

APPLICATION NO: 16/02197/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Ben Hawkes	
DATE REGISTERED: 9th December 2016		DATE OF EXPIRY : 3rd February 2017	
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Mr Chris Gough		
LOCATION:	68 Sandy Lane, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extension, application of render and timber cladding and replacement windows and doors.		

REPRESENTATIONS

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

70 Sandy Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DH

Comments: 2nd March 2017

Surroundings and character of area

The application site occupies an important and attractive corner location on Sandy Lane which forms part of the open and semi-rural gateway to the Cotswolds Escarpment and AONB. From this point the lane has open plan gardens to the west and a dense mature wooded screen to the east, forming the boundary with Lilleybrook Golf Course, leading to attractive views of the escarpment to the south. This section of the road is used and enjoyed by thousands of walkers and cyclists every year and is an important feature of Charlton Kings.

Like other corner plots in the surrounding area, the site is spacious and wide. However, this open character changes as the lane climbs up the hill towards the south. Nos 70 to 76 are much closer together with site widths being considerable less and space between the buildings much reduced.

Visual Impact of proposed development

Although the plans for the extension of no.68 have been amended, we feel that the resultant house will be out of character with the surroundings, particularly when compared with other large properties in Sandy Lane which maintain more space and openness between them. This detrimental impact is more pronounced as the site is an important corner plot.

The proposals will result in a very large and dominant two-storey building that will be 20m wide, built up to within 1 m of the boundary with no.70 Sandy Lane. The design is so - that there is no subservience to the proposed side extension. It appears as a two storey block with a constant unbroken roofline along the full 20m width. There is no break change in the form, change in heights or shape. If compared with other properties and plots of similar size in the surroundings and along Sandy Lane, they all either have: more space between the boundaries, single storey elements / subservient extensions to the sides, and / or changes to the shape & height of the roof line etc. These design features allow such large house to have prominence whilst creating a sense of space between them, reducing the impact of massing.

The fact that No.68 is on a corner plot extenuates this massing effect. All other corner plots in the surroundings maintain considerably more space around them. The size of the resultant building

and consistency of the roofline results in a detrimental visual coalescence and dominance especially in relation to No.70. This has a negative impact on the overall setting of the street scene when viewed from Sandy Lane.

When viewed from the rear of our property it will change the appearance of the surroundings considerably resulting in a bulky and dominant feature (similar to the impact described from the street). The gardens to the rear are not deep and buildings are close to boundaries. This significant extension will worsen the sense of enclosure with a resultant structure that is far greater and bulkier than anything else within view.

The proposed extensions are located / pushed close to our property. Measured along our boundary the side extension will be 13.5m deep only 1 m off the boundary. Considering the 20m width, this seems excessive and unnecessarily close to our property when there is a lot of space around the existing property.

Also, at the southern boundary with No. 70 Sandy Lane, the extension's roof overhang projects further than it does on the northern end of the property. Although a minor matter, it adds a little more impact on our enjoyment of the property and our residential amenity. Like all the other issues, they could be easily overcome with a revised scheme.

Front extensions, balcony and loss of privacy

The proposals include considerable flat roofed single storey extensions projecting in front of the existing building line. This seems an unattractive design feature considering the sensitivity of the corner site, is detrimental to the street scene and semi-rural surroundings.

The new garage will project 2m further forward (compared to the existing). This will mean that the cars parked on the drive, will be moved forward closer to the boundary with the highway. This section of Sandy Lane has an open estate layout - retaining an open strip leading from the corner plot up towards the escarpment with the mature trees bounding Lillybrook golf course to the east. This section of the estate has been designed to keep cars away from the road (providing a car free strip) where vehicles only park on occasion - which adds considerably to the semi-rural nature of the surroundings. We have provided photos of this vista and one of a nearby street that the garage locations result in cars parked close to the road. This creates a significant visual detriment to the street scene and would not be fitting in this semi-rural location. Once again, this could be easily changed by minor amendments to the proposal.

The garage's projecting front roof also provides a large balcony serving the new master bedroom with patio doors facing east. It has been designed so the balcony extends adjacent to the boundary of our house. It will provide unfettered views along the pathway to the side of our house into the rear garden and directly into the first floor bathroom window, ground floor toilet (only 2m away). These are the only windows to these rooms and both are opening windows. It would result in a significant loss of privacy and sense of overbearing. There is also a new window inserted into the existing first floor gable which also looks directly towards these windows; we are not certain this is essential.

Summary and possible solution

Overall we feel we need to object to the proposal in its current form. However, it is important to note that we are confident that with a different design a similar amount of floorspace could be effectively and attractively incorporated with minimal visual impact. We are very supportive of our neighbours being able to extend their house, but feel this could be done with significantly less detrimental impact to the surroundings and our amenity.

The scale of the overall development and massing of resultant building could be significantly reduced by creating more space between the buildings and changing its design by breaking up the roofline and pushing back the single storey garage projection. A balcony could still be achieved over the porch and 'Juliet' style balconies could provide options opening doors to first

floor windows. A scheme could be reworked that would be much more in keeping with the other large properties in Sandy Lane - particularly those occupying corner plots.

We would be pleased to have a discussion with our neighbours and their architect on how this could be achieved to do hope this representation as proactive comments seeking a positive solution for both parties.