

# 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 Jonathan Shingleton

Address: 29 Squitchey Lane Oxford OX2 7RU

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbours

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other - give details

Comment: Dear Mr Paterson

I note the developers of the site at 312A Woodstock Road have put in a request for an amendment to the planning approval for re-landscaping the front garden of House No 2. to include provision of a car parking space.

Numerous neighbours including myself objected to the plans prior to the granting of planning permission on the basis of the lack of car parking provision - there being only one space shown on the plans for House No 1.

The Planning Committee decided to approve the application without provision of a second car parking space. Presumably at the time the Committee considered the accessibility issue for disabled persons; OCC Policy M3 states the need for disabled parking must be considered in all residential developments as set out in Appendix 73.

I assume the developers and their professional advisers were also aware of this requirement when submitting their planning application and plans for the site and were content to submit their final application without provision for disabled parking for House No 2.

Having ignored the objections of numerous neighbours to the absence of appropriate parking in their final submission (and which was subsequently approved), it seems quite iniquitous that the developers now wish to change the plans to include a parking space for the sole reason that

without provision for disabled parking for both properties the development's legitimacy becomes questionable.

On the basis that planning permission was granted with parking provision (disabled or otherwise) for only House No. 1, I object to the proposed amendment for the inclusion of car parking to House No 2. I object to the proposed change and treatment to the front garden from that shown on the original plans which were granted planning approval, and which presumably met all considerations of importance and necessary requirements of the Planning Committee. This amendment to the planning application is unnecessary.

Your sincerely

Jonathan Shingleton