

APPLICATION NO: 16/02205/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Emma Pickernell	
DATE REGISTERED: 16th March 2017		DATE OF EXPIRY : 11th May 2017	
WARD: Benhall/The Reddings		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	M P Homes Ltd		
LOCATION:	The Hayloft The Reddings Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Retention of works carried out; including those under planning permission reference 14/02249/FUL as well as the removal and replacement of elements of the original Hayloft building not covered by planning permission reference 14/02249/FUL and minor alterations to the approved scheme.		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	21
Number of objections	19
Number of representations	1
Number of supporting	1

Carobs
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 6th April 2017

To be clear the current structure is a new build on greenbelt with no planning permission which this application seeks to regularise. There have already been two stops placed on this construction by the planning department because of irregularities. Examination of earlier documents clearly states that one wall of the original Hayloft should remain standing but in fact has been demolished presumably with consent from the planning department. The newly created cellar allegedly approved by a planning officer, may be subject to flooding as the water table is high in this area. In fact the cellar of the adjacent house has a constant pump working in spite of being correctly tanked out.

The current plan has no defining features of a single dwelling and the ground floor has little fluency in design. The garden room is in the front of the structure where logically the dining and utility rooms should be. The first floor appears to be of concrete construction, which is a necessary safety issue for a multi-occupancy building. The installation of five bathrooms seems excessive for a single dwelling and if used simultaneously are likely to have an adverse effect on the houses opposite. There is no provision for extra land or a garage to be included with this house despite the magnificence of its amenities. According to the plan the main entrance is but a side door.

This is quite clearly destined to be a block of flats/bedsits to which the developer has already confessed, so is this another planning application of fiction or a stepping stone towards completion of their ultimate goal? We also question the developers statement that the building was constantly inspected by the planning department, but the department claimed it did not have the manpower to achieve this.

To facilitate the developer the "Principal Urban Area" Appendix F no 21 recommends the removal OF THIS SITE ONLY from green belt allowing a new application for multi occupancy which clearly has been the intention from day one. The removal of green belt status has no benefit for

the community or local residents. It would appear that the developer has shown total disregard for the planning process and there is no reason why this building should be allowed to stand as, so far, no planning application submitted or retrospective has been adhered to. This sets a precedent for other similar builds and conversions of larger houses in the road to create further flats/bedsits which is totally out of keeping with the character of the area. This sends a message to other developers and residents alike that anything is possible without appropriate prior planning permission.

This has worrying connotations for the future of planning. This building is much larger than the original Hayloft (<http://www.zoopla.co.uk/property-history/the-hayloft/the-reddings/cheltenham/gl51-6rl/26704027>) and therefore this structure should be demolished and a single dwelling of recognisable construction should be built on the site as intended in the application dated June 2012.

Comments: 11th June 2017

Inspection of the list of applications will reveal that 16/02205/FUL dated March 20 2017 is the latest amendment to plans submitted and altered several times since 14/002249/FUL dated October 2010.

Simple calculation will reveal this debacle is in its seventh year.

Mrs Pickernell is the third planning officer since 2008 having been preceded by Miss Adams and Mrs Harris. Is this a poisoned chalice?

Further to our previous objections, it is noted that the title of the building is referred to as a "Proposed Development", yet again avoiding stating the true purpose of the completed building.

The current amendments are;

1. The deletion of two ensuite rooms means that Bedroom 1 which is the master bedroom will no longer have such a facility. This is unbelievable in such a well appointed house.
2. Flat roofs which could be built on at a later date.
3. The addition of a fire escape on the south elevation. Why?

The above items suggest that multi occupancy is the ultimate aim.

It is appreciated that the Planning Department is constantly under pressure, however had inspections taken place more frequently the current situation would have been avoided. It is therefore hoped that whatever the outcome, safeguards will be put in place to avoid any ambiguity.

All our previous objections of the 4/6/17 still stand.

Pserimos
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 26th March 2017

First I have little or no faith in this process, having been through a similar process whilst living at Manor Park and objecting to the Manor Farm Development. I'm fairly sure these comments either will not be read, or will be read and then duly ignored.

Second, I cannot open the documents attached to this application, so I am unable to review the specific details and comment accordingly. Perhaps the council will send me full details in the post

so that I am given a fair chance to review them. I suspect nothing will arrive through my letter box though.

