

APPLICATION NO: 16/01909/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Chloe Smart
DATE REGISTERED: 25th October 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY : 20th December 2016
WARD: Charlton Kings		PARISH: CHARLK
APPLICANT:	Mr A Cresswell	
LOCATION:	53 Beeches Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Single storey side and rear extension - (Revised Scheme - part retrospective)	

REPRESENTATIONS

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

1 Birch Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8PJ

Comments: 16th November 2016
Letter attached.

Ms. CHLOE SMART
PLANNING OFFICER
PLANNING: ENVIRONMENTAL & REGULATORY SERVICES
CHELTENHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL
P.O. BOX 12
MUNICIPAL OFFICES
PROMENADE
CHELTENHAM
GL50 1PP


1 BIRCH CLOSE
CHARLTON KINGS
CHELTENHAM
GL53 8PJ

15th November 2016

**STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER
16/01909/FUL**

SUMMARY

I oppose (part-retrospective) planning application **16/01909/FUL** for development at **53 Beeches Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham** and respectfully request that it be refused.

The reasons for my opposition are:

1. The structure **already built** is higher than shown on the approved drawings (specifically drawing 06) within the original and approved previous application **15/01385/FUL**. The **additional height of the structure so far constructed compared to the approved height makes it, in my opinion, overly bulky, massive and out of proportion.**
2. There are very few flat roof extensions and little coloured render on the whole of Beeches Road. Many properties on the road have been developed and extended. The vast majority of this development has been performed tastefully and in keeping with the local vernacular, using matching brickwork and tiled pitched roofs, fully in keeping with the existing properties. **The current approved permission under application 15/01385/FUL supports a similarly sensible and acceptable scheme. A flat roofed rendered extension would look ugly and out of character by comparison.** There are **no flat roof extensions nor coloured render** near to 53 Beeches Road on that side and the street scene is all the better for it.

The scheme for which permission is now sought is, in my opinion, ugly, overbearing, out of scale, out of character, uses inappropriate materials and will, if approved, spoil the street scene.

Though I realise that enforcement matters are outwith the remit of the Planning Committee, I further respectfully request that the appropriate enforcement process is applied by Cheltenham Borough

*Council to ensure that the original permission granted and currently in force for the property under application number **15/01385/FUL** is implemented in full. This would include taking down and removal, as required, of the part structure already built to allow the approved design to be constructed with the approved materials and the development to proceed in accordance with the approved drawings which form part of **15/01385/FUL**.*

STATEMENT OF INTEREST IN ADJOINING PROPERTIES

I, Robert Banbury, co-own with my wife Susan, both properties 55 and 55A Beeches Road adjacent to 53 Beeches Road.

DISCUSSION ON REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO APPLICATION 16/01909/FUL

Proper consideration of this application **16/01909/FUL** requires examination of previous application **15/01385/FUL** for the same property, which was granted Permission For Development on 5th October 2015.

Condition 2 of the Permission For Development stipulated that the development be carried out in accordance with **the approved numbered drawings 01, 03, 05 and 06** submitted with the application.

Condition 3 stipulated that **“the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building” – “to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP7 relating to design”.**

The **approved drawing numbers 01 (“Location Plan”) and 03 (“Proposed Block Plan”)** both show a pitched roof over the new side and rear extension. **Drawing 06 “Proposed elevations”** clearly shows the pitched roof design with notes stipulating **“Concrete tiles to match existing” and “Facing brickwork to match existing”** – in compliance with Condition 2 of the Permission For Development.

Construction on site commenced in summer this year and **Conditions 2 and 3 of the Permission For Development have been ignored from the outset** as detailed below.

I quote as follows from the covering letter for the application from Mr Russell Ranford (acting as the applicant’s agent) dated 20th October 2016.

“The applicant has now decided part way through the build process that a flat roof is his preferred approach rather than the pitched roof. This will further reduce any perceived impact on the neighbouring property whilst also adding a modern approach to the extension of this property”.

No mention is made in this letter of the fact that the structure so far built (*“part way through the build process”*) and for which retrospective permission is now sought (a) **has used the wrong facing material (16/01909/FUL stipulated brickwork to match existing, not concrete blockwork as used)** and (b) **is too high**.

The structure built is **already higher** than shown on the approved drawings (specifically drawing 06) within the original application **15/01385/FUL** – in other words **the applicant has from the outset built, using incorrect non-approved wall materials, to accommodate a flat roof and not the approved pitch roof with matching tiles**. There is no doubt too that a flat roofed rendered blockwork extension would be considerably cheaper to build than the approved scheme.

I refute the claim that this flat roof proposal “*will further reduce any perceived impact on the neighbouring property whilst also adding a modern approach to the extension of this property*”.

The additional height of the structure so far built compared to the approved height makes it, in my opinion, overly bulky, massive and out of proportion. Nor does the street scene require a “modern approach”. It needs a structure in keeping with the local vernacular, as stipulated in the original permission.

There is furthermore a point of principle at stake here. If this application is approved, I fear that the planning process for the built environment in Cheltenham will be severely undermined. As outlined above, in this case major conditions of the original Permission For Development have been ignored at the start of construction. If this application is approved, some may infer that similar conditions to Permission For Development on other applications can be largely disregarded at the whim of the applicant - and the violation later “fixed” with a retrospective application. Not only might the planning process be undermined, but public resources would be strained by the number of extra applications thus generated.

For all the reasons outlined above, I repeat my position stated in the Summary of this document, namely that I oppose planning application **16/01909/FUL** and respectfully request that it be refused.


1 Birch Close, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham GL53 8PJ

15th November 2016