

20 Turnstone Green
Bicester
Oxon
OX26 6TT

4th April 2024

Cherwell District Council
Planning & Development Management
Bodicot House
Bodicot
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA

Dear Hansah Iqbal,

Re: Planning Application 24/00703/F
22 Turnstone Green Bicester OX26 6TT

I wish to strongly object to the first floor side extension of the planning application No: 24/00703/F at 22 Turnstone Green, Bicester OX26 6TT. I am an immediate neighbour of the above mentioned address.

My objections are as follows:-

1. I object to the development of the first floor side extension above the garage in close proximity to my house, because of previous relevant Planning History to the site.

My late husband and I purchased 20 Turnstone Green, as a new build and moved in July 1996.

At the time of our purchase, No 22 (plot 48) was to have a double stand alone brick garage at the front and this indicated the boundary of our property at the front and we had more land to the side of our dwelling. The road in the front of our property (No 20) is not public highway, but private land. The title deeds to our property (No 20) stipulate access allowance across the said road to No 18 and 16 with maintenance of any part of the road divided between the 3 dwellings. I submit with this letter

site plans (Attachment 2) indicating the original proposed position of the garage of No 22, the boundaries and the landscape planting against the walls. Fences were erected between the properties prior to us moving in as per these plans.

After moving into No 20, a request (as we understood) was made to the developers from the first purchasers of 22 Turnstone Green for a single garage to be built on the side of No 22, as No 16 Turnstone Green. Our outlook was improved, so we accepted the change and agreed to give up some of our land at the side of our house to enable this.

The repositioning of the garage and fence (reducing the land at the side of our property) between the two properties is shown in Attachment 3, Plot 48 is No 22 and Plot 49 is No 20. We did not expect further development on the side of No 22.

2. Incorrect Block Plan Submitted in Application and Site Size of No 22. Overdevelopment and Overcrowding of Dwelling Site.

The block plan submitted with the Planning Application is incorrect. Please refer to Attachment 2 to show the correct outline of No 22 (Plot 48) in relationship to No 20 (Plot 49). No 20 has access to my back door and the rear garden by a side entrance through a gated access with fencing. The “boundary line” does not cut across to the wall of my house as shown in the submitted block plan of this application. There is a pathway to my drive. As detailed before boundaries are relevant, because of certain conditions and clauses of my title deeds. The site size of No 22 is not equivalent to other sites of 5 bedroom dwellings in Turnstone Green, suggesting overcrowding of the site.

3. Parking Spaces and Amenity of Road

Parking spaces on the drive for No 22 would be limited for a five bedroom dwelling. An amenity of Turnstone Green is that sufficient driveway space is provided for each dwelling to prevent overspill into the road contributing to the character of the road and enjoyment of living in the road.

4. Materials

I have concerns whether the building materials particularly for the front elevation of the second storey side extension can be found to match the existing materials in colour, texture and mortar colour, the latter being very specific. No 12 is built in the same buff coloured and textured bricks and the rear extension built recently (seen from my bedroom window) is of a much brighter yellow and different texture. If materials like this are used for the front elevation it would not meet with the character of the surrounding dwellings.

5. Amenity and Privacy

An attractive amenity of owning No 20 was the size of the garden and the space between No 20 and 22 allowing sunlight through the gap to the back garden. The erection of the current garage on the side of No 22 reduced this, which we accepted for a better outlook at the front of our property. The present garage on the side of No 22 has an exit only to the back positioned at the time of build, for our privacy. I observe that the proposed ground floor plan of the garage, sites a door on the side, as well as to the back. The wall of the present garage is 750 mm (0.75m) from my fence giving a very narrow pathway down the side of No 22 to the rear garden. I propose this exit is too close to my fence intruding on my privacy.

6. Loss of Light and Overshadowing of my Garden

An amenity enjoyed by my property, because of the aerial space between the dwellings is the amount of sunlight path to the back garden, as the sun moves round in front of my dwelling to the back. After the garage was erected on the side of the house with the pitched roof, a sufficient amount of sun and light still comes between the properties into my back garden aiding my gardening needs and pleasure in gardening. Adding the second storey extension will have a negative impact on this, reducing the amount of sunlight and light. I already experience overshadowing in the late afternoon caused by the willow trees in the adjoining Bicester Fields, behind my dwelling.

I have no objection to the building of the rear extension at the back of No 22, but I strongly object to the second storey extension for the reasons given above. Removal or damage of my fence is not acceptable for any

part of the build. I cannot allow access for building requirements to my property, as the patio and pathway have been replaced.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Sutton (Mrs)