Either way, I will give my comments as follows:

- 1) This is Green Belt land - does this actually mean anything in today's society? It clearly seems to give little or no protection status to the land upon which this classification has been given. I object to any large scale development (anything exceeding a single private dwelling of maximum 2 storeys) occurring on this land.
- 2) Visual/ Character/ Environment - Any proposed development should be in keeping with the other properties & developments in this road. This is not a commercial landscape or a multiple occupancy landscape, this is a semi-rural landscape and any such developments should remain in keeping with the surroundings.
- 3) There is already heavy through traffic on this road during morning and evening rush hour periods. Any multi-occupancy type of development will further turn this semi-rural road into a heavy use road. It is already dangerous in places where vehicles routinely travel at 40+mph. Traffic calming is needed in the mid-section of the road.
- 4) Noise/ Disturbance - Any multi-occupancy development is likely to increase noise & disturbance within this quiet community.

PLEASE REMEMBER this is a semi-rural location, and it is not appropriate for a town centre style development to take place here.

PLEASE NOTE I am already concerned at the underhand way that this development seems to be progressing. Building work progressing prior to the appropriate planning consent demonstrates a non-compliant approach with clearly no regard for the area or community.

I understand there are now attempts to remove the green belt status of this land to enable the building work to progress. Again this appears VERY UNDERHAND, UNWARRANTED & POTENTIALLY ILLEGAL PROCESS.

PLEASE ENSURE A COMPLIANT, ROBUST, FAIR & TRANSPARENT PROCESS IS UNDERTAKEN AT ALL TIMES.

PLEASE GIVE PEOPLE FAITH THAT THIS PROCESS IS VAGUELY COMPLIANT!!!

Lynwood
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 10th April 2017

I object to this development. The proposed plans are for a 'single dwelling' which is vastly out of scale with the other dwellings in the road. The plans are not an extension or alterations of the Hayloft - the traditional old building of the Hayloft has been demolished. If this has been done without planning permission, it should be re-instated, so that the visual impact remains similar, rather than the visually unappealing elevations proposed.

The proposal is effectively for new build, which is not appropriate in greenbelt land. I do not feel it is appropriate to allow development to be approved retrospectively in this way, as it will indicate to developers that there is no requirement to adhere to planning permission.

The plans submitted seem so out of scale for a single dwelling in this area that it does give substance to local concern that this is not intended to be a single dwelling, but instead something easily converted to multi-occupancy. Combined with this there is the proposal within the

Cheltenham Plan to include the site within the town's Principal Urban Area. I strongly object to this, as I see no reason whatsoever for changing the status of this site. This would remove the single dwelling restriction currently applicable to this Greenbelt site and allow this development to convert to a multi-unit development of flats or bed-sits. This would be quite inappropriate to the character of the area.

Penny House
6 The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 9th April 2017

I object to this proposal for the retention of what is a very substantial wholly new structure built without planning permission in the Green Belt.

Cheltenham Plan (Part One) Appendix F refers to the addition of a residential dwelling to the PUA at The Hayloft in The Reddings. Ref No. 21 on the interactive map. This Cheltenham Plan is to be used in combination with the Joint Core Strategy, which contained a Green Belt Assessment completed by Amec.

This assessment puts The Hayloft in designated Area 21 of the Green Belt, and red flagged it as having a significant contribution to the Green Belt, with the following recommendations:

"Critical to the separation of Cheltenham and Gloucester, being the original purpose of Green Belt designation. Critical to preventing ribbon development along the A40 and A46... These segments do not merit further consideration for release from the Green Belt at this stage"

With this recommendation by the JCS there is absolutely no justification for the approval of this application.

Furthermore, In relation to the protection of Green Belt land The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 89 states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include:

"the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces."

Anything else must be considered as 'Inappropriate Development' unless there are 'Exceptional Circumstances'.

Furthermore, the "Reason" given in Appendix F for its inclusion is as "Inclusion of residential dwelling". This is completely inaccurate since "The Hayloft" - the residential dwelling in question - was demolished and replaced by a substantial structure built on into the adjoining Green Belt without planning permission.

This new structure is illegal and offends against the Green Belt and the council has a duty to take action to have it removed and for the site to be reinstated. Indeed, Mr Levick, a Senior Planning Enforcement Officer, has stated unequivocally that the Hayloft itself has been demolished completely and replaced with this new structure.

Bearing in mind that this new build structure has been constructed on Green Belt land - additionally your own people in Customer Relations under an FOI request have pointed out that "The owners of the site were urged to stop work on site and secure it and make safe as there is no planning permission for the structure on the site."

