

APPLICATION NO: 16/01402/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Gary Dickens
DATE REGISTERED: 4th August 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY: 29th September 2016
WARD: Leckhampton		PARISH: Leckhampton With Warden Hill
APPLICANT:	Mr Rhodri Sutton	
AGENT:	Mr Adam Greenslade	
LOCATION:	64 Church Road, Leckhampton, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	First floor side/rear extension over existing ground floor with small two storey element	

Update to Officer Report

1. OFFICER COMMENTS

1.1. As mentioned in Section 4 of the Officer Report, the views of the Parish Council were sought and their comments have now been received.

1.2. Parish Council

19th September 2016

The Council objects to the application for the following reasons:

- i. The proposed first floor French windows / balcony in Bedroom 3 would overlook neighbouring gardens. This is an unnecessary invasion of privacy that should be refused.
- ii. The existing extensions, although maybe a little untidy, do look in keeping with the existing house when viewed from Church Road because they are small scale, single storey, set back behind the rear wall of the original house and have the same colour and rendering. The Council tends to agree with the planning officer that the proposed two-storey extension, even if it has the same finish to match the existing house, would dominate the original dwelling as viewed from Church Road and would not play a supporting role in accordance with CP7.
- iii. The Parish Council is strongly in favour of allowing extensions wherever they are acceptable. The ability to extend homes is of very great benefit to residents and increases the availability of family homes and also the ability to support elderly relatives in the home. However, the Council opposes extensions that are seriously detrimental to neighbouring properties. The current proposal seems to seriously harm 66 Church Road, both in being overbearing and in loss of light, taking into account also the comments on this from the planning officer.
- iv. Given the constraints of the site and the imperative to avoid serious impact on 66 Church Road, the Council believes that the design of the proposed extension is unhelpful. The large flat roof and two-storey wall adjacent to 66 Church Road are particularly undesirable. The Council notes that this two-storey wall seems to be required primarily to accommodate the second staircase. The Council wonders if a different design with the roof sloping down to a single storey wall might still allow enough headroom for a staircase. The sloping roof would considerably reduce the degree of

overbearing and loss of light for 66 Church Road. It would also allow a window to bedroom 2 on the rear rather than the cumbersome dog-leg window to the front that is proposed by the application. In turn, this could avoid the need to bring the two-storey extension 1.2 metres forward of the existing extension, thereby reducing the length and bringing the front of the extension back into line with the rear wall of the original house. It is conceivable that, with a good roof design, this might sufficiently reduce the dominance over the original dwelling. A door between bedrooms 2 and 3 could allow furniture to be moved into bedroom 3 via the existing staircase so the second staircase would only need to handle people. The Council offers this suggestion to be as helpful as possible but without implying that it is architecturally feasible or that it would turn out to be acceptable.

2. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains to refuse for the reasons as outlined in the Officer Report.