

# Comment for planning application 21/00026/F

<b>Application Number</b>	21/00026/F
<b>Location</b>	13 Blackwood Place Bodicote OX15 4BD
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of dwelling house, garage and associated vehicular access off Oxford Road A4260 - re-submission of 20/02152/F
<b>Case Officer</b>	Bob Neville
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Andy Ellis
<b>Address</b>	2 Victoria Cottages,Oxford Road,Bodicote,Banbury,OX15 4AH
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I wish to continue to strongly object to the renewed application 21/00026/F for the following reasons. The windows of the main living area of 2 Victoria Cottages face north east the proposed application is in very close proximity to our boundary and is still going to block natural light to the kitchen diner, middle living room and bedrooms of 2 Victoria Cottage. The measurements shown on the proposed South East Elevations, (2020 10 01 PE-V3) the flat roof of the new proposed dwelling shows an internal height of 2.300m, the external height will obviously be greater, the same applies to the main house South East Elevation which will be in excess of the 4.600m from the figures shown, as these are only internal measurements, the total height and the close proximity of the South East Elevation will be depriving natural light to 2 Victoria Cottages. As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development we are of the view that it will have a serious impact on our standard of living. Street Scene 1, (2020 10 01 SS-V2) is misleading as it only shows the roof of the garage and not the proposed dwelling, if the dwelling was incorporated in the view, it would show the actual height in comparison to 2 Victoria Cottages. I also question as to whether the dwelling is a 2, 3 or 4 bedroom property? There are interesting amendments - more ground area but less useful inside. There is a discrepancy on the forms, the report says, "reduced to 2 bedrooms", floor plan says 3 bedrooms and application form says 4 bedrooms! It would be naive to allow this application to be granted without further clarification. Further to this one questions if application 19/01813/F would have been granted if it had been known that a further property would be applied for in an inappropriate plot size, we did not object to the original application 19/01813/F but if the true facts had been disclosed then, this would have made a considerable difference to our opinion. 3.3 Chapter 6.7 of the Cherwell Residential Design Guide SPD states: Outdoor amenity should be provided in the form of a rear private garden for houses and balconies, roof gardens or shared gardens for flats. The amount of garden and outdoor space should be appropriate to the size of the property, with an expectation that larger properties will be located within larger plots with a larger garden, reflecting the likely needs of larger family's. If this application is granted the newly extended property No 13 Blackwood Place that is now a 5 bedroom, 3 en-suite family home, will not conform with the Cherwell Residential Design Guide SPD. No 13 Blackwood Place has been tastefully renovated and one questions the reasons behind the need to squeeze in another house spoiling the character of a mature residential garden that benefits birds and wildlife and if this application was granted it would also set a precedent for further development of the beautiful gardens that the houses of Blackwood Place have to offer. In addition Chapter 6.7 of the Cherwell Residential Design Guide SPD we disagree with the statement made in 3.4 that the 20m back-to-back distances would suffice which is 2m shorter than the standard that must be maintained. This is overdevelopment in the back garden of an area awash with new building projects; the requirement of a single house in a back garden is unnecessary, except for being built purely for financial gain. We agree with Bodicote Parish council objections to this application on all counts, where will the construction lorries access the site? It is with grave reservation that one can accept the information provided in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit submitted with application 21/00026/F it is contradictory and out of date. As Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was carried out using (Google streetview) from August 2018 this is out dated and a new Road Safety Audit study should be carried out after lockdown to give a true representation of the current traffic flow on the A4260. 2.4 Departures from Standard (Design) 2.4.1. A formal Road Safety Audit brief approved by Oxfordshire County Council was not provided to the RSA Team, however the RSA Team received a supporting email with relevant background data and information and therefore did not consider that the lack of a formal brief would compromise the production of a Road Safety Audit for these proposals. Can Oxfordshire County Council</p>

provide the email to substantiate the facts? Page 10 of the RSC Stage 1 Road Safety Audit is showing the old diagram position of the driveway and problem 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 are now inaccurate as the visibility splays (sightline) will be different if the driveway is moved 16m to the north as proposed in the new application 21/00026/F. The A4260 has a 40mph speed limit; turning from a driveway directly onto a main A road without adequate visibility is a recipe for disaster. If this application goes ahead to obtain the required visual splay then further trees and bushes will need to be removed currently a viable public asset and this will increase intrusive noise, light pollution to residents and reduce animal habitats. The information presented in the new application appears to have been 'cobbled' together. As we have first hand experience of living on the A4260 we are familiar with the high volume of traffic, noise, pollution, hazards and the belligerent nature of motor vehicle drivers. I formally request that the council take my objections into consideration when deciding on this application. Kind Regards Andy & Alison Ellis

**Received Date**

12/02/2021 12:19:34

**Attachments**