Additionally, the current planning application is invalid because it is seeking retrospective permission for regularisation of further breaches of a planning permission (Ref: 14/02249/FUL) for 'Extensions to The Hayloft' - a permission that became null and void when The Hayloft was demolished. The application should not have been validated by the Planning Department and the Planning Committee should therefore refuse permission for this reason alone.

The new building (the replacement building) is more than three times the size of the original building, which makes it 'Inappropriate Development' within the Green Belt.

There is considerable concern locally that the building is not what it purports to be. A building of this size is completely out of scale with its neighbours. The very unusual mix and layout of the proposed accommodation, and its patent lack of architectural merit, would make this speculative development a very unlikely commercial success for the developers as a single dwelling.

There is also real concern that a proposal within the Cheltenham Plan to include the site within the town's Principal Urban Area (a proposal with no public benefit whatsoever) would remove the single dwelling restriction currently applicable to this Green Belt site - effectively 'opening the door' to a multi-unit development of flats or bed-sits, which would be wholly inappropriate.

If this application is permitted then it sets a precedent for other similar builds and conversions of larger houses in the road to create further flats/bedsits totally out of keeping with the character of the area. This would send a message to other developers and residents alike that anything is possible without appropriate prior planning permission; that it is fine to build what you like in the area - Green Belt or not - without planning and then get retrospective permission even for new build - after all with a precedent as blatant as this anyone would have a strong case to do just that.

In summary the application for the retention of the new building should also be refused for the following reasons:

1. It is an illegal development, built without planning permission.
2. It is classified as 'Inappropriate Development' in the Green Belt under Section 89 of the NPPF.
3. Cheltenham Plan (Part One) Appendix F refers to The Hayloft as being in designated Area 21 of the Green Belt, and red flagged this area as playing a "significant contribution to the Green Belt".
4. CBC personnel already put a stop on this construction stating: "The owners of the site were urged to stop work on site and secure it and make safe as there is no planning permission for the structure on the site."
5. The application is devoid of architectural merit or sensitivity, visual or otherwise, towards its surroundings, neighbours and Green Belt location.
6. Approval of this application would in effect be rewarding the developer for its systematic breaches of the planning process and disregard for the Green Belt and may well encourage similar actions by this and other like-minded developers in the future.
7. Allowing the retention of this 'Inappropriate Development' in the Green Belt - a visually unattractive building of a scale and design that appears more suited to a multi-unit use than the single dwelling it purports to be - could well create a precedent for further developments of its type, leading to a serious decline in the character and quality of the neighbourhood.

The Hedgerows
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 8th April 2017

I object to this proposal for the retention of what is a very substantial wholly new structure built without planning permission in the Greenbelt.

In relation to the protection of Greenbelt land The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 89 states that:

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Greenbelt. Exceptions to this include:

- The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

Anything else must be considered as 'Inappropriate Development' unless there are 'Exceptional Circumstances'.

The Council's Customer Relations Department has confirmed in writing that the original building (The Hayloft) has been demolished completely and replaced with a wholly new building, for which there is no planning permission. It is in effect an illegal structure.

The new building (the replacement building) is more than three times the size of the original building, which makes it 'Inappropriate Development' within the Greenbelt.

There is considerable concern locally that the building is not what it purports to be. A building of this size is completely out of scale with its neighbours. The very unusual mix and layout of the proposed accommodation, and its patent lack of architectural merit, would make this speculative development a very unlikely commercial success for the developers as a single dwelling.

There is also real concern that a proposal within the Cheltenham Plan to include the site within the town's Principal Urban Area (a proposal with no public benefit whatsoever) would remove the single dwelling restriction currently applicable to this Greenbelt site - effectively 'opening the door' to a multi-unit development of flats or bed-sits, which would be wholly inappropriate.

The construction of this building is not the result of some misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the rules on the part of the developer. It is the result of a deliberate flagrant abuse of the planning system.

The current planning application is invalid because it is seeking retrospective permission for regularisation of further breaches of a planning permission (Ref: 14/02249/FUL) for 'Extensions to The Hayloft' - a permission that became null and void when The Hayloft was demolished. The application should not have been validated by the Planning Department and the Planning Committee should therefore refuse permission for that reason alone.

However, the application for the retention of the new building should also be refused for the following additional reasons:

1. It is an illegal development, built without planning permission.
2. It is classified as 'Inappropriate Development' in the Greenbelt under Section 89 of the NPPF.

