

# 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>	simon Porter
<b>Address</b>	The Dairywell, Kenhill Road, Shenington, Banbury, OX15 6NQ
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Ref: 22/00489/F I am writing on behalf of myself and Mrs D Porter to express my opposition to the proposed housing development ref 22/00489/F. My objections to this development are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of (among other factors) noise*, disturbance*, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc.</li><li>2. The Number of proposed houses is unacceptably high density and an over-development of the site.</li><li>3. I do not consider the proposed development to be infilling as per section 3 139 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The Plan defines infilling as " Infilling will be regarded as being the development of a small gap is an otherwise continuous built up frontage suitable for residential development.</li><li>b. The School at the end of stocking lane does not form a " continuous built-up frontage" with the houses on the west side in stocking lane. Nor does in form infilling on Rattlecomb Lane between The Leys and Rattlecomb Hollow separate by open fields of approx. 200 meters.</li><li>c. Policy H! of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 also states that significant additional housing development including inappropriate in fill, should be avoided where it is likely to result in car commuting to urban centres, as is the case here. This is compounded by the significant increase in home delivery van traffic particularly in rural areas with the decline of retail in urban areas particularly in Cherwell.</li></ol></li><li>4. Visual impact of the development<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing developments in the village since changes and implementation of more rigorous planning and control polices implements in recent decades.</li><li>b. Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners</li><li>ii. An adverse effect on the adjacent Conservation Area which will have an adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Whilst the majority land of the development is outside the conservation area it is directly adjacent to it and the proposed access point to the development will require a breach in the boundary on Rattlecombe road which is within the Conservation area. The proximity of the development to the adjacent Conservation area will be profoundly detrimental to the protection of the Village its character, landscape and setting in the countryside.</li><li>iii. Although on the boundary of the ANOB this development in its elevated position in at the western edge of the village will be clearly visible from the adjacent ANOB and spoil the protected vista overlooking the countryside eastward from the ANOB less than 1 mile from the proposed site.</li></ol></li></ol></li><li>5. Design of the properties are poor.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The extensive use of brick is contrary to previous conditions for permission granted ie Long Acre development in Stocking lane 07/01272/F Granted 30/08/2007. This required all the dwellings be constructed in natural ironstone in order to be in harmony with building materials used in the locality including bulk and massing, detailing and materials.</li></ol></li><li>6. The development would adversely affect highway safety and limited capacity of current roads leading and from the village or the convenience of road users.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. The Developer's statement on peak vehicle usage is unsupported with appropriate credible data to support their claims.</li><li>b. Refer to point 3c above.</li><li>c. The roads leading to the village are unsuitable for increased traffic and cannot be widened. Particular the bend into the village from Alkerton the main access route from Banbury and the M40 into the village</li><li>d. I anticipate on street parking will occur on this development with national statistics for rural areas as issued by the RAC in 2020 stating that over 61% of households in rural areas have more than one car with less than 12% actually parking vehicles in a garage.</li><li>e. People living in rural areas in England make more trips and travel further than in urban conurbations. The</li></ol></li></ol>

lack of general amenities other than the primary school, surgery & pub will mean the vast majority will need to travel to access services such as retail, employment, and secondary education. 7. Utilities are already overloaded. a. Sewage and water system and beyond capacity loads for the village before any additional development is permitted. b. The electricity supply to the village is at full capacity. The burden on the network following this development will be far exceed the capacity of the current infrastructure. c. There is no statement on how these properties will be heated. The transition to heat source pumps and high-capacity charging points for electric cars will further exacerbated strain on the utility infrastructure not only from this proposed development but also for the rest of the properties in the village which will also need to transfer their energy and supplies needs within the next 10 -15 years. 8. Elan Community Statement The Developer did not properly consult with the Community including the Parish Council. I was not consulted as a resident nor as a Councillor, asked nor provided with information about the proposed development by them. The community are not obliged to engage with the Developer pre their application and the consultation does not provide a true and accurate reflection of the villager's views on a development which had not been submitted nor made fully public upon which a detailed response could be made. Regards Simon Porter & D Porter

**Received Date**

25/04/2022 23:05:01

**Attachments**