

**From:** Brigit Foster [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 March 2021 14:55  
**To:** Planning <planning@oxford.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Cllr Roz Smith [REDACTED]; Councillor ALTAF-KHAN Mohammed [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Objection to: 20A Osler Road, Headington (number: 21/00262/FUL)

Dear Sirs

Please not my objections as follows:

I object to application 21/00262/FUL because it does not address the previous reasons for rejection (please see comments on previous rejected proposals), it is a further attempt to contort the planning system for commercial gain to the detriment of neighbourhood character and neighbour's privacy and amenity.

I have also been informed by my councillor (Roz Smith) that an application in Marston was recently rejected (within the last six months) on privacy grounds, and that another appeal was dismissed (for an application at 40 Van Diemens Lane) in part due to the impact it would have on the character of the area. This application should be likewise rejected on both of the grounds.

In addition, I make the following objections:

The proposal suggests there is a clear ribbon of development established by 18 Osler Road and 17 Stephen Road (4.4 Design and Access Statement (DAS)). The applicant's statement is not the case and each planning application should be considered separately – the bungalow at 20A established the character for the plot for over 40 years. The application also references 40 Osler Road, which is absurd as this property is within the area of the historical manor house where the development is completely different in terms of size of grounds and history to the newer Osler Road where the application is sited. The permission for a single development at 18 Osler Road and the historic presence of 17 Stephen Road, developed when the properties on Osler Road enclosing the plot had not been built, should not set any precedent for a series of backland developments along Osler Road. Additionally, the development at 18 Osler Road was of a taller building with first floor gable end window, in effect two storeys, whereas the proposal is to change from the now demolished much lower level single storey bungalow to a much larger, bulky two storey building of two properties. This is significant overdevelopment, which must be considered on its own terms.

The application clarifies that the previous building at 20A has been demolished and states it will compare itself with the approved permission for a single storey dwelling. This is not relevant as that permitted development has not gone ahead and comparison should be made with the demolished building, which was considerably smaller and single storey and did not impinge on the character of the neighbourhood or privacy and amenity of neighbours. Indeed, it was all but invisible to neighbours. If the applicant wishes to compare with the existing permitted scheme it should go ahead and develop this, otherwise this approach represents a potentially interminable ratcheting up of development. In addition, there is little reference to the approved scheme or the existing condition of the demolished site. For instance the CIL form states there is no building on the plot and the proposal will add 145sqm. However, approval 19/01727/FUL stated the now demolished building was 52sqm, which is the comparison that should be made to judge the impact on the neighbourhood character and privacy. Indeed the approved scheme clarified the appropriateness of a modest single storey building on the plot.

The height of the proposed development is over 7m at its highest point, nearly double the height of the previous demolished building as it replaces a single storey structure of approximate 4.6m height based on the proposed plans and the delegated report for the previous refused application 20/02090/FUL. The new building will be highly visible from Osler Road and Stephen Road, as is demonstrated by the new development at 18 Osler Road and therefore will alter the existing character of the area. The applicant is incorrect in its assertion in the DAS 4.1 where it claims the development will be 'only glimpsed' which will 'enjoyed' – strong claims indeed. 4.3 claims the buildings will be 1.5 storeys which is incorrect – the plans clearly show two full height storeys with roof space above, which is a significant change from the previous low level single storey building on the site. During demolition, some low level planting was retained along the boundary of Stephen Road but there is little room to provide further screening and the proposal should not be reliant on screening provided on other properties to provide privacy or retain character. DAS 4.6 suggests further planting East and West will 'soften the setting' which is not possible for two storey buildings of this height as the planting of full height mature trees is not possible or included within the plans. Therefore the change in character and visual impact will not meet the key design objectives and principles for delivering high quality development required by DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 and CIP1 and GSP4 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan.

The height of the structure and the proposed full height windows on the East first floor will result in a major loss of privacy (including direct views into bedrooms and gardens), daylight and sunlight and loss of amenity to the gardens and properties on Stephen Road. In these respects these proposed windows are even worse than the previous proposed rooflights, which did not provide sufficient privacy or amenity either. The proposed timber louvres on the upper half of the windows are not sufficient to safeguard privacy as there is no control over their retention and it is inconceivable any future occupant would retain them. H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 states that 'planning permission will only be granted for new development that provides reasonable privacy, daylight and sunlight for occupants of both existing and new homes.'

- DAS 4.4 states the footprint of the proposed building is similar to the approved 72sqm under 19/01727/FUL. It suggests it is only a small increase of 3sqm. No footprint area is provided but based on the drawings, it is considerably larger than the suggested 75sqm and this is confirmed by the Gross Internal Area of 145sqm provided in the CIL form. Therefore, assuming the footprint is in the region of 90sqm, the overall footprint is considerably larger than the previous demolished building previously stated as 52sqm (and then claimed as 61sqm) and bigger than the existing permission.

DAS 5.3 compares with the development at 18 Osler, which it states is not overdevelopment and would fit 'comfortably into the site'. This is clearly not the case and a site visit will confirm the significant impact and overbearing nature of this development on neighbouring properties.

The new proposal sits awkwardly in its plot. Even though there appears an approximate 1.8 to 2m separation from the boundaries with 22 and 18 Osler Road, this is considerably smaller than the separation with which it is compared at 18 Osler Road where the separation is 7m from 20A and 10m from 17 Stephen Road. In addition, the building is only 5m away from the boundary with Stephen Road, increasing to approximate 6.35m at its maximum. The proposal also brings the building significantly closer to the Stephen Road boundary than the existing approval 19/01727/FUL.

The design and height of a blank, 2 storey gable end structure along the northern boundary provides a poor relationship to the garden of 22 Osler Road in comparison to the previous single storey demolished building or even the approved 19/01727/FUL for a single storey building.

The proposed external space for the properties is broken up into small and narrow areas to the front and rear which are impacted by the bin and cycle stores. Very little of the space will be usable as private amenity space as required by H16 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 and is not in character with the wider garden plots in the area, thus altering the neighbourhood.

The approved permission 19/01727/FUL was presented as an EcoHome whereas this application makes no pretension to achieving over and above basic requirements for sustainability. It therefore represents a retrograde step with the loss of the green roof 'to incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity value' and general lack of consideration of sustainability within the design. This is not in keeping with requirements and ethos of RE1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

I note that Oxfordshire Highways have submitted that this application should be excluded from inclusion in the CPZ. I would add that this application should be rejected for the reasons stated above. In the unlikely event that it is granted, it should be excluded from inclusion in the CPZ.

Therefore, this application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Brigit Foster

--  
This email was Malware checked by UTM 9. <http://www.sophos.com>