

From: Julian Philcox [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 May 2022 14:43
To: Planning <Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning application 22/00489/F: Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road, Stocking Lane, Shenington

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

Please would you confirm whether my email (below) and attachments of last Thursday (28/4) were received? They are in respect of application 22/00489/F.

I ask as my comments and attachments have not yet gone up online.

Thank you in advance.

Best wishes

Julian

Julian Philcox, Director

JP Planning Ltd

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: JP Planning Ltd, Hill View House, 1 Rainsford Close, Clifford Chambers, Stratford upon Avon, CV37 8HY

From: Julian Philcox [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 April 2022 23:56
To: 'planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk' <planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application 22/00489/F: Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road, Stocking Lane, Shenington

Dear Sirs,

Planning application 22/00489/F: Erection of 49 no. dwellings, Shenington

The above planning application and accompanying (EIA) Screening Opinion Request submission have been brought to my attention. I have now reviewed the application submission, including the pre-application response of the Local Planning Authority ('LPA'). I know the village well, having lived there for c. 13 years, and am fully aware of relevant planning history to the village and site; the background to the 2009 Conservation Area ('CA') designation, and the background to the village's Category C position within the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 ('CLP'), adopted 2015.

Firstly though, having reviewed the submission I can see that it is in error, and not valid. Attached is the Current Title Plan for Title Number ON349677. This is in the public domain with HM Land

Registry. The Plan shows that the application site (identified by a red line on the majority of the applicant's drawings) is but part of the wider Title identified on the Current Title Plan.

In addition to the application site's red line National Information Requirements (see Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 14-024-2014030 for the Government's advice on the same) require that:

'A blue line should be drawn around any other land owned by the applicant, close to or adjoining the application site'

That being the case a blue line should at minimum identify the c. 1.5 hectares of land adjacent and to the northwest of the application site on all relevant plans, to include the location plan. This would mean that drawings SHN PI 002-D, SHN PI 001-D and SHN PP 001-B require amending, and likely other plans and documents too. This would then mean, at that point, that National Information Requirements are met, and it would be a valid planning application. This would then provide consultees (statutory and non-statutory), third parties and decision makers with the correct information. From that they can properly draw conclusions.

This is no fault of the Local Planning Authority.

If and when the correct red and blue line plans are supplied by the applicant, the application will be valid and the statutory time period for determination of 13 weeks commence at that point. Presently the application is invalid.

The attached Planning Appeal decision letter reference APP/K1128/W/17/3187008 is of note and amplifies well the above points. In not progressing with the planning appeal the Inspector noted that, '*.. the discrepancy in terms of the blue land ownership and the failure to comply with the PPG mean that the application is invalid. Consequently, the appeal should not continue, and I am unable to consider the planning merits of the scheme.*'

This is notwithstanding that additional information has been requested by ecology (CDC and BBOWT) and archaeological consultees, and Thames Water require evidence from the applicant of the Foul Waste infrastructure needs of the development and have also identified an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the development proposal. The Thames Water consultation response equates to a holding objection and should really be framed as such.

On hearing of the proposal to build 49no. dwellings, a housing estate, within the open countryside beyond the built-up limits of this characterful, Conservation ironstone village, I was taken aback. I have read the pre-application response of LPA officers and concur with their assessment. I would imagine, if valid, that the application would be refused for a minimum of 5 or 6 no. reasons.

Shenington is a Category C village, and for good reason. This is in part because of the size of the settlement, but mainly because it is relatively remote, lacking in facilities and offers no reasonable alternatives to the use of the private car in gaining access to facilities and services further afield. The diminished bus service through the village, financially supported by Warwickshire County Council, provides a limited service of 3 buses a day, upon which residents simply cannot rely in gaining access to wider services, public transport hubs and retail.

Given that the application is NOT valid I have held back from providing a full critique. IF the application is ultimately made valid, meeting National Information Requirements and Government

advice within the PPG on the same, then I would strongly suggest that further analysis of local views is undertaken, particularly those from Stocking Lane looking west over the rear curtilage and setting of Top Farm House and its attendant curtilage listed barns, this being a view from the Conservation Area; the view from the public highway on Stocking Lane, from a position to the immediate northeast of the school entrance and looking south-southeast across the application site towards Rattlecombe Road and finally the view looking northwest from the junction of Mill lane with Rattlecombe Road and heading west, again from the Conservation Area. It should also be noted that Stocking Lane is an adopted (public) highway that continues northwest across the airfield affording other views back towards the application site.

Nevertheless, from initial inspection I would imagine that the application, once valid, will be refused for a good number of reasons, being wholly inappropriate and not in accordance with the Development Plan.

Please would you kindly confirm receipt?

Best wishes

Julian

Julian Philcox, Director

JP Planning Ltd

Telephone:

Fax:

Mobile:

Email:

Address: JP Planning Ltd, Hill View House, 1 Rainsford Close, Clifford Chambers, Stratford upon Avon, CV37 8HY