

APPLICATION NO: 16/01203/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Michelle Payne
DATE REGISTERED: 12th July 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY : 6th September 2016
WARD: Charlton Kings		PARISH: CHARLK
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs N Jobson	
LOCATION:	332 London Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Single storey rear extension and new detached annexe building to side (resubmission of withdrawn application ref. 16/00776/FUL)	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	7
Number of objections	4
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	3

330 London Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6YJ

Comments: 9th August 2016

As previously advised, we fully support this application. The house and grounds are large enough to accommodate the annexe which is to be built where they already have planning for the erection of a detached double garage of a similar design.

3 Courtfield Drive
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6XW

Comments: 9th August 2016

I live nearby the proposed planning application Ref: 16/01203/FUL and have previously objected to the prior applications Ref: 16/00776/FUL and 15/01321/FUL that were subsequently withdrawn. I am generally concerned regarding the over-development of properties in London Road and in particular the impact of this proposed development as follows:

1. The visual impact of the proposed annex does not maintain the integrity of the present house and is at variance with other local properties with a negative impact to adjacent properties. This has a bad impact on the general character of the neighbourhood.
2. The further threat of demolition of significant healthy trees in the neighbourhood, in particular two birch trees has a negative impact on the visual amenity of the local community. Trees have a positive affect on the local habitat and air quality.

I am disappointed by persistent applications for unnecessary development of this site and request that you reject this proposal.

328 London Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6YJ

Comments: 9th August 2016

I feel the barn style annex adds an attractive element to the site and an interesting addition to the house.

The frontage of this plot is extremely wide and the annex will sit quite comfortably within the plot and would benefit the setting.

Historically large houses used to have an annex or outbuilding and so the addition of an annex would be appropriate for this house.

The house styles on this part of London road vary enormously and the timber clad design of the annex can only add more character to the area which I would welcome.

3 Ledmore Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8RA

Comments: 10th August 2016

The previous owner had this property extended and the present owner has had the property extended and I have not made any comment in the past, it is now the size of an elderly care home and is unoccupied this is investment property so why do they need any further extensions also there is enough congestion on the London road with all the new developments so why do we need any further unnecessary access

Cedar House
6 Courtfield Drive
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6XW

Comments: 10th August 2016

Thank you for informing me of the above planning application. I write again to object as my wife and I are immediate neighbours and our house is the only house due east of any point on the proposed new dwelling. We emphasize this as other nearby houses to 332 London Rd have a view on other bearings and any changes since the Chalet style house proposed under application 15/01321/FUL have a different visual impact.

I note this proposal revises the design statement in respect a comparison of an earlier approved double garage in terms of area width and height and that a statement is made on the proposed method of drive construction aimed at protection of roots of TPO'd trees but I am not aware of any other changes.

There have been many changes and revisions to the original proposal put forward for public consultation under application 11/01874/FUL., making a full understanding of where the final design is going to is frustrating and time consuming. We have lived in our present house for 18

years and have been advised of building proposals on the site of 332 London Road over the last 5 years -each one being progressively more ambitious.

We found the proposal of 12/0082/FUL broadly acceptable and resultant build an overall enhancement to the existing local environment. We do not feel the same way about more recent proposals and have previously commented on 15/01321/FUL and 16/00776/FUL. I have edited my previous comments to cover the main points on the new dwelling described as an "annex" and which have not been fully addressed.

Character and Appearance (new dwelling)

My comments on the previous proposal are based on the both the drawings and the 3D images which have been omitted from this submission. As the description of the design remains unchanged, I assume they are still considered representative. Looking again at the elevations and block plans and images the design looks far from "subservient" to the main building." I also question the harmony with the main house. Although there has been a notable reduction in the visible area from the north and south aspects and lays further from the road compared to the chalet style house (15/01321/FUL), it remains a substantial self contained single storey building with considerable erosion of space and together with loss of healthy trees, is I believe, detrimental to the character of this part of London Road. The majority of properties facing directly onto this part of London Road are substantial, well spaced and set in pleasant grounds of which 338/336 and 332 London Road (as it is) are examples with more dense development has largely being restricted to side roads or recessed closes.