3. It is devoid of architectural merit or sensitivity, visual or otherwise, towards its surroundings, neighbours and Greenbelt location.
4. Approval of this application would in effect be rewarding the developer for its systematic breaches of the planning process and disregard for the Greenbelt and may well encourage similar actions by this and other like-minded developers in the future.
5. Allowing the retention of this 'Inappropriate Development' in the Greenbelt - a visually unattractive building of a scale and design that appears more suited to a multi-unit use than the single dwelling it purports to be - could well create a precedent for further developments of its type, leading to a serious decline in the character and quality of the neighbourhood.

March House
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 10th April 2017

I object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

This is a green belt site and the scale of the development is completely inappropriate; the proposed building is almost twice as large as the existing building which has been demolished.

The building purports to be a single dwelling, which is hardly credible considering the size, number and layout of the rooms. The building work has already been stopped on two occasions because the work was not in accordance with the approved plans. I feel that it is inevitable that if approved, the developer will submit yet another planning application to convert the building into multiple flats or bad-sits, which would be totally unacceptable.

I and the other residents of the Reddings will feel totally let down by the Planning Department if our comments are disregarded and this development is approved by the Cheltenham BC Planning Committee.

Bethany House
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 10th April 2017

I object to this proposal for the retention of what is a new structure built without planning permission in the Green Belt.

I completely agree with the previous comments about the Cheltenham Plan (Part One) Appendix F, and the Joint Core Strategy, which contained a Green Belt Assessment completed by Amec.

This assessment put this location of the Green Belt, as a red flagged site it as having a significant contribution to the Green Belt, with the following recommendations:

"Critical to the separation of Cheltenham and Gloucester, being the original purpose of Green Belt designation. Critical to preventing ribbon development along the A40 and A46... These segments do not merit further consideration for release from the Green Belt at this stage"

With this recommendation by the JCS there is absolutely no justification for the approval of this application.

This development also does not comply with the protection of Green Belt land according to The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 89.

Council enforcement officers and customer relations officers have also stated that the Hayloft itself has been demolished completely and replaced with this new structure. This is why work has been halted on the site for so long.

As such the current planning application cannot be valid because it is seeking retrospective permission for regularisation of further breaches of a planning permission (Ref: 14/02249/FUL) for 'Extensions to The Hayloft'. As what is there at the moment does not comply with the first planning permission then there is nothing to regularise.

Folly House
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 8th April 2017
Background

In January 2015 we made the following comments.

"Because of the somewhat long and tortuous nature of the development and the general lack of up-to-date information we believe the developer should submit a concise statement giving the current proposals covering, appearance, construction, exact sizes, use of building, likely number of occupants, position within the plot, car parking, access arrangements and likely completion date.

With this information to hand it will be possible for planners and all interested parties to assess the proposals and make informed comments.

The building is in the greenbelt and there seems to be a definite element of planning creep with considerable incremental increase in size. The original idea was to contain the building within the footprint of the old building. It now appears to be over twice the size. When will it end? It was already a large building"

Process

It is disappointing that there is a lack of clarity, transparency and responsiveness and unfortunately requests for information from the planning department have gone unanswered.

Comments

Despite many letters and comments it is clear that no one has a clear view on what is the exact scale and scope of the development and what further development creep there might be. Answers requested in the earlier background paragraph are still relevant and have not yet been answered. The development creep is enormous and it begs the question, would all the agreements given in the previous submissions be correct and a simple test would be to determine if the application as currently stated would have been approved had it been applied for originally. We suspect not. Therefore in order to provide some clarity we believe the current application should be reviewed overall. Incremental increases, as in these situations, have unexpected consequences and frequently occur.

The development is out of scale and out of character in terms of the appearance with other properties in the vicinity. Architecturally the building has little merit.

The internal design is unusual and it appears more like a multi-unit development with communal living. The problem being this may increase the number of parked cars and cause difficulty with traffic as it is located on a bus route and the junction with Badgeworth Road.

3 Fairhaven Park
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RW

Comments: 20th March 2017
Letter attached.

Iona
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 8th April 2017
I object to the application 16/02205/FUL

This building is totally inappropriate for The Reddings. This area of The Reddings is a rural area within the Green Belt, the application may state that it is a single dwelling but the residents in the area believe it to be a development by stealth. There have been numerous applications submitted for this site including an application for four apartments in 2008 a residential home for the elderly in 2009 and 2012. All of which have been permitted.

The developers have carried out work which was not covered by the previous planning application ie: removing parts of the existing building which I believe was done deliberately to avoid extra work and cost.

The original application 12/01271/FUL was granted with the restriction imposed in para 11: the roof area must not be used as a balcony or roof garden without further planning permission. Had this been applied for in the original application more residents may have objected.

