

Comments for Planning Application 21/00347/VAR

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00347/VAR

Address: 312A Woodstock Road Oxford OX2 7NR

Proposal: Variation of condition 7 (Details - Front Garden) of planning permission 20/02631/FUL (Demolition of existing bungalow. Erection of 2 x 4-bed dwellinghouses. Provision of bicycle and bin stores and associated landscaping.) to allow additional car parking.[cr]

Case Officer: James Paterson

Customer Details

Name: Mr Christopher Danziger

Address: 312B Woodstock Road OXFORD OX2 7NR

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbours

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Effect on traffic
- Noise and disturbance
- Parking provision

Comment: This application is for permission to provide car parking space to house # 2 which was previously denied by the Planning Department when application 20/02631/FUL was approved on 16/12/2020.

Car parking took up considerable space in the Design and Access statement for application 20/02631/FUL and was also a feature of almost all the objections lodged by neighbours to the original application. It cannot have been neglected or overlooked, therefore. The Planning Department must have made their decision on the basis of all the regulations in force at the time. None of them have changed since then.

When the original planning application was submitted, two days before a decision was due to be made the applicant submitted revised plans which made significant alterations to the original plans. I asked if these should not be submitted for public consultation, but was told that as they had SUBTRACTED from the original application, no further consultation was necessary. This application (21/00347/VAR) however, ADDS to the original application, and should therefore be the subject of proper consultation and not just a three week advertisement from lamp posts.

It seems that the current application arises out of a conflict between an obligation to provide disabled access to new developments and the Council's wish to restrict car use in central Oxford. What it makes clear is the unsuitability of this site (as pointed out by all the objectors) for more

than a single dwelling.

The original application claimed that it would make the access lane "more spacious and less squeezed and cars would not be manoeuvring awkwardly in the tight space in front of 312B, so their amenity will be improved". However, if a car is parked in front of house # 2, that space will be unavailable for any other vehicle wishing to turn around, making the whole of the previous claim invalid.

On all these grounds, therefore, I strongly object to planning permission being granted for a second car parking space in front of the new pair of houses.