

Comments for Planning Application 21/00262/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00262/FUL

Address: 20A Osler Road Oxford Oxfordshire OX3 9BJ

Proposal: Erection of a 2 x 2 bed dwellinghouses (Use Class C3).

Case Officer: Sarah Orchard

Customer Details

Name: Edith Woodruffe-Peacock

Address: 22 Osler Road Oxford OX3 9BJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbours

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Amount of development on site
- Effect on adjoining properties
- Effect on character of area
- Effect on privacy
- Height of proposal
- Information missing from plans
- Local plan policies

Comment: I still object to this resubmitted application.

No attempt has been made to address the fundamental issues highlighted in the previous refusals (20/02969/FUL and 20/02090/FUL).

Indeed, the response seems to be a doubling-down and a reiteration of the false assertion that the development on the much wider plot at #18 Osler Road somehow establishes a precedent to develop 2 houses on the narrower plot at #20. This is emphatically **not** the case.

The scale of the new proposed development has actually not been substantively changed since the last application, so the application should STILL be rejected for reasons stated in the previous 2 decisions.

Furthermore, the applicant should be advised to desist from making repeated applications that fail to respond to the refusal reasons detailed in the previous delegated reports. These repeated re-submissions amount to an attritive approach that is vexatious and wasteful in consultees' time and in the resources involved in the administering planning process.

These are the reasons stated in the previous refusals that have still not been addressed in this new application:

1. "Due to the scale of the development, size of the plot and proximity of the development to the boundaries of the application site, the proposal results in an overly cramped development which fails to address the low key backland nature of the site and the existing grain of development in accordance with policies DH1 and G6 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 and policies CIP1 and GSP4 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan." This is still not been addressed.

2. "Due to the location of the proposed access to the units and detached nature of the front garden and high boundary treatment of the southern unit, the southern unit would fail to benefit from adequate privacy and direct access to adequate amenity space and would have a poor outlook contrary to policies H14 and H16 of the Oxford Local Plan." This is still not been addressed.

3. "Due to the proximity of the rear elevation of the development which could contain the sole outlook from the rear bedrooms, the proposal would result in loss of privacy to the rear gardens of properties in Stephen Road contrary to policies RE7 and H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036." This is still not been addressed.

- The applicant has now added angled louvres to the windows that overlook Stephen Road that have already been judged to be contrary to policy. This is a temporary mitigation of what will become a permanent aspect of the proposed properties. It is merely a temporary "fig-leaf" that will protect the modesty of Stephen Road for a short period of time only. It is unreasonable and unenforceable to expect that these louvres/blinds will be kept in place in perpetuity.

(The references to "Stanley Road" are presumably a mistake in the illustrations - possibly because the architect has repurposed a "cookie-cutter" design from another location that overlooks somewhere else?)

4. Energy and Sustainability:

- The design illustrations no longer show photo-voltaic panels to the roof - which will reduce the sustainability of the proposal relative to that of the approved, uncontentious "low-rise" proposal (19/01727/FUL).

5. Bike and bin storage:

Bike and bin storage now feature in the plan - but there is insufficient space to navigate through the narrow corridors to the street. Consequently bins will be left permanently on the street, to the detriment of the street scene.

Other comments (carried forward from the previous applications) that remain unanswered by this

resubmitted application:

1. It is an overdevelopment of the site:

It seeks to squeeze too many dwellings/inhabitants into too constrained a space. It's simply too high density. The original site was intended for a single family dwelling. This was admittedly generous, but the same space is now expected 7 dwellings - which is extremely ungenerous.

2. It is overbearing in height:

18 Osler Road should not be the yardstick against which 20A is measured. Please visit the site to see how high it is and how much 18 Osler Road overshadows the gardens of Stephen Road. The proposal for 20A will make the problem even worse.

3. Privacy concerns:

a. For the inhabitants of the proposed dwellings at 20A: their bedrooms would be overlooked from the rear windows of 16, 20 and 22 Osler Road.

b. For the inhabitants of 16, 20 and 22: their gardens will be overlooked.

c. Residents of Stephen Road will also be overlooked by the proposed windows in 20A.

4. Possible use as short-term lets:

a. This developer has other properties that have been listed on Expedia/AirBnB types of short-let websites. Doing the same to the properties at 20/20A/20B would alter the character of our neighbourhood. Is it possible to ensure that this is prevented - both for 20 and 20A? I would like this accommodation to be put to more socially productive use.