I object to the roof being made flat and converted into a balcony because it will rob neighbours of their privacy. It may also distract motorists approaching the road junction of The Reddings with Badgeworth Road. This is already a dangerous junction, the scene of several accidents.

I refer to the application form para 11 Foul Sewage.
State how foul sewage is to be disposed of; Answer - unknown.
Are you proposing to connect to the existing drainage system; Answer - unknown

Surely before the building work started the decision of how it would be connected to the sewer should have been formalised. Also as the ground floor has been built this decision must have been made. Is this something else that has been done without planning consent?

If this site is to be connected to the main sewage system it will exacerbate a problem that already exists where the system back fills during heavy rain causing a flood of untreated sewage to those dwellings already on the system. Severn Trent is aware of this problem.

This issue should be investigated before the building work recommences.

I believe this latest application is a way of getting a building on the site which can later be converted into something else.

If this application is permitted to proceed, I feel the Planning Committee should impose a restriction forbidding further changes to the property.

Comments: 25th May 2017

I wish to object to the proposal 16/02205/FUL and my existing objection dated 8th April 2017 still stands.

The developers have put in a Revised Covering Letter dated 10th May 2017, entered on the web site 18th May 2017.

In this letter under the heading: Background, location and proposed development, para 4, they state:

Some aspects of the works carried out vary slightly from the approved plans, and thus this application is submitted to regularize those works. In addition, during the carrying out of those works, it became apparent that a far more appropriate solution to the whole site would be to re-order what was the original dwelling which was looking out of place against the new extensions.

In para 5 they state:

Following the extensions to it being almost complete therefore, the decision was taken to repair what little remained of the original dwelling and finish that off in the new bricks to match the extensions that now surround it.

In para 6:

As well as the slight alteration to the location and size of some of the openings, the small front extension has also been finished in a different fashion. The Permitted Scheme had this finished in a mono-pitch sloping roof; the as built/proposed scheme has this finished in a flat roof behind a parapet. This too matches the other elements of the now extended dwelling and if anything has a lesser impact on the Green Belt than the Permitted Scheme.

The addition of the external fire escape indicates that this building is not going to be used as a private dwelling but I suspect it has been included to allow an easy change of use at a later stage.

The developer knew that the work they were carrying out did not comply with the existing planning permission but carried out the work regardless.

This shows that they have scant regard for the planning process, and think that they are above the law which governs planning permission.

It appears the developers made the decision to build what they wanted irrespective of any restrictions imposed by planning, and are now seeking retrospective planning permission to get whatever they wanted in the beginning. Therefore I feel this application should be rejected.

Tawnys Lodge
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 10th April 2017

We are writing to object to the proposal for the retention of what is a very substantial wholly new structure built without Planning Permission in the Green Belt.

It is an illegal development classified as 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt under section 89 of the NPPF.

There is concern locally that the building is not what it purports to be. A building of this size is completely out of scale with its neighbours and believe would be more commercially viable to the developers for multiple occupancy i.e luxury flats and wonder if this could be their ultimate aim.

In addition there are real concerns regarding the disposal of foul sewage. During periods of severe heavy rainfall the main sewer back - fills and neighbours have been seriously affected by this. Any further development involving multiple occupancy will only increase the problem still further. I understand the Severn Trent Water Authority are aware of this problem.

The Applicant's proposal within the Cheltenham Plan to include this Site within the Town's Principal Urban Area (a proposal with no public benefit whatsoever) would remove the single dwelling restriction currently applicable to this Site effectively 'opening the door' to a multi - unit development which would be totally inappropriate. If granted, it would set a dangerous precedent to residents and other developers that any development is possible without appropriate Planning Permission whether land is located in the Green Belt or not. Furthermore, if retrospective Planning Permission was granted, this would 'open the flood gates' to further development on Green Belt Land in The Reddings.

Flowerdale House
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 5th April 2017

I am writing about the application to amend the permission already granted for the Hayloft.

The permission already granted is more than sufficient for this site and the amendments now proposed are relatively minor and should be approved subject to conditions as set out below:

1. The development must be completed within 24 months of permission being granted.
2. The proposal to exclude this property and the adjoining field from its current Green Belt status should be declined, as this sets a dangerous precedent for nearby property.
3. Provision should be made to provide sympathetic screening/ landscaping at the front and side of the property in keeping with the semi-rural nature of The Reddings.
4. Access from the adjoining field should cease once the development has been completed and the farm gate entrance and field should be re-instated
5. No further planning applications should be made on this site for at least 15 years in line with the local plan

Otherwise permission should be refused.

