

APPLICATION NO: 16/00989/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Michelle Payne	
DATE REGISTERED: 2nd June 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY : 28th July 2016	
WARD: Leckhampton		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs J Butt		
LOCATION:	Chavenage, 13 Merlin Way, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Addition of first floor to existing bungalow (revised scheme)		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	3
Number of objections	2
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	1

31 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 21st June 2016

We note that in the revised application, the views of neighbours in Merlin Way have been canvassed. As a neighbour backing on to the property we have not been consulted or asked for our view. We note the very slight reduction in height but overall still feel this will have a negative impact on our property and so still object to this proposal

33 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 21st June 2016

I would like to register my objection to the above planning application.

As a neighbour directly backing onto the property there has been no consultation with me as an interested party. Whilst the reduction in height is welcomed, the building remains essentially the same as was previously refused.

My concerns relate to the design and the materials used on the elevation that faces my property and the impact it will have on me.

14 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LT

Comments: 29th June 2016

In connection with this revised application (following the refusal of the previous application) please find here our support for the proposal. I have not risked using Public Access to lodge this comment and trust that this can be placed on the planning file as necessary.

As with the previous scheme we have no objection to the proposed development. We are near neighbours to this proposal. The dwelling in question is not in our direct line of sight, but is very apparent to us in the overall street scene.

There is a huge variety of properties locally in all respects - size, scale, form, design, materials etc. The existing bungalow is of no great architectural merit and the site is not in a conservation area or subject to any other designation. It might not be a case of 'anything goes' here, but there is in my opinion certainly great scope for significant alterations and extensions to dwellings in this area, including the application site (just as many other properties have been altered on this estate).

As far as the proposal itself goes, I have no objection to the increase in the height to create rooms in the roof, and the asymmetrical roof line will add interest to the property and the street generally. This is particularly so given the alternative option of adding large 'box' dormer windows to achieve much the same result. Such a solution would look far worse in design terms and have a much more severe impact on the street scene than what is proposed in the application.

The amendments to the scheme do not alter our original lack of objection to the application and if anything, as set out in the design and access statement, mean it has even less impact than the original proposals. There are many examples, some of them not that far away, where single storey dwellings have been extended vertically; sometimes when these are part of an original single storey 'pair' of dwellings. On Church Road in Leckhampton for example, there are at least two dwellings which have been successfully extended in this way. These are also in prominent locations on a busy through road with a great deal of passing pedestrian and vehicular traffic, in comparison to the very quiet and tucked away location of the application site.

As I said before, the design itself might not be to everyone's liking and one could argue that aspects of it could be enhanced (as one might argue about any scheme), but in a non-designated area with the materials proposed being evident throughout the immediate and wider locality, and with LPAs not supposed to impose style aspirations on development proposals, I do not think there is anything objectionable at all about the scheme and we do hope the Council supports it.