

<b>APPLICATION NO: 17/00934/FUL</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mr Gary Dickens</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 13th May 2017		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 8th July 2017
<b>WARD:</b> Park		<b>PARISH:</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Francis Russell	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Taychreggan, 7 Tryes Road, Cheltenham	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Side extension and two storey rear, stepped extension with internal alterations. Removal of existing garage	

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>3</b>
Number of objections	<b>3</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

9 Tryes Road  
Cheltenham  
GL50 2HB

### Comments: 7th June 2017

We are writing in connection with the above planning application. We are the immediate neighbour of the semi-detached property in question, linked via the common party wall. We have examined the plans and know the site well. We wish to strongly object to this application, which we believe will have a serious impact upon us for the following reasons:

#### (a) Loss of Light/Overshadowing

- The proposed development has the impact of blocking daylight to our neighbouring windows to an unacceptable degree.
- We do not believe that the proposed extension is in compliance with the 45° principle; (Refer Local Development Framework: Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Alterations and Extensions, Adopted February 2009); which ensures adequate daylight to neighbours windows, and prevents excessive overshadowing of the original buildings.
- The proposed extension is of such a large size that it would make the rear facing rooms in our house, particularly on the group floor, excessively deep, thereby reducing daylight to unacceptable levels.

#### (b) Overlooking/loss of Privacy

- The size and height of the proposed extension will overlook our property, leading to a loss of privacy and impacting our peaceful enjoyment of our home and garden.
- Private areas of our garden would become severely overlooked from the development resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy.
- We believe that a development of this size will have a dominating impact upon us. The primary amenity area of our garden would become enclosed by two storey walls, thereby feeling oppressive, uninviting and claustrophobic.
- The mass, bulk and proximity of the rear elevation will result in a poor outlook from our habitable accommodation.

#### (c) Effect on the character and appearance of a Conservation Area

- By virtue of its size, design, and the materials used we do not believe that the proposed development preserves or respects the character and appearance of either the original 1930's style semi-detached house, or of the Conservation Area in which it is situated.

- The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, would have a dominating impact on the scale of the original dwelling - the extension is more than half the size of the original building and will be thereby visually overbearing, and will dominate rather than support the original structure.
- All of the existing rear extensions on this side of Tryes Road are single storey in nature, have been designed in a similar manner to the original buildings, and use traditional materials similar to those of the original structures. In contrast the proposed extension consists of two storeys, and incorporates zinc cladding which will be particularly out of character, matching neither the colour nor the texture of the original building.
- The building will no longer be in proportion to the existing garden space, which has already been significantly reduced following an earlier sale of a substantial portion.

(d) Inaccuracies within the application documents

- There were a number of inaccuracies in the original documents submitted that appear to have been corrected in a revision dated 2 June, most significantly that the original location plan was incorrect in that
  - It did not reflect the sale of a substantial proportion of the original garden to a third party, and,
  - The development on the location plan was shown to be smaller than the dimensions implied by other drawings.
- We would like to point out that these changes have been made after we advised the council of these errors, and therefore believe that it would be appropriate for the council to confirm in writing that the drawings have been checked and are accurate before a decision is made.
- We would also like to request that in light of the above changes the council ensure that any relevant parties have been specifically informed that the plans in question have been changed.

(e) Other

- We would ask that the council prohibit any future construction of a balcony to the first floor without a further planning application being submitted and approved.
- The proposed work impacts, and takes place within 3m of the party wall, therefore we would expect the terms of the Party Wall act to be applied.
- We note that the proposed relocation of the kitchen to the front of the property would appear to entail demolition of the existing chimney breast. This is of great concern to us due to the potential impact upon the structural integrity of the overall property. We would note that the fireplace on our side of the party wall is in regular use, and care should therefore be taken to ensure that this can continue to be the case. We would request that an appropriate method is used to support the remaining chimney stack that does not impact upon our element of the remaining chimney breast or stack.
- We believe that an existing sewer that runs between the properties will now run underneath the development. We would therefore ask that care is taken to ensure that the sewer is maintained in good condition, and that future access is not adversely impacted by the proposed build.
- We would like to request that, should the application be approved, the council consider enforcing controlled hours of work and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable for local residents. The proposed site is on a road where access for residents during daytime hours is already restrictive due to non-resident parking, therefore we would ask for consideration to be made as to how, when and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours.

Therefore in summary we would ask that this planning application is refused in its current form.

Should you require any additional information, clarification of any comments made, or would like to arrange a visit to our home to verify that these objections are valid, please do not hesitate to contact us.

If this application is to be determined by the planning committee, please take this as notice that we would like to speak at the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

**Comments:** 4th July 2017

Just a quick email to let you know that we have reviewed the revised plans re the above planning application, and whilst they would appear to represent an improvement on the original, we still have the same issues re the overbearing nature of the development by virtue of its size, the impact on our privacy, and the materials used on the first floor (i.e. the zinc cladding). These points are set out in our original response, therefore to avoid any confusion I haven't submitted anything further on the understanding that our original submission stands.

As noted previously should the application be called to committee we would very much appreciate the opportunity to address the meeting.

I would also like to thank everybody for their help through what for us is quite a stressful time.

Grasmere  
16 Tryes Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2HD

**Comments:** 7th June 2017

We would like to object to this application because we believe it will create a development that is completely out of context with adjacent properties due to its size and the surface finish proposed.

Tryes Road is a small community of 3-4 bedroom properties, built in 2 distinct phases, but around the same historic period. They all present a traditional 1930's style; bay fronted with a stucco style of rendered finish, small garages and extensions.

The proposed development will result in a building that will be significantly larger than its neighbours. The style of finish being proposed is also out of context; all of the other properties have a rendered finish that has either been painted or left natural. The introduction of a more contemporary finish will result in a building that stands out in a negative way from its neighbours.

We therefore believe that this application should be refused and the applicant requested to reconsider their design for one more in keeping with adjacent properties in both size and finish.

**Comments:** 28th June 2017

We are pleased to note that the applicant has reduced the overall size of the proposed development. However; we still believe that it remains large for the building and the external surface finish will give the impression of a shipping container bolted onto the rear of the property. We would not wish to prevent the applicant from carrying out works on their home, but we believe that this proposal would result in development out of context with the neighbourhood. We note that where surrounding properties have extended at first floor level it has been to the side rather than the rear.

30 Painswick Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2HA

**Comments:** 7th June 2017

I write as an individual who has viewed the application and looked at its impact on the applicant's immediate neighbour.

I consider that the proposal will seriously affect the amenity and privacy of the occupants of no. 7 Tryes Road: by reducing their daylight and sunlight to an unacceptable degree; and by creating a bulky, intrusive feature overlooking their garden, thereby much reducing the enjoyment of this space.

I hope the council will therefore either reject this application or require that it be modified so that it is less un-neighbourly.