

## Application Summary

**Address:** 29 Old High Street Oxford Oxfordshire OX3 9HP

**Proposal:** Partial demolition of existing house and demolition of existing garages and outbuildings. Erection of two storey side and rear extension. Provision of new access, car parking and turning area. Rebuilding of stone boundary wall fronting Old High Street.

**Case Officer:** Tim Hunter

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

**Name:** Mr Howard Stanbury

**Email:** [secretary@foh.org.uk](mailto:secretary@foh.org.uk)

**Address:** 29 St Andrew's Road, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 9DL

## Comments Details

**Commenter Type:** Amenity Group

**Stance:** Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

**Reasons for comment:**

- Access
- Effect on character of area
- Information missing from plans
- On-street parking
- Parking provision

**Comments:** I am writing in my capacity as Secretary to the Friends of Old Headington; the views of the trustees follow.

29 Old High Street is a derelict small Georgian-style 1850s 2-storey house with single-storey rear extension, on a prominent site at the southern edge of the Old Headington Conservation Area.

There is a long-running history to this application and the Friends of Old Headington would like to see a successful and appropriate restoration of the house and its setting.

The present application has problems which we think should be addressed in order that an informed decision can be made. We think the current plan is unbalanced, with implications for living arrangements and parking.

The proposed extension can be larger than the existing one, but with a volume not greater than the amount shown. Six bedrooms would overload the accommodation in the ground floor.

The plans show one garage with a turning space. Six people are very likely to have more than one car, and they need a visitor space. If cars are parked in the turning space, cars would have to back out into the road (unless they had backed in). The development may well have implications for on-street parking.

If the number of bedrooms was limited to four, the northernmost part of the upstairs new building could be omitted, and the bulk of the building would be reduced.

We think there is a lack of architectural logic to the plans (for instance, an arched and a rectangular window side by side in a new wall would be inappropriate), and would wish to see a lot more detail including information on choice of materials - and indeed a re-worked set of drawings, before finally coming to an opinion.