

<b>APPLICATION NO: 17/00087/FUL</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mrs Emma Pickernell</b>	
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 18th January 2017		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 15th March 2017	
<b>WARD:</b> St Marks		<b>PARISH:</b>	
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Mitch Counsell		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Atherstone 17 Church Road St Marks		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Proposed rear and side extension to provide 3 dwelling units (re-submission 16/00375/FUL)		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>5</b>
Number of objections	<b>5</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

14 Church Road  
St Marks  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7AN

**Comments:** 28th February 2017

I would not support the proposed development as the resubmission varies only in a very minor way from that previously refused by the Council in 2016. The additional three flats would result in an extension that is bulky and out of keeping with the character of the existing building and have a significant adverse effect upon the residential environment. I would see no reason why the Council should take a contrary view to this application.

With regard to the proposed provision of one parking space per dwelling, I note the officer's previous view that the relatively sustainable location would encourage the use of alternatives to private cars. However, in reality, it is likely that a couple occupying a two bedroom flat would own two cars in many cases. There have been significant parking and access difficulties experienced by residents in past years which has resulted in the approval of a controlled parking zone which will be introduced shortly. While I reiterate my opposition to this proposal, should the Council wish to contemplate the approval of any proposals that intensify the pattern of development, I would suggest that in such cases, the Council seeks a legal agreement through section 106 to exclude eligibility to any controlled parking zone to encourage more sustainable travel.

22 Griffiths Avenue  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7BH

**Comments:** 20th February 2017

Having examined the most recent revised proposal submitted for the extension of 17 Church road, we note the reduction in size of the proposed extension. However, we remain doubtful about the affect of the proposal on the overall character of the street, from a foreword perspective and potential overlook to the rear. Additionally, although the effects of the extension on parking constraints were not raised during the original grounds for refusal of the previous revision, I am

aware that this point (notably potential spill-over onto the street) is also still an issue of concern to local residents.

In summary, whilst we welcome the efforts by the planning consultancy to reduce the mass and footprint of the development, we reiterate our previous objections to the proposal and general concerns regarding the impact it will have on local amenity.

Flat 3  
19 Church Road  
St Marks  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7AL

**Comments:** 20th February 2017

Having received notification of the re-submission for planning to build at Atherstone 17 Church Road, St Marks, Cheltenham GL51 7AL, I have studied the proposed plans and see nothing that alters my previous decision to object to this development.

Once again I would formally object on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its sheer size and siting, represents and unneighbourly form of development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of an overbearing effect.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its sheer size and siting, would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, adversely affecting the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling houses.
3. The proposed development would be out of keeping with the design and character the adjacent property which was originally the Old Vicarage for the nearby St Mark's Church.

To quote the previous refusal of permission:

The proposed extension, by reason of its mass, size and design fails to respect the original dwelling. It is out of keeping with the design and proportions of the original building and serves to overwhelm it. As such the proposed extension would be harmful to the design and appearance of the existing building and its contribution to the street scene in the locality. Therefore the proposal is not in accordance with Policy CP7 (Design), Development on garden land and infill sites in Cheltenham SPD (2009), Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD (2008) and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, Chapter 7 (requiring good design).'

4. The layout and siting, both in itself and relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views, is inappropriate and unsympathetic to the appearance and character of the local environment and is entirely out of character with the adjacent and surrounding properties in Church Road.
5. The site access proposals are not acceptable and would lead to potential safety hazards for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Church Road.
6. The proposed development will increase the traffic flow on an already busy and overcrowded residential street, Church Road.
7. The proposed development will lead to an overall increase in vehicles in the area and the insufficient on-site parking will result in an overspill onto Church Road. This will exacerbate the current on-street parking issues of which the Council have been made aware of on

numerous occasions, endangering motorists, cyclists and pedestrians alike and causing a potential road blockage for emergency service vehicles responding to a call out.

I would ask that the Planning Department take account of my concerns when considering planning application as submitted.

Flat 2  
19 Church Road  
St Marks  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7AL

**Comments:** 21st February 2017

I wish to present my objections to the proposed development to the rear of 17 Church Rd, St Marks.

My objections are on the following grounds:

The revised proposal is still out of keeping with the rest of the building and the rest of properties in the local area. Such an unsympathetic build will detract from the character of the area and is likely to have an adverse effect on the value of other local properties.

Approval of this build, after so many historic refusals (because of the strength of objection of the neighbours on so many previous occasions), will likely encourage others in the area to apply for 'in-fill' development permission, reducing the local vegetation cover, adversely affecting both the human living environment as well as the environment for local bird and wildlife.

The reduction in on-site parking and construction of new dwellings will only exacerbate the existing parking challenges; this will become clearer once the long anticipated parking restrictions in the area take effect later in 2017.

As old, Victorian semi-detached houses, construction on the side of number 17 is extremely likely to exert changes to the structural 'load' on number 19. This is very likely to cause damage to the properties at number 19, both in the immediate and longer term. As a property owner in number 19, I would have serious concerns as to whether this has been properly considered especially in the light of the slope on which the properties are built.

Notwithstanding the adjustments to the plans, this new build, were it to go ahead, will have a serious adverse effect on the privacy of the neighbouring properties, both on Church Road and on Griffiths Avenue.

Per various previous objections to the numerous different planning applications from number 17, I hope that you agree that to grant the application would be out of keeping with the local area, unfairly devaluing the neighbouring properties on both Church Road and Griffiths Avenue. It would also set a precedent for yet more planning applications on an already very developed and congested road; accepting this proposal might make declining future applications more difficult.

19 Church Road  
Leckhampton  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 0PS

**Comments:** 21st February 2017

I wish to present my objections to the proposed development to the rear of 17 Church Rd, St Marks.

My objections are on the following grounds:

The revised proposal is still out of keeping with the rest of the building and the rest of properties in the local area. Such an unsympathetic build will detract from the character of the area and is likely to have an adverse effect on the value of other local properties.

Approval of this build, after so many historic refusals (because of the strength of objection of the neighbours on so many previous occasions), will likely encourage others in the area to apply for 'in-fill' development permission, reducing the local vegetation cover, adversely affecting both the human living environment as well as the environment for local bird and wildlife.

The reduction in on-site parking and construction of new dwellings will only exacerbate the existing parking challenges; this will become clearer once the long anticipated parking restrictions in the area take effect later in 2017.

As old, Victorian semi-detached houses, construction on the side of number 17 is extremely likely to exert changes to the structural 'load' on number 19. This is very likely to cause damage to the properties at number 19, both in the immediate and longer term. As a property owner in number 19, I would have serious concerns as to whether this has been properly considered especially in the light of the slope on which the properties are built.

Notwithstanding the adjustments to the plans, this new build, were it to go ahead, will have a serious adverse effect on the privacy of the neighbouring properties, both on Church Road and on Griffiths Avenue.

Per various previous objections to the numerous different planning applications from number 17, I hope that you agree that to grant the application would be out of keeping with the local area, unfairly devaluing the neighbouring properties on both Church Road and Griffiths Avenue. It would also set a precedent for yet more planning applications on an already very developed and congested road; accepting this proposal might make declining future applications more difficult.