

# Comment for planning application 22/00489/F

<b>Application Number</b>	<input type="text" value="22/00489/F"/>
<b>Location</b>	<input type="text" value="Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road Stocking Lane Shenington"/>
<b>Proposal</b>	<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)"/>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<input type="text" value="Nathanael Stock"/>
<b>Organisation Name</b>	<input type="text" value="J. Huskisson"/>
<b>Address</b>	<input type="text" value="Mulberry House,Banbury Lane,Horley,Banbury,OX15 6BG"/>
<b>Type of Comment</b>	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
<b>Type</b>	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
<b>Comments</b>	<input type="text" value="I and my family are longstanding patients at the village surgery and with our children having been to the village school and former nursery I am familiar with the village, its charm and appeal and with some of its facilities/infrastructure. I support the many objections to this significant housing development application, particularly to the high number of houses being applied for. Should permission be granted, hopefully not, the council should ensure: a frequent bus service; sufficient capacity on buses for pupils travelling to/from schools outside the village; sufficient capacity at the village school; increased capacity specifically at the Shenington doctors' surgery and avoiding the need for more villagers to travel to the busy sister surgery at Fenny Compton; footpaths from the new houses to the village school and surgery to prevent increased traffic along Stocking Lane. Should there genuinely be the need for additional housing specifically in Shenington then the number should be limited to the specific number required, not the number the landowner and developer would prefer. Any development on fields and open land is at the very least disappointing. Where is our wildlife to prosper if we keep building over its natural habitat? And how will we reduce our environmental footprint when housing is built in areas that increase the number of people travelling to reach essential services?"/>  <input type="text" value="Regards,&lt;br/&gt;J.Huskisson"/>
<b>Received Date</b>	<input type="text" value="05/09/2022 21:49:38"/>
<b>Attachments</b>	