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

Charlotte Cavaghan

Address

3 Long Acre, Stocking Lane, Shenington, Banbury, OX15 6NF

Type of Comment

Objection

Type

neighbour

Comments

I object in the strongest terms possible to the proposed development. 1. Shenington is a category C village. Therefore only infill or redevelopment should take place. 2. The proposed development is not in keeping with the village. Elan's paperwork contains photographs of more modern housing stock in the village but it is misleading and in fact most of the houses are at least 1800's and more probably 1700's after the fire of 1721 raised most houses to the ground. The houses are mainly vernacular, built in local ironstone. Elan's proposals are very different and feel like a different county. 3. Shenington is on the edge of the cotswolds, an AONB and views surrounding the Cotswolds are thus protected. The proposed site can be viewed from multiple area within the AONB and as such blights the view and contravenes protections afforded to the area. 4. The roads in Shenington and Alkerton are not suitable for the increase in traffic such a development would afford. Rattlecomb Rd which the development would be reached from is a narrow lane. Stocking Lane is also very narrow - 2 cars can not pass each other easily and the lane through Alkerton which is used in order to reach the village is incredibly twisty, with sharp bends and a very narrow lane clearly designed for horse transport rather than car transport and is already treacherous during the school run and when the school bus and bare-bones bus service runs through it. There is no pavement on rattlecomb, non through Alkerton and, importantly, no room for one either. Children use these lanes to walk to school and they are dangerous as they currently stand, nevermind with the increase in traffic 49 homes would create. Furthermore although lorries and vehicles used for the construction phase of the site may not travel through alkerton, rattlecomb itself is not fit for the purpose of these vehicles. The entrance onto the site would be treacherous. 5. The village has extremely limited public transport which is operated out of county by Warwickshire CC. The village does not have an Oxfordshire funded bus service running through it, such is its small nature. Buses are limited and not very practical. See attached timetable. 3 buses per day to 2 local towns. This means there is little public transport to support the expansion of houses in Shenington. Car usage will therefore be the only practical option for people in the new homes and as outlined earlier the roads and pavements (or rather, lack of) is a major issue. 6. Shenington is a small village. Less than 150 homes. The proposed development would increase the dwellings by more than a third. As per point 1, this is not an infill situation. 7. The water / sewage system can not cope with the population in Shenington and the surrounding villages as they are now. Our water flows down to treatment in Shutford and I attach a recent article from Shutford Magazine outlining the unacceptable levels we are already at and I quote a relevant part here: In 2020, Thames Water... Released untreated sewage into Shutford stream on 114 occasions, for a total of 1530 hours... This was the equivalent of untreated sewage being released... 24 hours a day... For just over 2 months! ". As it stands, this is devastating for wildlife recovery. 8. the land is ancient pasture. It is 6.85 acres. It is a haven for wildlife. This again brings me back to point 1 that the site can not be classified as infill or redevelopment. For all these reasons I object wholeheartedly and entirely to the proposed Elan development.

Received Date

06/04/2022 22:31:03

Attachments

The following files have been uploaded:

- sewage issue p1.pdf
- sewage issue p2.pdf