

## DCAdmin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 13 November 2023 18:04  
**To:** DCAdmin  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2023/92712 - Care Home and 12 Res Units near 36 Oxford Rd

Dear Sir/Ms

I wish the following comments to be taken into account regarding this application.

1. The proposed entry/exit via Reservoir St creates a near cross-roads with Clarke St introducing a danger. It will also lead vehicles exiting right onto Reservoir St towards an unadopted Rd - James St, without those residents permission - unless a prohibition on this is created. Likewise this entry could create unwanted approach traffic coming via James St.
2. This entry/exit will, when combined with that on Oxford Rd, create a trough way that non-residents will use: either as a convenient short cut (eg to and from St. John Fisher school) or at night for nefarious reasons. Entry/exit only from Oxford Rd is desirable.
3. The Application cites 40 employees. Assuming only half present at one time (20) but adding the independent living residents (12 units) and visitors and service-supply vehicles it is questionable that enough on-site parking space is planned. Overspill parking to Oxford Rd and Reservoir St. needs to be avoided.
4. The bin storage area seems inadequate for the number of persons and the demands of a care home.
5. There is reference to Paladian green fencing in submitted documents but elevations do not show this. Where is it intended? If permitted it will create an "institutional" appearance- not one that suits a residential area.
6. No consideration appears to have been given to the impact of building and hardstanding layouts/SUDs features etc regarding the Standard Root Protection area for trees to be retained.
7. There is spurious mention of other brick faced buildings in the adjoining Conservation Area.

The only ones near are not comparable to the proposed scale of the submitted design. These are on Park Rd (which cannot be seen from the development site) and are individually designed feature villas not a large block building. The new-build should not be in split brick/stone facade, for which there is no local precedent, but wholly in stone to complement all the other nearby buildings and have slate roofs. The proposal in one document to have some partial metal clad facing should be rejected as completely out of keeping.

8. Nearby buildings do not have dark grey window frames and it would be preferable to have this proposal changed to a colour more complementary to stone masonry.
9. The saw-tooth roof elevation of Court 2 independent living is jarring and at odds with the surrounding vernacular. Likewise the smaller Court 1.
10. The Suds attenuation tank will require an excavation to 1.5m depth. The possibility that this may intercept shallow coal mining or weaken the roof over any mine has not been considered.