

APPLICATION NO: 15/01503/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Martin Chandler	
DATE REGISTERED: 10th September 2015		DATE OF EXPIRY : 5th November 2015	
WARD: Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Mr R Keatinge		
LOCATION:	59 Painswick Road, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Two storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer window		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	4
Number of objections	4
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

57 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EP

Comments: 29th September 2015

This is an over-development of a 3 bed semi-detached house in a conservation area. No 59 adjoins my house and is one of 4 semi-detached houses built here in 1957.

The proposed two-storey extension is clumsy and ugly in design and would obstruct sunlight to my patio, and the pleasant view to the surrounding area.

The ground floor living extension is excessive. It will increase the ground floor area by 75%. The 4.5 metre projection will destroy the character of the garden.

The house is 1950s not 1970s as stated in the Application.

The dormer window is ugly and more in keeping with a 1970s house. It would have an impact on my privacy. An application for permission to construct a dormer window at No 61 was refused in 2005. Reference was made to Policies GP3, GP4 and 8E8.

The timber cladding is not in keeping with the rest of the property, which is built in brown brick.

The proposal means that approximately 25% of the rear garden would be removed.

The Design and Access Statement refers to the extension marrying well with the original property while keeping separate identities. The use of timber cladding, aluminium windows and doors is completely at odds with what is already there.

The block plan does not show the single storey extensions at No 61 and 63 Painswick Road - these are quite acceptable.

Comments: 20th November 2015

I live next door at No. 57 and wish to object to this application as follows:

Visual Impact

The proposed 2 storey extension is an over-development of a 3 bed semi-detached house in a conservation area. No 59 adjoins my house and is one of 4 semi-detached houses built here in 1957. The proposed 2 storey extension would change the symmetry of this compact group of houses.

The projection of the single storey extension remains at an unacceptable 4.5m. It would mean that approximately 25% of the rear garden would be removed. This is excessive when compared with extensions already built at Nos 61 and 63.

The substitution of brown brickwork for the timber cladding in the earlier application is welcomed so long as this is matched as far as possible to the existing building as I would face the full rectangular slab which is the north elevation of the ground floor extension.

Amenity

The proposed extension would obscure sunlight to my patio and garden from NE through until S or SW aspect, late in the day: i.e. it would be lost on my patio for most of the day. Whilst it is acknowledged that the overall projection has been reduced to 3.5m from the original excessive 4.5m, this loss of sunlight has now been accentuated by the raised profile of the pitched roof.

I believe the proposed extension would affect my right to light and request a Daylight Analysis be carried out.

Nowhere
61 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EP

Comments: 2nd October 2015
Letter attached.

Comments: 20th November 2015
Letter attached.

30 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2HA

Comments: 8th October 2015

This objection is made on behalf of the St. Philip and St James Area Residents' Association (SPJARA), which is the local residents' association for the area affected by this proposal.

We have seen the objections of the two households most seriously affected, nos. 57 and 61 Painswick Road. We endorse their concerns about the proposed two-storey rear extension to 59 Painswick Road, believing that it will seriously impinge on the privacy and amenity of its immediate neighbours. The proposed rear extension will:

- Overlook both their houses and gardens in an obtrusive manner
- Deprive both households of much of their view from the rear of their properties
- Deprive no. 61 of the sun for much of the day.

We consider that the proposal is not in line with the planning policies set out in the Local Development Framework (2008), notably "An extension should not dominate or detract from the original building".

It should be noted that SPJARA does not routinely support objections by neighbours to proposed developments. However, in this case we believe that what is proposed is so out of scale as to raise wider issues of good neighbourliness and - if permitted - would set a bad precedent for development control elsewhere in our area.

Adrian Phillips CBE, MTPI, FLI
- on behalf of SPJARA

Comments: 16th November 2015

We objected to the previous version of this scheme.