By removing the level containing dormer windows, I am very disappointed that the consequent reduction in area of the north and south elevation, does little or nothing for the eastern aspects. Adjustments in location and overall height have relatively little impact when seen from our picture/patio windows (loss of small triangular peak formed by the east-west ridge joining the north-south ridge, Drg. No. 582/03). Our personal visual amenity remains significantly degraded by the proposal. The pleasant vista we currently enjoy to the west with the a varied treescape beyond our boundary which complements our own garden, would be replaced by a large area of monotone grey rising to approximately to the eaves of the existing house at 332. Rev. A of the design statement makes play of the difference in width between previously proposed double garage and the new dwelling and is largely irrelevant as far as our visual amenity is concerned since all that would be potentially visible would be the triangular peak of a double garage but largely hidden by the trees which in this case would not have needed removal. The length of the new dwelling is significantly longer at (~14m cf 6.5m) and visible roof area many times greater than that of the garage (~47 sq m cf 5.8sq.m). and therefore comparisons are not meaningful from our personal perspective. Figures were scaled from from Drgs. 1442-15A and 584/06. It therefore remains an unpleasant addition to our current environment.

The extract of the drawing showing the disposition of the garage (584/DA/rev A) is not the same as the original revised design with garage 12/00824/FUL which we were asked to comment on. I believe this changed with a revision to the Porch 15/019767/FUL. In any case, it was never built - its area scaled from the above drawing is about 39 sq m. Where is the remainder of the previously approved ~140sq m (584/DA/rev A) but not implemented come from? If it is referring to the new and existing garage (the latter is rebuilding) it appears well short of ~140 sq m.

Protection of the Development Site Tree Population.

The proposal does not make an adequate assessment and their value to the environment. The revised Design statement 534/DA/rev A does however give additional information on tree root protection. Notably, the proposal involves the felling of 2 trees and possibly moving a third. The larger of these trees is a mature silver birch. I and others consider it to be a grand specimen which complements other trees on the site. There is no need for it to be felled as it doesn't block access as viewed on the plan. If the foundation works impact on the root ball the new dwelling could be repositioned to avoid it. There is room in the plot. That could be the basis of an amenity

compromise. If the younger silver birch tree needs to be moved, (a big if), and can be undertaken without terminal damage (a big if), as suggested, it may be sensible to relocate it near to the fence, provide addition amenity and become a natural successor to the mature silver birch.

Vehicular Access to A40 trunk Road

My previous comments regarding the safety issues in the proximity of the pedestrian crossing remain a concern and perhaps needs fuller consideration in a wider arena. However, if the highway authority's previous concerns over visibility of the earlier design have been resolved or have been solved by reverting to the single access further west and the present level of traffic ingress/egress from the site remaining the same, I have no further comment.

Privacy

The eastern elevations of the proposal are very close to my boundary and some loss of privacy will result. It is acknowledged the east facing roof lights overlooking our property are now repositioned on the west side of the roof thus removing that possibility. It's difficult to determine if the full sized (east facing) picture window is a threat to privacy or not.

We are also concerned at the number of numerous revisions of the previous plans, withdrawals and resubmissions which significantly extended 332 London Road in our direction, have detrimentally evolved from our perspective with each change. A new garage permitted with the main house extension has been repositioned with another minor revision and has now manifested itself as a substantial dwelling and "garden grab" with the original garage to 332 on the west side retained. This is clear evidence of ratcheting of what was once a broadly acceptable property enhancement.

My wife and I remain devastated by this intrusion and loss of visual amenity caused by unwarranted removal of healthy trees and the ugly substitute introduced by this development. Would you please reject this proposal on the above grounds?

5 Courtfield Drive
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6XW

Comments: 10th August 2016

Our support of this application remains unchanged since the last plans were submitted.

Our property sits exactly east of the proposed annexe building and our property boundaries are separated by a public footpath. Houses in the immediate area are built in a variety of styles namely Mock Tudor, Cotswold Stone, Regency, Rendered and Brick. Therefore we have no objection to the proposed appearance or style of the annexe as it will just add to the unique, varied mix of house styles in the area.

We have reviewed the previous plans and new plans extensively. By reducing the height to single storey, installing low-level windows, installing skylights overlooking their existing property and only removing necessary trees in order to build, we do not think this will have any impact on our lives.

We are therefore still in support of this application.

3 Riverside Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NW

Comments: 26th July 2016

This must be one of the greatest amount of planning applications I have seen. How it differs from 16/00776/FUL I am unable to work out. I do see however that there is to be a Juliette Balcony to the rear plus Lantern Roof Lights which will over look my 3 and 3a properties. Also in the Annexe there will be more rear high windows

Have the tree problem been solved? Another worry is the possibility of water from the enlarged roofs flooding my properties. I am unable to work out the drainage system as part of the drainage for 300 228 are in the sewer on my land if the sewer goes forward to London Rd ok

Please can you tell me what is the difference between a house and an ANNEXE When I asked a few years ago the ANNEXE did not have a Kitchen. This is a HOUSE