The Reddings has suffered, and continues to do so, from several speculative planning applications (BMW site in Grovefield Way, B&Q, Asda, Pure Offices, Symphony Road development, Care Home at Arle Court and land off Brock Close to name a few). The Reddings is a semi-rural residential area on the edge of Cheltenham and is important in its position to prevent the urban sprawl of Cheltenham into Churchdown and ultimately Gloucester.

The road system in the area is already creaking under the strain of the existing developments and this will increase significantly once the BMW site is open for business.

The Green Belt status of the area was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate following the appeal against refusal for permission to develop the land off Brock Close (15/00573/OUT) and this decision is also appropriate to this property and adjacent field.

Glyndon
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 10th April 2017

I wish to register my strong opposition to the proposal for the retention for what is a new building within the green belt.

The current planning application is invalid because it is seeking retrospective permission for regularisation of further breaches of a planning permission (Ref: 14/02249/FUL) for 'Extensions to The Hayloft' - a permission that became null and void when The Hayloft was demolished.

The existing planning permission was granted on the expectation that the frontage wall would be retained. It is such a shame that this precipitate action has been taken without the courtesy of either discussion with neighbours or following due process and seeking planning permission. One cannot help but think that the demolition of the wall was done to ensure that faced with such a fait accompli, retrospective planning permission could be more easily acquired.

I believe that construction of new buildings within the Green belt are inappropriate, exceptions to this include the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. The proposal by reason of the overall floor area created and in the absence of any very special circumstances would lead to an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt, detrimental to its open, rural and undeveloped character.

In 2016 the Green Belt status within this area was upheld by two Planning Inspectorate appeals against refusal for permission to develop the land off Brock Close (15/00573/OUT) and at Pine lodge Hatherley Lane 16/00805/FUL Thus demonstrating the importance of maintaining a strong and robust policy to prevent urban sprawl, maintain the unique character of the area and reject inappropriate development.

There is considerable concern locally that the building is not what it purports to be. Unrealistically large rooms hint that this is a not a real plan and is just being used to justify keeping what has been built, as a form of development-by-stealth. A building of this size is completely out of scale with its neighboring properties. Also the very unusual mix and layout of the proposed accommodation and its patent lack of architectural merit would make this speculative development a very unlikely commercial success for the developers as a single dwelling. Development-by-stealth hurts the local community.

The construction of this building is not the result of some misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the rules on the part of the developer. It is the result of a deliberate flagrant abuse of the planning system.

Currently policies confirm that any proposed development should be in keeping with the other properties & developments in the road. This is not a commercial landscape or a multiple occupancy landscape. This is a semi-rural landscape and any such developments should remain in keeping with the surroundings.

The application does not describe the impact of the new build on foul sewage services. Experience of many local residents is that foul sewage is over capacity. A building of that size will exacerbate a problem that already exists where the system back fills during heavy rain causing a flood of untreated sewage to those dwellings already on the system clearly creating considerable demand on the foul sewage system and so it is not appropriate for this application to proceed in its current state without discussing impact on services.

If this application is permitted then it sets a precedent for more conversions of houses to create further flats/bedsits totally out of keeping with the character of the area. This would send a message to other developers and residents alike that anything is possible without appropriate prior planning permission.

This application should be refused on a number of grounds:

- The design statement and justification contains much misinformation.
- It is an inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- It is devoid of architectural merit or sensitivity, visual or otherwise, towards its surroundings, neighbours and Greenbelt location.
- Approval of this application would in effect be rewarding the developer for its systematic breaches of the planning process and disregard for the Green Belt and may well encourage similar actions by this and other like-minded developers in the future

Windermere
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 25th April 2017

This application should be approved to allow completion of building and landscaping.

I have viewed the previous applications for this site including a residential care home and a large house this current application appears no larger than the previous applications.

Foul drainage: The site is already connected to the sewerage system.

Storm water: My cellar has seen very little flooding in the last 3 years - an improvement.

The Hayloft prior to this redevelopment was for many years a dilapidated building in poor condition and needed some sort of rebuilding programme.

This part of The Reddings from Grovefield Way to Badgeworth Road has seen much development in the past.

Green Belt: Actually 72% of the residential properties along this road have been built in the last 35 years all of which have been developed on Green Belt Land (Termed Green Belt Infill) Several being characterless properties similar to what you would see on many local housing estates.

Quite hypocritical to be suggesting redevelopment of an existing plot is green belt infringement considering what has been built along this road since the early eighties.

We have also witnessed large extensions almost doubling the floor space of several local properties, Green belt infringement?

