

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="ivan young"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="The Scrum,The Green,Shenington,Banbury,OX15 6NE"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input 100="" a="" able="" access="" accessibility,="" add="" additional="" all="" already="" also="" an="" and="" anticipated="" are="" around="" assembling="" atmosphere="" banks="" be="" becomes="" below="" bends,="" best="" brief,="" bring="" bungalows"="" bus="" but="" by="" car="" carriageway,="" change.="" chosen="" citizens.="" community="" community.="" completely="" dangerous="" dealt="" development="" dispersing,="" during="" effectively="" enforcement="" especially="" even="" everyday="" existence="" existing="" expansion,="" facilities="" foot.="" footpaths,="" for="" freely,="" fulfill="" further="" have="" having="" hazardous="" here="" high="" hospitals="" housing="" i="" impact="" in="" inadequate="" infrastructure="" infrequent="" into="" is="" it="" lack="" landscaping="" law="" limited="" live="" locations="" maintenance="" making="" may="" meaning="" more="" move="" narrow="" need="" no="" non-existent="" not="" number="" of="" old="" on="" or="" other="" otherwise="" p="" part="" people's="" plan="" planners="" probability="" problems="" proceed.="" proposed="" proven="" provides,="" putting="" reducing="" requirement,="" requirements="" requires="" residents="" rights,="" roads="" roads,="" room="" run="" rural="" safely="" school="" see="" senior="" service="" services.="" shenington.="" shops,="" short,<="" should="" small="" social="" speeding="" station,="" subject="" that="" the="" there="" they="" this="" through="" to="" town="" traffic="" type="text" unacceptable,="" unsightly="" up="" value="I wish to make the following points which were omitted from my previous objection, sent in jointly with my wife Mrs Carole Young: The village has grown organically during our time here (42 years) and has now almost reached capacity with infills and conversions as per planning requirements, plus additional pressure brought by a successful new school with a roll of around 100 children, the majority from outside the village, and a new surgery of several GPs and its own pharmacy serving several other villages. These make the village completely unsuitable for further expansion, with inadequate infrastructure, and sewerage already regularly overflowing into a villager's field with unpleasant consequences for wildlife and the villager, and the local pumping station is already over capacity. The scale of the proposed development is incongruous with its core of miniscule dwellings and flats, which doubtless please the council with the promise of more council tax but nobody else. Even more incongruous and completely inappropriate is the proposed use of red brick as building material, when even the original council houses on Stocking Lane were built of materials of a colour more sympathetic with their surroundings, and the abutting Conservation Area contains few examples of the use of red brick, the majority being of local stone mixes. This plan could have been plucked from a planner's manual for insertion anywhere, but not a small rural settlement such as Shenington, there is a degree of arrogance shown by the planners in even considering putting this forward, unless they have received assurances that this would be acceptable, and of which we are not aware. The site is within visual distance of the Cotswold AONB, is situated on elevated ground some 6 feet above the rest of the village in places, and will dominate the skyline, and most of the rest of the village, overlooking many properties that face it with the accompanying loss of privacy. It would also be visible from the western approaches in between the AONB and the village. The environmental adjustments that the planners have made around the perimeter are merely window dressing, while the removal of ancient hedgerows is unchanged. These cannot be replanted overnight, but develop over many years. The proposal to include some social housing is also completely inappropriate, whether this is a requirement added without any research or proven need is debatable, but any young Sheningtonians who were born and bred in the village and wish to continue to live here already do, and the " vehicles="" village="" village,="" visited="" walls="" way="" when="" whether="" which="" while="" width="" will="" wish="" with="" wonder="" work,=""/>

this development is completely unacceptable in any form, and should not be permitted - it should be remembered that the villagers (for the most part) fought to have the Conservation Area introduced to help retain the very reasons they wish to live here - and now face a disproportionate development and disruption right next door to it on two sides, and to open fields on the others. It makes a mockery of the whole thing and should not be permitted. Ivan Young

Received Date

12/04/2022 13:05:05

Attachments