We have examined the revised application. Our comments are as follows:

- We believe that the revised scheme is an improvement in terms of the appearance of the extension. The owner has tried to take on some of the criticisms of original scheme and it would certainly appear less bulky as a result.
- However our objections to the earlier version were mainly about the likely impact on neighbours and their privacy and amenity. We agree that the new design will reduce these somewhat (for example the extension will project less far into the garden) but not to a great extent. It will still:
 - Overlook both their houses and gardens in an obtrusive manner
 - Deprive both households of much of their view from the rear of their properties
 - Deprive no. 61 of the sun for much of the day
- Therefore we wish to maintain our objections to the proposal in its re-submitted form.

Adrian Phillips CBE, MRTPI, FLI
- on behalf of SPJARA

53 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EP

Comments: 23rd November 2015

Even after the revisions it would appear that this proposed extension is still significantly out of proportion to the dimensions of the 4 similar houses, 57,59,61 and 63 and would look unsightly when viewed from Ashford Road, and from the houses and gardens of some of the houses in Painswick Road.

Proposed 2 storey rear extension and installation of rear dormer window 59, Painswick Road. Cheltenham. Ref. 15/01503/FUL

We live at no. 61 Painswick Road immediately next door to the applicant.

Proposed 2 storey extension.

All quotations are taken from "Local Development framework" adopted 2008. These houses were built in the in the nineteen fifties and not the nineteen seventies as claimed in the application.



1. Proportion. "An extension should not dominate or detract from the original building".

The sheer bulk of the extension is excessively large. It is out of all proportion with the rest of the house the neighbouring houses and the gardens. It has wood cladding, quite unlike any other close building.

2. Daylight and privacy.

"Neighbours have the right to adequate daylight and sunshine."

We have a single storey garden room at the back of our house and looking north we see a large tree and the sky. This bulk will totally destroy that view. It will be close to our boundary wall and beyond the building line created by our single storey extension and that of number 63. It will dominate our small garden with a view looking straight down our garden. It will be overpowering and will completely destroy the pleasure we get from our garden. It will destroy the light, the view and our privacy

The bulk is such that it will be visible from Ashford Road and neighbouring properties and out of keeping with the other 3 houses in this group.

3, Proposed dormer window.

"Loft conversions should not have the appearance of an extra storey on top of a house."

In March 2005 the owners of no. 61 applied for permission to construct a dormer window similar to this application. The Local Authority refused this and their decision was upheld on appeal. The full judgment of the appeal inspector is now in the hands of the Local Authority.

In brief the judgment referred to the house being in the conservation area and although out of keeping with surrounding older properties was low in height and compact in scale compared to its historic neighbours. The dormer would be out of scale with proportion of the modern houses.

If this is true of a dormer window how much truer of a huge extension?

"Development will only be permitted where it is of a high standard of architectural design...and it compliments and respects neighbouring development.

This planning application will neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area, contrary to Policies GP3,GP4 and BE8 of the Cheltenham Borough Local plan and policy NHE.6 of the Gloucestershire structure plan.

We would have no objection to a single storey extension similar to that of numbers 61 and 63. We would have no objections to a room in the roof with velux windows.

If the application is approved it will seriously impact upon our privacy, our outlook and our well being.


61, Painswick Road.

29th. Sept. 2015

59 Painswick Road. 15/01503/FUL

We live next door at number 61 and wish to object to this application.

Our houses are part of a group of 4 built in the nineteen fifties. They are low in height and compact in scale and a neutral feature among the surrounding historic dwellings. They are in the central conservation area.

This development would dominate and detract from the original building.
The building is compact and in keeping with the other 3 buildings. A large 2 story extension stretching down the garden would be out of all proportion to the current building and surrounding ones. It would be clearly visible from Ashford Road and from the rear of a number of houses in Grafton Road as well as a number of neighbouring houses.

This building would cause us a loss of daylight and sunshine.
This would be particularly apparent in our kitchen/breakfast room and in our living room. We spend every day in this living room where my wife enjoys her painting hobby. The room is currently light and airy but would be overshadowed by a blank wall crowding in upon us.

We request a "Daylight analysis."

This building would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.

The current house with this extension would no longer be a neutral building but its increased bulk would dominate surrounding properties. We urge you to reject this application.


12th. Nov. 2015