CBC - approve this application and let completion and landscaping improve the appearance of this road.

Cambria
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 7th April 2017

My objection is based upon the following points.

1. The developer has demolished The Hayloft and replaced it with a building twice the size of the original and is in excess of that allowed by greenbelt regulations. The existing building does not have planning permission as confirmed in writing by your customer relations department
2. The look of the building does not bear any relation to the modern building for which planning permission was given and is visually very unattractive
3. No assessment has been made for the possible effect the excavation of the basement might have on the water table and an existing problem with flooding as experienced by other basements in the area
4. The layout and number of rooms strongly suggest that this is not a single dwelling. A building of this design and size is far more likely to be flats or bedsits which are completely out of keeping with the area
5. The developers agent in his covering letter refers to " proposed amendments to the Permitted Scheme". How can this be so if the original building has been demolished

Comments: 31st May 2017

I object to this update of the proposed development and my objection of 7th April 2017 stands.

In addition

This site has been a building site for in excess of 5 years and a completed building built in line with approved planning permission is what is now required. Can the council appoint a building inspector to oversee the construction of the development is in line with the given permissions

Plan 21634/5 A does not accurately reflect the building as it is NOW . There are openings for further windows on the east elevation WHY as on plan 21634/4 A this is shown as a blank space what is the this area going to be?

Can a restriction be added to the planning approval that this building must be one residential unit and not a house of multiple occupancy?

2 The Grange
The Reddings
Cheltenham
GL51 6RL

Comments: 20th March 2017

Letter attached.

The Poplar
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RY

Comments: 5th June 2017

Letter attached.

Sycamore Lodge
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 9th April 2017

We wish to strongly object to this application. Having lived opposite this site for the last few years we are familiar with its history and progress, having seen the emergence of this structure on a daily basis.. There cannot be any doubt that this is an entirely new structure, including the apparent removal of all elements of the Hayloft and the addition of a basement. This factor alone should prevent this application from being granted. A review of the latest plans also reveals an enormous single dwelling which suggests that there are firm plans in place to apply for change of use or otherwise convert the property into flats or bedsits as soon as the dust has settled. This is an unwarranted intrusion into precious greenbelt land and would set a bad precedent indeed.

We also have concerns about the practical consequences of the development proceeding. In particular what regard has been had to the impact of a development of this size on the drainage/flooding potential or on traffic levels and safety bearing in mind the proximity of the site to existing driveways, a blind junction leading to Badgeworth Lane and the inevitable increase in traffic with the introduction of the BMW site and further anticipated expansion.

Overall a development of this significance, whether it will remain a single dwelling or be converted to flats/bed sits is entirely out of character with the rest of this semi-rural area with very limited infrastructure.

4 The Grange
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 31st May 2017

I object to the plans reference 14/02249/FUL for the following reasons:

1. Inappropriate dwellings for a green belt field.
2. 13 bedsits is totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

3. Increase in traffic and noise entering and leaving the property.
4. Increase in traffic down The Reddings, already dangerous levels of speeding traffic up and down the road. We were supposed to be getting traffic calming measures when Asda at Arle Court was built. They have never appeared, now the traffic levels and speeds are increasingly dangerous.
5. Drainage will be stretched beyond what it is able to cope with.
6. Dangerous junction will be even more dangerous with the increase of traffic to and from the site.
7. If this is allowed to go through further building on green belt land will no doubt follow, as it will change the character of the area.
8. The illegal destruction of the original character building on the site.
9. Further unauthorised building work on the site.
10. Hard paving for car parking will increase the surface water and possible risk of flooding.
11. Under the radar building approach to getting approval. What have they got to hide why keep changing the plans? Their disregard of the law so far should not be allowed to go unchallenged.
12. Destruction of important wildlife habitat.
13. Lack of respect of local residence who have chosen to live in this semi-rural location.

Woodways
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 9th April 2017

I wish to register my objection to the above planning application on the following grounds.

In essence:

- The real fear by residents that the final building will not be as per this application.
- The present sewage drainage problem will be increased.
- The flat roof will become a balcony.

Many residents believe that, once the building is erected, the internal layout will be altered and it will become a multi-dwelling property. Many of the rooms are large and excessive, making it by far the largest dwelling in the area and not in keeping.

There are no answers to the important questions regarding the disposal of foul sewage. If the intention is to connect to the existing drainage system, the present problem for residents of backfilling during heavy rain, will only be exacerbated. Severn Trent are acutely aware of this issue. It is a major concern that on the application form under the heading 'Foul Sewage', the disposal of said sewage has not even been considered by the developer. In the past the ancient ditches on the site helped with the drainage of the area. However, these ditches were filled in by the workmen on the site, creating added problems for us all.

