

# 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>	Nathanael Stock
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Renate Welz
<b>Address</b>	5 Stocking Lane,Shenington,Banbury,OX15 6NF
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>The development should not be permitted as it is in complete conflict with the Council's Local Plan 2011-2031 and it is also not sustainable, as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Local Plan 2011-2031 states that it is the Council's duty to maintain water quality. The plan states: "Development proposals which would adversely affect the water quality of surface or underground water bodies, including rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs, as a result of directly attributable factors, will not be permitted." Clearly the current sewage and waste water systems cannot cope. Sewage is known to overflow into streams in Alkerton. The development will have an additional adverse impact on the water quality of rivers and ground water and therefore cannot be permitted.</li><li>2. Shenington is a category C village which only allows Infilling or Conversions. This development is not infilling and it is clearly not suitable for development. The Council's Local Plan 2011-2031 also states many spaces in villages' streets are important and cannot be filled without detriment to their character. That is true here, as the development is planning to destroy the conservation area for the access road to the development. Additionally, the development is adjacent to the conservation area and will affect the character. This development should therefore not be permitted as it will alter and destroy the character of the conservation area.</li><li>3. The development is built adjacent to the conservation area. The access road, via Rattlecombe Road, into the development should not be permitted, as it will destroy the conservation area. In effect, that means the whole development should not be permitted as access cannot be granted without destroying part of the conservation area.</li><li>4. In the Developers Planning and Affordable Housing Statement they assert that they respect the local context and the wider setting of this site, including the surrounding countryside and the adjacent conservation Area. However, they have not taken into consideration local materials and the conservation area. The developer is correct that more affordable housing is required in Cherwell District, however, the affordable housing must be in an area with transport, services and amenities.</li><li>5. The development does not have access to amenities or reasonable services. The village has slow broadband, at best 3 buses a day (none on Sundays or Bank Holidays!), overflowing sewage, no cycle paths to the towns and electricity cuts due to overload.</li><li>6. It is likely that teenagers and young adults will not have access to activities or entertainment, due to a lack of transport to Banbury or any other town in the evenings, Sundays or night. No provision has been made for an indoor community / recreation centre which is also available to people with mobility and other disabilities.</li><li>7. The developer quoted the National Planning Policy Framework in their Planning and Affordable Housing Statement. We note with concern that they do not appear to have mentioned the social objective, which includes fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services. As the design of the development is not in keeping with the</li></ol>

local architecture and conservation area, it does not meet the beautiful requirement (it can be seen from the Cotswold AONB), neither does it meet the requirement for accessible services. It is evident that there is extremely limited public transport, poor broadband and no stores, libraries or community or recreation centers. We also note, that it fails on the environmental objective, which includes improving biodiversity and minimising waste and pollution. Destroying Grade 2 agricultural land and wildflower meadows will not improve biodiversity. Also, adding increased demands on the local sewage will lead to increased pollution, whilst the level of expected home deliveries from delivery vehicles to the new development will result in further pollution and climate change. It is therefore clear that the developer is not planning a sustainable development and therefore it should not be permitted.

8. The pedestrian crossing point which connects the development to Stocking Lane exits directly onto the road on Stocking Lane, which is dangerous considering the number of vehicles driving to the school and health centre. During the school run cars are parked on that side, which will make it very difficult for drivers to see pedestrians.

9. We note that the developer's Transport Statement states that they will promote the use of suitable modes of transport and reduce the needs to travel by private car. That will be challenging, in a village with a bus 3 times a day and none in the evenings, night, Sundays and Bank Holidays. The developer suggests cycling, which is not feasible as the roads are steep, dangerous and narrow, with no cycle lanes. Walking is also not an option, as the nearest town is around 6 miles away.

10. There is insufficient resident and visitor parking on the development. As there is essentially no regular and reliable public transport to the village, each adult will require a car, for example the homes may require spaces for 2 parents and 1-2+ further parking spacing for any adult children. The plans have not made any provision for these additional vehicles, with the likely result that the verges on Stocking Lane would be used as parking for residents and visitors to the development. It is already very difficult for emergency vehicles to pass on the narrow Stocking Lane in order to access the school or health center. We also note that the development does not provide any disabled parking bays for visitors. We acknowledge that the developer has considered the Oxfordshire County Council's parking recommendations, however, as the village is only realistically accessible by car, these considerations are not sufficient, meaning they would only really work if there was viable and regular public transport available.

11. We note that the developer plans to install a number of vehicle charging points for most of the development's properties. However, they have not made any provision for visitor parking charging points or offered the local Sherington community charging points on the development. Our other concern is that that electric vehicles have a higher chance of vehicle fires or fires to the properties. We had a major fire in Stocking Lane a few years ago, and it took the Fire Service 25 minutes to reach us. We understand the developer has taken no steps to mitigate the risk and spread of fire. Furthermore, the local electricity network will be overwhelmed with these electric charging points, leading to even more regular blackouts. We suggest that the local electricity network cannot cope with the volume of electric charging points which means the development is not possible and must not be permitted.

**Received Date**

16/06/2022 15:27:29

**Attachments**