



CHELTENHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Planning Committee

**Thursday, 14 October 2021
2.30 pm
Council Chamber - Municipal Offices**

Membership	
Councillors:	Garth Barnes (Chair), Paul Baker (Vice-Chair), Barbara Clark, Bernard Fisher, Stephan Fifield, Paul McCloskey, Tony Oliver, John Payne, Richard Pineger, Diggory Seacome and Simon Wheeler

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting.

Important Notice

FILMING, RECORDING AND BROADCASTING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

This meeting will be recorded by the council for live broadcast online at <http://www.cheltenham.gov.uk> and www.youtube.com/user/cheltenhamborough. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm this.

If you make a representation to the meeting you are consenting to the use of those sound recordings for broadcasting and training purposes.

Agenda

5e **21/01591/FUL 52 Farifield Parade, Cheltenham** (Pages 3 - 4)
GL53 7PJ
[Planning Application Documents](#)

Contact Officer: Democratic Services,
Email: democraticservices@cheltenham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION NO: 21/01591/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Claire Donnelly	
DATE REGISTERED: 10th July 2021		DATE OF EXPIRY : 4th September 2021	
WARD: College		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Mr M Rayner		
LOCATION:	52 Fairfield Parade, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire		
PROPOSAL:	Rear extensions and internal alterations		

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

13th October

50 Fairfield Parade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PJ

Comments: 8th October 2021

Thank you for allowing us to make further comments on the above planning application. Now I have received an additional drawing for the West elevation, I would like to make further objections in time for the planning committee on 14 October 2021. Our current position as outlined in letters on the 22 July and 9 September 2021 remains unchanged.

After visiting our property, I hope you have a better understanding of the impact the extension for no.52 will have in relation to the alterations we have made, including the raised decking that extends the kitchen via bi—folding doors to create an additional "room" adjoining the kitchen. Now that the measurements have been accurately calculated, it illustrates just how the proposal for no.52, will protrude so far along the boundary between both properties that the current decking will be excluded from light and the outdoor dining area will be dominated by a 7ft wall significantly altering the open space we currently enjoy. Moreover, the 45o light test which failed on the plan and just passed on the elevation view only goes to reinforce how the natural light as a consequent of these current designs will be reduced significantly and will alter the amount of light in the rear kitchen immeasurably for all seasons. In addition, we have an open plan house, and the light will be reduced though to the middle room. This supports my concern that this will be potentially a consideration for future purchasers of no. 50 and consequently may impact on the value of our property. As you will have established, the decking is a feature of the house that we use in all seasons and will become an area we no longer will be able to enjoy. This remains an unacceptable erosion of the open space around the existing building as set out in the LDF, 02/08 on p.2.

Thank you for sending me the revised plans for the West elevation - single storey. The submission of the West elevation single storey illustrates how the second storey protrudes beyond the rear boundary of our property at no.50. By moving this back a modest degree, I believe this will not impact on the design of bedroom 1 and the corridor leading to the staircase for the second floor at no.52. The owners will still benefit from a significant extension.

I am still unable to view the current elevation on the West side for the second storey based on the plans submitted to Cheltenham Borough Council. The West side will dominate our view from the rear of the garden where the garden design has a seated area looking towards no.52. I remain concerned that such important visual evidence continues to not be included and respectfully request again that I have an oversight of this part of the design. You confirmed that this was an omission at the planning stage and yet there is only a partial resolution to this request. I hope you

Page 4

can appreciate, having now viewed both properties that there is a gap between our boundary and the proposed second storey which would suggest a further loss of privacy. The west elevation may include windows but currently we are unable to identify and comment on this or the materials that will be used. I would like to argue that there would be due prejudice to give these plans the go ahead as this agreed action has not been completely resolved.

Can I please emphasize that I am not trying to disrupt the planning process, but I am sure that you and the committee members will appreciate that I cannot make a fair objection in person on the 14 October, until I have had an opportunity to see the plans in their entirety. When we discussed this on the 5 October you stated that if the plans were not provided, then this hearing would be put back to the November planning committee. I apologise if when discussing this with you, I was not clear enough about what aspects of the West elevation I wanted to see.

In summary you asked that I make any further comments in writing by Friday 5 October 2021. As stated earlier, the current design of the proposed extension particularly the extended rear boundary is simply too large for the site and will deprive no.50 and 54 of significant daylight and is an unacceptable erosion of the open space around the existing building. The designs are out of character with neighbouring development and will alter the character of the locality. The plans will significantly alter the character of no.50. As referenced in the LDF as best practice, I would query the extent that the architect has stood back to look at the plans in relation to no.50 and how these alterations will be viewed by ourselves. The LDF outlines this as an important feature for attached neighbours.

Our request of Cheltenham Borough Council remains as follows:

- I. The design of the extension be in keeping with the surrounding properties, respecting the scale and massing. At present we would suggest this isn't achieved.
- II. Any extension does not extend beyond our own, respecting the uniformity of the locality, and is set back from the boundary so the footings do not need to go on our land. To do so would need a party wall agreement and cause damage to our decking which I am sure you would appreciate, we would not find acceptable.

We hope that after reading this letter and visiting the property you understand that our concerns continue to be based on the rationale, the principles and spirit set out in the LDF "good design and good community spirit."

Finally, I would be grateful if you would support us in being able to view the entire West elevation first and second storey by contacting the architects directly.