

<b>APPLICATION NO:</b> 15/00958/FUL	<b>OFFICER:</b> Mr Ed Baker
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 2nd June 2015	<b>DATE OF EXPIRY:</b> 28th July 2015
<b>WARD:</b> Charlton Park	<b>PARISH:</b> Charlton Kings
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Robert Deacon Builders Ltd
<b>AGENT:</b>	Mark Wood
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Former Barrington Lodge Nursing Home, 138 Cirencester Road, Charlton Kings
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Erection of four detached dwellings with garages (revised scheme)

## Additional representation and further comments from applicant

The Council has received the following further representation.

### **Additional representation from agent on behalf of 46 Bafford Lane**

15th October 2015

*We note the comments made by the Agent on behalf of the Developer for this scheme and to add balance we respond on behalf of the Owner of No. 46 Bafford Lane as follows.*

*We refer to the points raised in the e-mail of 13 October utilising the same paragraph numberings:*

1. *Our Client welcomed and supported a four house scheme for this site, which was approved. Since that approval, Plot 2, against our Client's property, has increased in size, an additional house has been proposed, since removed, and substituted with a much larger house on Plot 1, than was originally approved. It also transpires that the level information on which the four house scheme was approved was incorrect to the detriment of our client. This despite us indicating from the outset the importance of correct levels when making comparisons between the site and neighbouring properties. It is not surprising, therefore, that the occupier of No. 46 Bafford Lane has concerns with regard to this site, the way it has been proposed and the way it is being dealt with.*

2. *We stand by the point made in our previous letter that it would have been far simpler if the Developer had simply withdrawn the five house application and re-submitted the four houses with one substantially larger, as this simply adds to the complexity and confusion concerning what is proposed.*

3. *In relation to Plot 2, approval was granted for a very large house, incorrectly stating the levels of No. 46 Bafford Lane in relation to the site, to the detriment of No. 46 Bafford Lane. This was further compounded by an increase in size of Plot 2 for which approval was subsequently sought and obtained.*

4. *We have made no observations with regard to overlooking with this revised four house scheme. Overlooking has largely been dealt with satisfactorily, but we would contend the development of this site is far more overbearing than the former nursing home. The conservatory referred to was single storey and obliquely over 26 metres away from the rear wall of 46 Bafford Lane. The closest wing of Barrington Lodge which was set back behind the rear elevation of 46 Bafford Lane was 15 metres away. This compares with the 2 storey part of the proposed house within 21m of the main rear elevation of 46 Bafford Lane and Plot 2 within 10m of same point and projecting beyond the rear wall. They are clearly not comparable.*

20<sup>th</sup> October 2015

*We further note that the distances quoted have been taken from the south east corner of the main house and not the nearest habitable accommodation the sun room which is some 3m closer. Compared with the approved scheme, the change is significant and harmful.*

*Our Client has always acknowledged that some development would be carried out on the Barrington Lodge site. Our only concern is to ensure that it is reasonable in relation to surrounding properties, hence supporting the approved four house scheme. Unfortunately all of the properties to the west of the site are located substantially lower and therefore the location, style, shape and size of the proposals if not dealt with very sensitively will be very overbearing.*

*5. We welcome the no change to the garage position and acknowledge that a consent has been granted for a garage in this position, which is accepted. Our concern is that what is now proposed is more detrimental to No. 46 Bafford Lane than the approved scheme, due to the increased proximity of a very large house close to the rear of the much lower lying No. 46 Bafford Lane.*

*6. We note that our calculation of floor area omitted to include the basement to the originally approved Plot 1. However the comparison made by the developer's agent in terms of bulk and massing is misleading in that a significant proportion of the original Plot 1 was proposed as a basement and, therefore, not appearing above ground level or contributing to the scale and massing of the unit. To clarify, we have taken, utilising the Idox Tool, the ground and first-floor area of the proposed house, excluding garage, which equates to a gross external area of 427m<sup>2</sup>. Taking the house only of the approved four house scheme at ground and first-floor level, gives a gross external area of 273m<sup>2</sup>. This indicates that the visible size, .i.e above ground level, of the building proposed, compared to that approved, is some 56% larger than the approved Unit 1. The plot is large by virtue of a very large tree and, therefore, to make comparisons with regard to plot occupancy are somewhat meaningless in this case.*

*Compared with the approved four house scheme, this proposal is massive, overbearing and, as a consequence, harmful to No. 46 Bafford Lane and some of the adjoining properties and, therefore, should be refused.*

### **Applicant's further comments**

The applicant provides the following additional points.

1. The applicant says that the parish council (in its latest response) is incorrect in that the height of Plot 2 has not increased. It is actually 0.25 metres lower than the original approved, 14/02133/FUL.
2. The applicant states that they have taken the following measurements from the first floor of Plot 1 to the neighbouring properties; No. 4 Lawson Glade, No. 8 Bafford Approach and No. 46 Bafford Lane:

Distance to No. 4 – 13.7 metres.

Distance to No. 8 – 17.8 metres

Distance to No. 46 – 21.3 metres