

<b>APPLICATION NO: 14/01681/FUL</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mr Martin Chandler</b>	
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 19th September 2014		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 14th November 2014	
<b>WARD:</b> Up Hatherley		<b>PARISH:</b> UPHATH	
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Gordon Malcolm		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land between 24 and 25 Ullswater Road, Hatherley		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of one detached dwelling with associated hard and soft landscaping		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>6</b>
Number of objections	<b>4</b>
Number of representations	<b>2</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

4 Hazebrouck Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3QA

**Comments:** 12th October 2014

I wish the planning committee to note that this new property is proposed to be built on a very narrow road. At the point the road bends (approximately where the proposed driveway will be) it is very difficult for 2 cars to access at the same time. Frequently the exiting vehicle uses the current access to the garages/hard standing to pull in to let the other vehicle round the corner. It appears from the plans that the driveway will be built right up to the edge of the roadway. This will severely restrict access on this corner. If the driveway/site boundary were set back a little so that an area (large enough as a passing place) can be retained this will be to the benefit of all.

As an aside, please can the tarmac leading into Hazebrouck Close be replaced as part of this building works.

27 Ullswater Road  
Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3PR

**Comments:** 13th October 2014

I object to the proposal on the grounds of parking, design, light, overlooking and character of the area.

**Character**

The open parking and garage areas are characteristic of the area. To infill this location would diminish the sense of space and be harmful to the residential character.

**Overlooking**

The new house will overlook the house to the rear in Windermere Close and adversely affect their amenity space.

#### Light

The proposal will diminish daylight to the side window of no.24 and will permanently reduce sunlight to the amenity area of no. 25.

#### Design

The design is lacking in detail and the main windows are poorly proportioned.

#### Parking

The proposal 14/01681/FUL does not include any net replacement of the 13 parking spaces to be taken away.

The area is already deficient in parking, with the problem added to by staff parking from the nearby Paragon laundry. There is a comment on providing garages, which are not parking spaces. The existing garages are too small for parking and are mostly used as lock-ups or vehicle storage.

Many of the properties adjacent to the site are occupied by people with disabilities so require nearby spaces for themselves and the visitors they rely on.

Removing the existing spaces will add to the problematic on-road parking and stress to the local residents. Ullswater Road leads to the Hazebrouck development so traffic is not as quiet as one may think.

In conclusion, the proposal will significantly reduce parking and adversely affect the built environment in a road where many are elderly or disabled and rely on their immediate surroundings.

#### **Comments:** 18th November 2014

I have looked at the new parking strategy and have the following comments.

The amount of existing parking spaces described for the site between 24 and 25 Ullswater Road has been revised from 13 to 10. There are clearly at least 13 spaces there, so I query the veracity of their information.

The proposed replacement spaces are a significant distance from the bungalows at 12-15 and 25-28 Ullswater Road, which are usually occupied by the elderly and those with disabilities. There are 3 disabled spaces adjacent, but they also serve the flats at 5-11 Windermere Road. The most notable traffic for these properties is for carers and family, who are often transporting their relative in and out.

In all Ullswater A and B will be losing at least 4 public car parking spaces and 7 garages. I trust you find this as unacceptable as the local residents, but should you approve I hope the demolition of the garages and making good at Ullswater B is conditioned as a pre-start requirement.

#### **Comments:** 23rd January 2015

RE: Entran Parking Report

This is based on a small sample of current levels of parking and I agree that the current level is often not at maximum.

There is an unusual situation in that all four properties, nos 25-28 directly adjacent, do not currently have cars and the occupants opposite are registered disabled and park in the disabled spaces by 25-28.

The proposed new house is not temporary, so one must look at the long term likelihood. It would be sensible to assume, at the minimum, that properties 25-28, 15 & 16 own one car per house and they are not registered disabled, so would not decently park in the disabled places.

In any estimations for suburban highways/parking requirements I would expect a specialist such as Entran to assume at least one car per household.

I have lived in my home for nine years and certainly for the first five I often had to park in other roads with no room left in the proposed site area. The area can still become full on occasion with parking from the Paragon and visitors.

The applicant seems to be spending money on consultants but not offering solutions. There is room within the proposed site to fit parking spaces for public usage, also the parking spaces in front of 25-28 could be extended towards Windermere road.

16 Rippledale Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 6HD

**Comments:** 22nd September 2014

We have had access to the rear of our property for over 30 years via double gates that open out onto the proposed property. Given the 20 year right of access rule, I presume we will still retain vehicular access to the rear of our property.

5 Windermere Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3PP

**Comments:** 10th October 2014

The plans indicate that my property is bordered by a wooden fence on the side of the development, however, this is not actually the case. It is only bordered by a chain link fence, which I do not own or have any responsibility to maintain.

I am concerned that if this development doesn't replace the chain link fence with a more suitable alternative then the security and privacy of my property will be impacted as I will be continually overlooked.

24 Ullswater Road  
Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3PR

**Comments:** 15th October 2014

To start with I am very disappointed by the lack of consultation & notification given to residents in regard to this proposal.

As the owner of one of the houses next to the proposed site, I have serious concerns about the effect this will have on my property, i.e. access to the rear of my property, the impact on light, & of course parking (all important factors when I chose to purchase this house).

The garages were removed some time ago & the car park is used by several cars on a daily basis. Where will residents, & visitors park if you build on this site, particularly when parking is already an issue?

In addition to this, several bungalows where the elderly & disabled live are next to the proposed site, has consideration been made to the impact this will have on them? Where will their carers park? Is it really appropriate to build a large family home next to the elderly?

42 Fernleigh Crescent  
Up Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3QL

**Comments:** 3rd February 2015

As ward Councillor, I have concerns about this application (also applicable to its sister applications in Haweswater Road and Coniston road).

Before committee considers passing this application it is important that residents' concerns, especially over parking, are not only taken into account but are met, given the already acute parking shortages in roads in the 'Lakeside' area. Any loss of parking capacity will create serious difficulties for residents. At minimum committee should condition adequate parking capacity if it is minded to pass the application(s), as well as ensuring that other neighbour issues (e.g. crime risks in alleyways etc, and loss of light) are fully addressed.

Proposals at the time of writing (03/02/15) propose additional parking through demolitions of garage blocks i.e. additional to the actual building site, and displacement of garage users to underused capacity in adjacent blocks. This approach is good as far as it goes, but DOES NOT go far enough to make good the shortfall. Further measures are needed - by taking this process further and/or residents have suggested other measures such as extending laybys further into grass verge areas, and generally utilising other available spaces.

I await the officer report with interest, having already registered request to speak at committee.