



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Planning Committee

Thursday, 19 December 2019
6.00 pm
Council Chamber - Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Garth Barnes (Chair), Paul Baker (Vice-Chair), Stephen Cooke, Diggory Seacome, Victoria Atherstone, Bernard Fisher, Dilys Barrell, Mike Collins, Alex Hegenbarth, Paul McCloskey, Tony Oliver, Simon Wheeler, John Payne and Rowena Hay

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

Important Notice

This meeting will be filmed by the council for training purposes. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting will be filmed. The recording will not be broadcast to the council's website or on any other online platform but will be retained by the council for a period of six months.

If you make a representation to the meeting you will be deemed to have consented to be filmed. By entering the Chamber you are also consenting to be filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for training purposes.

Agenda

- a) **19/02143/FUL 15 Hartley Close Cheltenham** (Pages 5 - 10)
Gloucestershire
[Planning Application Documents](#)

Contact Officer: Judith Baker, Planning Committee Co-ordinator,
Email: builtenvironment@cheltenham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



Stable One, Manor Farm Courtyard
Southam Lane, Southam
Cheltenham, Gloucestershire
GL52 3PB

BPA Ref: 18.043

Members of the Planning Committee
Cheltenham Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham
GL50 9SA

16th December 2019

**Planning Committee, Thursday 19th December 2019 - Agenda Item No 6a (ref: 19/02143/FUL)
for a wrap around extension comprising two storey to the side and single storey to the rear at
15 Hartley Close, Cheltenham**

Dear Members,

I write in support of the above application and to specifically address the reason this application has been referred to Committee for determination given the **Officer's recommendation for approval**.

As detailed in the Officer's Committee Report, this application has been referred by Councillor Baker due to neighbouring concerns. The application received a total of four objections, largely relating to the scale of the proposed extensions, the potential loss of openness, the design approach, and the potential loss of car parking. I shall deal with each point in turn below.

The Scale

To set the context, 15 Hartley Close currently stands as originally built and is one of the smallest properties on the street, when compared against other original dwellings and those that have already been extended (no.'s 1, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 19 & 21 among others). The property as extended would not appear unduly large in comparison with nearby houses.

The objections regarding scale namely relate to the two-storey side extension element of the proposals. The comments are unsubstantiated, given the houses in the Close are predominantly wide fronted, with many of them occupying most of the width of their plots. There are also comparable examples of recently permitted two-storey side extensions within Hartley Close which clearly set a precedent and are material considerations (refs: 17/00218/FUL & 17/00386/FUL).

The height and width of the proposed side extension is considered to be subservient to the existing dwelling. Although the proposed extension would bring the side elevation and porch slightly forwards of the existing frontage, this allows for a front apex and porch which is empathetic to the existing street scene; replicating existing local architectural features and is considered to harmonise with the existing dwelling. Again, there are other examples within the Close (no.'s 19 & 21) and surrounding streets (Sandy Lane, Highland Road, Southfield Manor Park) where the Council have considered this to be acceptable. Furthermore, Hartley Close has no defined build line; with existing properties set back from the roadside at a variety of distances.

Taking the above factors together with the scale and comparable precedents of surrounding development, the proposed works would not have a significant effect on the character and appearance of the locality.

Loss of Openness

The proposed side extension will reduce the space between the neighbouring property to the west at the first floor level, however a visual gap of five metres will be retained. It is not considered the proposed design would reduce the perception of openness within the street scene, as the remaining gap between the properties would be equal to or greater, and certainly not be dissimilar, to other separation distances in the Close (no.'s 9 -11, 10-12, 17 - 19, 19-21 among others).

It is worth noting that the loss of a private individual's view is not relevant to the consideration of a planning application, unless the proposal would appear oppressive from the principal windows within neighbouring buildings and the private amenity areas. This does not apply in this application as the positioning, design and scale of the proposed extensions are not considered dominant, and given separation distances in excess of 25 metres, would not have any adverse impact on the windows of adjacent properties.

Design Approach

The applicant seeks to remodel the exterior of the dwelling and has drawn inspiration from nearby properties within Hartley Close and nearby streets. Most notably the design reflects the many gable end buildings in Hartley Close and by way of example will closely reflect no.4 Highland Road directly north of the application site (ref: 16.02297/FUL) and no.'s 68 and 70 Sandy Lane which lie at the junction to Hartley Close, and were granted permission by Members in 2016 and 2017. These properties were originally of a similar design and style as the application site before being modernised. Images of the above mentioned properties and other nearby examples are contained within [Appendix 1](#) of this letter. As a number of properties within the locality have undertaken similar works it is considered that the visual amenity and character of the area will not be unduly affected by the proposal.

In any case, the proposed use of materials are not considered to be visually at odds with the prevailing nature of the Close. The neighbouring properties to the east (no.'s 19 and 21) are fully rendered, while many other properties (including the application property) include an element of render to the front elevations.

Loss of Car Parking

The site benefits from a generous driveway which following the proposed works, would still be ample, able to accommodate at least two large parked cars. A replacement garage will also be constructed which will provide further off street parking, as such there should be no concerns over highway safety as a result of the proposal.

Summary

I trust the above has adequately addressed for Members the concerns raised by the Ward Councillor in referring this application to this Committee. Furthermore, I would like to endorse the findings detailed in the Officer's Report and the recommendation made to this Committee to approve the proposal:

- The principle of a two storey side and single storey rear extension is considered to be acceptable.
- The extensions are not of a scale which would result in an overdevelopment of the site and although the front elevation would have an elongated appearance, it is not considered that this would unduly disrupt the street scene.
- It is not felt a property with a wholly render finish will harm the visual amenity of the area and adjacent AONB.
- It is considered that the proposed scheme represents a high quality design which is in accordance with the general design advice set out within the NPPF and on this basis is deemed acceptable.
- The proposal will not cause a loss of light or privacy, neither will it have any overbearing effect on neighbouring properties.
- The application is considered to be in accordance with the policy requirements of the Joint Core Strategy, Cheltenham Local Plan and advice contained within the NPPF.

We therefore respectfully request members to uphold the **Officer's recommendation of approval**.

Yours sincerely,



Lorelie Davies | MRTPI
Senior Planning Consultant

Appendix 1 - Nearby properties of similar scale, design & use of materials

1) No.4 Highland Road - original to modernised, side & forward extended



2) No. 68 Sandy Lane - original to modernised, side & forward extended



3) No. 53 Sandy Lane - side & forward extended and use of modern materials



4) No.'s 74 & 76 Sandy Lane - side and forward extended, use of rendering



5) 15 Hartley Close looking to No.'s 14, 16 with No. 10 to the far right; each with front apex/gable forward of side aspect



6) 16 Hartley Close looking at No.'s 11 & 15 with front porch to the right



7) Street view of No.'s 15 & 17 (front apex/gable) and then No.'s 19 & 21 having forward extensions with render.



This page is intentionally left blank