

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	Thomas Harrigan
Address	The Old Post Office, Rattlecombe Road, Shenington, Banbury, OX15 6LZ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>The proposed development is essentially for a housing estate, with no relation to the village of Shenington, apart from the fact the village provides a boundary to it. It will not only dominate the village due to its elevated position, but it will detract from, and encroach upon the Conservation Area. The impact on the road network will be to increase traffic through Shenington and Alkerton to the point where it will present a hazard to all road users, particularly pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The site of the proposed new junction with Rattlecombe Road will be intolerable to the residents opposite. I also have some particular concerns with the application and how it is being presented to the public. Site History: The site history is incomplete. I have a letter from Cllr. George Reynolds to the residents of Shenington, hawking these fields for development, from 1992. Given that the Cllr. Reynolds was acting in a personal capacity, one cannot expect CDC to keep a record of his letter, but it refers to a Planning Officer report, which apparently concludes that the proposed development on the fields would be "detrimental to that part of the village". There has been a great deal of previous work dealing with proposed developments on this section of agricultural land, which has become unavailable via the planning portal. Is this because the opinions were mostly negative? Planning application 02/02000/F is not in the Site History. This was for 5 houses on the same fields, and attracted a recommendation for refusal based on a slew of policies. The proposed development was found to be contrary to policies: H13, H18, C13 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan, H16, H19, EN34, H22 of some other plan, as well as policy TR5. It is important that both objectors and supporters of the proposed development have access to these opinions, particularly to see if the reasons for refusal have been addressed in any way, which in this case they have not. It beggars belief that if a development of 5 dwellings attracts a recommendation for refusal, a development 10 times the size would not. While planning application 01/02422/OUT (29 dwellings) appears in the Site History, important documents associated with that application are missing from it. Fortunately I took some notes at a time these important documents were available, particularly in relation to the impact on the deficient highway infrastructure. Conservation Area: Despite the lack of support from our District Councillor (see above) Shenington with Alkerton achieved its long overdue Conservation Area status in 2009. The proposed development will therefore not only be "detrimental to that part of the village" as stated in the missing Planning Officer's report, but it will be detrimental to the Conservation Area. The "extensive engineering operation" (again quoted from the P.O. report via Cllr. Reynold's 1992 sales pitch) required to provide a suitable function with Rattlecombe Road, would drastically alter part of the Conservation Area. It will be interesting to read the Conservation Officer's opinion on whether that alteration will be for the better or worse. Highways: The highway infrastructure through Shenington with Alkerton is deficient, with steep, narrow winding roads with blind bends. While the section of Rattlecombe Road in question is straight, it is narrow, with no footpath. I took the following notes from the Local Highways Authority recommendations to refuse development at the same site with access onto Rattlecombe Rd. 02/02000/F (5 dwellings) "4. Highway safety factors - there are two main issues to consider in this respect namely i) Safety in the vicinity of the proposed new junction onto Rattlecombe Road where visibility is inadequate which will increase danger to all users to this part of the highway and ii) An absence of footpaths along a considerable length of Rattlecombe Road thus increasing the hazard to motorists and pedestrians alike." 01/02422/OUT (29 dwellings) "3 Highway Safety 3.1) The proposed access onto Rattlecombe Road would be most dangerous adding more traffic through the only road</p>

through the village also causing great inconvenience to the households opposite the opening. The proposed access to Rattlecombe Road would serve to create a hazardous sequence of road junctions 3.4) We currently have a cocktail of potential disaster. There is no footpath for horses/pedestrians; the road is used regularly by buses, milk lorries, vans etc. We have traffic surges at school times and when the kart circuit is in action, plus the route is a rat run from Tysoe etc to Banbury" Of course you will need to find the original documents to verify my quotations, but anyone who has walked Rattlecombe Road knows the highway will not bear the increase in traffic the proposed development will bring, without greatly increased hazard to road users.

Received Date

06/04/2022 14:09:00

Attachments