

# Comment for planning application 22/00489/F

<b>Application Number</b>	22/00489/F
<b>Location</b>	Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road Stocking Lane Shenington
<b>Proposal</b>	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)
<b>Case Officer</b>	Robin Forrester
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Robin Oliver
<b>Address</b>	Mullinahogie, Well Lane, Alkerton, Banbury, OX15 6NL
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I write to strongly object to the proposal presented by Elan Homes to build a large number of houses on an elevated piece of open countryside, next to an Ironstone village which is largely encapsulated by a conservation area and adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, all of which will be blighted by this proposed development of urban housing. As other respondents have commented, the applicant has conducted a shoddy and largely desk-based exercise and demonstrates little understanding of building outside of urban environments, in sympathy with the surrounding environment. If the developers did not care sufficiently about the quality of the submission for this presumably highly important project for themselves, it can only be highly doubtful that they will take any more care in constructing this ill-conceived project. As other respondents have pointed out, there is a fatal flaw in this project. The highways are simply inadequate to deal with traffic at peak times as things stand; adding possibly up to 100 more vehicles would be unsustainable. The key point here is that there is simply nothing that can be done about the roads. There is no room to widen them and no suitable space to create pedestrian footpaths. This implacable fact alone should convince the Planning Committee of the impossibility of this proposal. On the matter of sewerage, the Shutford sewage facility and its surrounds have had numerous issues over time and the Sor Valley in Alkerton has been particularly vulnerable with a diameter of pipe unable to cope with the existing village requirements on a number of occasions. The Thames Water Pollution Incident Reduction Plan 2020-2025 aims to make a modest reduction in incidents per 10,000km of sewerage piping from 24.5 to 19.5 which is unlikely to be assisted by this proposal, especially as some of these incidents have occurred in the Sor Valley. Further to that is the historic nature of the village. I believe, like most respondents, I am conscious of the need for new housing but Shenington with Alkerton is a Category 3 village, according to CDC's Local Plan 2011 - 2031 and their own Villages Policy 1 document. There seems little point in having democratic consultation to formulate policy if it is then subsequently ridden over roughshod. As a Category 3 village, the only sustainable building (as recognized by the Local Plan) should be infill or conversion developments. These have accounted for 45 additional houses to the village over the last 35 years. This is not a case therefore of the village being exclusionary or "NIMBY-ist". Accommodation has been made to additional housing requirements which makes this proposal all the more repugnant in its ignorance of the village's history. This raises a further question as to the nature of the advice or instruction that the applicant has received. I believe that they should have been aware of a number of the above issues, however, as the land is owned in trust, the trustees, as legal owners, owe a fiduciary duty to the beneficiary owners to ensure the assets of the trust are being "managed" properly. Without sight of the Trust Deed it is difficult to be certain but it is highly likely that this duty represents a direct conflict of interest with our community. They wish to maximise value, regardless of the impact on the environment or the wider community. The proposal itself therefore finds its basis in supreme indifference and selfishness. It is unfit to proceed on that basis alone. The proposer's own documents highlight some of the issues that the proposal creates and others have been obviously ignored, such as the inability in 6 months to obtain advice and guidance from Thames Water on sewerage. It is most notable that the report Elan Homes commissioned from the Case Officer in Planning advised them clearly that this would not be a proposal which would be supported. It begs the question therefore of why they have proceeded. Oxfordshire County Council's Archaeology department also requires that the applicant funds a properly approved person to carry out a review of what is quite likely a piece of land on or close to potentially</p>

prehistoric grounds. The CDC Ecology response indicates that the applicant has not met requirements in respect of submissions to their satisfaction and even the Arboriculture response points out there is no Landscaping Plan and indeed there are no plans as to how, once landscaped, the ground not directly owned by houses will be maintained. In addition, the failure to consult Thames Water clearly is in hope of avoidance of dealing with what is a major issue to them and the village, in the hope that the problems caused will simply be left for us to deal with. All in all, this demonstrates how far short of a professional job Elan Homes and its advisers have done on behalf of the trustees of the trust which owns this land. This is open countryside and should, under no circumstances, be turned into something more akin to a suburban estate. It simply is not the right environment for this development. I would wholeheartedly encourage the councillors of the Planning Committee to unanimously reject this proposal.

**Received Date**

18/04/2022 19:50:55

**Attachments**