

Comments for Planning Application 21/00104/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00104/FUL

Address: 6 Burgess Mead Oxford OX2 6XP

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension. Insertion of 3no. rooflights to rear elevation. Insertion of gas flue. Removal of boundary wall and provision of bin stores.

Case Officer: Charles Refson

Customer Details

Name: Dr Margaret Pelling

Address: 12 Burgess Mead Oxford OX2 6XP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbours

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Effect on character of area

Comment: In general, I rather regret the major changes that have been made to the houses on this estate, especially those affecting the curve of the terraces. However, that horse has bolted. The present application is almost identical to the reconstruction (only) recently completed on the house next door to mine. Apart from the noise and disruption over an extended period, which I assume are not germane, I can attest that the end result, including the dropped roof corners, is in fact very attractive, not least because the brickwork was well matched. I have lost a little light in my side window on the ground floor, but not much. I would however like to make two comments about the present application.

1. While admittedly they are at the back, I cannot see the point of the row of roof lights. When I bought my (identical) house from the developers, I was told very firmly that the roof space could be used only for the lightest storage, and that it was unsuitable for any form of conversion. Because of the dormer windows, the roof space is in fact very limited. Possibly it is intended to put the boiler in the roof space, although this is a major exercise. Even so, electric lighting in the space should be sufficient.

2. Re the bin store: as new-builds go, our houses are carefully designed, with considerable attention to detailing, materials and consistency. There are covenants against altering the external appearance. As the application documents make clear, two adjacent houses in the opposite terrace have moved their porch wall forward to enlarge the bin store. As the houses are adjacent, the new porch walls are effectively continuous, so the change does not stand out. Also, the original design was carefully followed, including the ball, pediment, and the height of the porch wall. Unless this is also true of the present application, so that the only structural change would be in moving the porch wall forward, I would be opposed to the changes in the bin store.