC would be to act as the main point of contact for residents and external organisations with regard to the promotion of sustainable transport opportunities.”. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN/ENTAIL???

Impacts to the Village Fringe Area

The integrity of the villages' Category C status limits development to 'infill' and 'conversion' and if this development is allowed to proceed it will undermine this status.

The two dwellings located inside the village fringe conservation area, namely Garters, which has recently received planning permission for a large extension with large picture windows and the new 'infill' (another recently approved planning permission) sits directly next to the proposed development site. It could be argued that the visual impact on both these private properties would be such that it may affect the residential amenity of those dwellings. Other factors affected by the development would be noise, which would increase due to the population size and pollution, due to the number of vehicles (not all will be electric). All these factors have the potential to be compromised by the development and would be to the detriment of the residential amenity of the dwellings inside the conservation area.

The LVA document advises: *“The greatest levels of change during construction will be experienced by those receptors immediately adjoining the Proposed Development. This is due to the proximity to the Site and the extent of construction works that will be visible to receptors.”.*

“Following the completion of the Proposed Development the greatest levels of effects will still be experienced by those receptors closest to the Site.”

The mitigation proposals would not improve the visual amenity of distant views the properties currently benefit from but would shorten them considerably. Neither would noise and pollution be improved enough by these proposals. Conifers would provide evergreen screening throughout the year but these can grow to great heights resulting in high levels of shading, extensive root growth and water extraction from the garden. Deciduous planting would only provide screening during the summer months but will also increase shading during these months. All planting would take several years to become mature planting/screening.

How will these proposals help the visual amenity of the homes on Rattlecombe Road that have a direct view out onto this land? How prominent will these new homes be, I can't see any elevation measurements for the new properties.

Impacts to Land Use

The development would be built on greenfield land that has suffered little human interference over recent years. The ecosystem in the soil and on/around the land is probably significant and cannot be replaced in its entirety after development.

There is an obvious need for housing and as the developer has pointed out the LPA is short of its target. However, the NPPF states that LPAs & Developers should consider development of Brownfield sites. These sites would better support new housing estates due to the existing infrastructure, improving the view/street scene for that area and create local construction jobs. Affordable housing would benefit from established transport links to and from workplaces, shops and recreational facilities which may even be within walking distance, reducing the cost of travel and the necessity of car ownership for those homeowners. Local shops and services would benefit from the development of these sites. These sites are more suited to buildings such as flats, which are out

of keeping in a village environment and are likely to benefit from biodiversity net gain more than this site will. I'm sure there is a brownfield site in Banbury that could accommodate 49 new dwellings thereby helping the LPA achieve its target.

Unfortunately, developers are deterred from using brownfield sites due to the cost of clearing and decontamination, however, this should not be at the expense of losing valuable greenfield sites and leaving Brownfield sites to languish in their demise without ever being improved.

BTW: Who owns the playground and green spaces on the proposed development? Can these one day be used as 'infill' thereby expanding the number of houses on the site?

The new development will increase the carbon footprint of the village as red brick is manufactured and excavating land will release stored carbon into the air, oil fired heating is unsustainable and will involve additional oil deliveries to the village (is there provision for oil storage for each dwelling = 49 oil tanks on the site?). In the interests of climate change developers should include alternative energy sources such as solar panels and heat pumps rather than leaving it to homeowners to retrofit these, which is offputtingly expensive. Not all the vehicles will be electric and this will also increase the carbon footprint.

Benefits to Existing Amenities?

We have few village amenities... The Bell Pub, Shenington School and the Doctors Surgery. The Bell will enjoy an uplift in trade from the housing estate but that may come with a negative uplift in noise suffered by the residents who live around the pub.

Does the school and surgery have capacity for such numbers? The school run could well increase if not.

Banbury is losing clothing shops by the minute (H&M the latest shop to close). Alternatives are online shopping resulting in more home deliveries, driving to other towns to shop not supported by the bus route, e.g., Leamington, Solihull etc.

Finally, I hope the LPA recognises that the village is not opposed to development of the kind it has been accustomed to, a slow but steady increase in housing by "infill and conversion". If allowed to go ahead, the proposed development will substantially increase the population very swiftly and will irreversibly alter the landscape and character of this peaceful rural village. I sincerely hope this planning application will be rejected.

Yours sincerely

A. Jasko