The original application put a restriction on the use of the roof area for any other purpose, unless further planning permission was sought. The creation of a balcony or roof garden will mean that neighbouring houses will lose their privacy.

I feel the developer is trying to hoodwink the planning committee by using the latest application as a way to get a building on the site which will later be converted, making the large rooms into bed-sits or small flats.

Parts of the original house have been demolished by the developer without permission. Is the planning committee going to ignore developers who flout the rules? This constitutes a new build.

I believe the planning committee should make a stand and impose a restriction which does not allow any further changes to the property.

Stanhope
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RL

Comments: 9th April 2017

I wish to register my objection to the above application on the following grounds:

- Foul sewage and flooding: The application does not describe the impact of the new build on foul sewage services. Local residents already experience problems with foul sewage system, and with drainage. Experience of many local residents is that foul sewage is over capacity. A building of that size will clearly create considerable demand on the foul sewage system, and so it is not appropriate for this application to proceed in its current state, without discussing impact on services.
- The developers have, in the past, not been able to describe a plan for the building they wish to build. Numerous applications have been needed to get to this point, and the current building-in-progress is not consistent with previous applications (hence a retrospective planning application). The application should not proceed until the planning authority have worked out how to get the developers to describe what will actually get built.
- Unrealistically large rooms hints that this is a not a real plan, and is just being used to justify keeping what has been built, as a form of development-by-stealth. Development-by-stealth hurts the local community, because planning factors such as draining, foul-sewage and access cannot be properly taken into account in the planning process. The planning authority has a duty to local residents to ensure that a realistic plan is made available for inspection, so that local residents can understand the full impact of the new build.
- The property would appear unrealistically large to fit in with the local area: 4000 sq. ft. by my reckoning of the plans.
- Rooms are unrealistically large, e.g. 3m x 3m cloak room, and the energy efficiency of the property will be extremely poor.

3, FAIRHAVEN PARK,

THE REDDINGS

Re: "The Haystack/Orchard area"

CHELTENHAM

92 51 6RW

19.3.17

Dear Sir,

Regarding 'The Haystack'; 'the Reddings',
it is with some concern I learn that this
site may, at some time, be included in the
urban area of Cheltenham.

As I understand, this property has been
the subject of several planning proposals,
and building alterations which do not always
bear a resemblance, and that the 'site'
cannot now be returned to its original appearance.

As such, it is worrying what final appearance
and usage will result, and that this could
lead to further urban dwelling development,
possibly encroaching on green belt.

Please tread with care and consideration
for this rural area and its residents, both
human and wild.

Yours faithfully



2, The Grange,
The Reddings,
Clattenham

Re: The Hayloft - The Reddings GL51 6RL.
16-3-17.

Dear Sir/Madam

It has been brought to our attention that The Hayloft ^{site} could be included in the Clattenham urban area.

As long term residents of The Reddings (over 30 years) this has always been a semi-rural area. Over the years there has been a lot of damage done to our area, but in recent times in a very surreptitious way.

It is a disgrace that these builders are allowed to ride rough shod over everyone in their efforts to get their way. Now it appears that they are attempting to get in by the back door. They should not be allowed to get away with it.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

To Tracey Beavis & Martin Levick, Planning Officers

THE HAYBOFT, THE REDDINGS, GL51 6RL PLANNING

We would ^{like to} ~~you~~ ~~reading~~ the points we make showing our objections/concern to the above development.

* Total overall area built has no bearing on original footprint - building by stealth.

* 31 bedsits (not high end apartments) would mean many vehicles. Is the access route now on the adjacent field to be given permanent status for parking? Road junction & bus stop suggests safety risk.

* Freedom of Information. Letters from the Council to neighbours over last 5/7 yrs have been spasmodic. Decisions made & retrospective planning over the years have been made - by whom? Could we be informed directly of any updates please.

Much appreciated.

[Redacted]
The Poplar (opposite site)

* N.B. When developer first took over the original "farm gate" entrance leading to the field adjacent, things were altered. Widening this access point, they filled in ancient working ditches either side. The High Water Table in this area leaves real, already proved, flooding risk.

* The fact that some neighbours have been approached directly by builder to request "approval" so that the roof can go on before bad weather has only emphasised our real objections.

* Acknowledgement of this letter & addressing some of these issues would be much appreciated.

