

APPLICATION NO: 18/00934/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Ben Hawkes
DATE REGISTERED: 14th May 2018		DATE OF EXPIRY : 9th July 2018
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH: CHARLK
APPLICANT:	Mr Chris Gough	
LOCATION:	68 Sandy Lane, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	First floor front extension, single storey extension to the rear of the garage, first floor side extension, application of render and timber cladding and replacement windows and doors (revised scheme to previously approved application ref. 17/01984/FUL, changes to include an increase in the overall height of the first floor addition by approx. 400mm, removal of fascia/guttering detail and removal of first floor side elevation cladding) Part-retrospective.	

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	7
Number of objections	5
Number of representations	2
Number of supporting	0

70 Sandy Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DH

Comments: 18th June 2018
Letter attached.

Comments: 18th June 2018
Letter attached.

70 Sandy Lane

Charlton Kings

GL53 9DH

Dear Councillor,

You will be visiting **68 Sandy Lane** for a site visit on Tuesday. We live at the neighbouring property and are most affected by this retrospective planning application. We have made formal representations objecting to the proposal along with 6 other residents, including the Parish Council. When visiting the site we would respectfully request that you give careful consideration to the following points:

Increase in height and massing. The top two courses of blockwork and coping stone adds 20 inches or 0.5m to the height to this already large extension. This can be best visualised by following the mortar line under these two courses and following it back to the existing eaves at the back of the building. This can be clearly viewed from the rear of No. 70. These two additional courses of blockwork do make a considerable difference to the overall size, appearance and impact of the extension.

Visual Impact: The plans provided do not accurately reflect the impact and massing this structure has on the surroundings. This can only be truly appreciated when standing in front of it from the highway. The resultant structure now completely over dominates the original building and is no longer subservient or in keeping with the surroundings. This is a prominent and attractive location enjoyed by many walkers and residents additionally.

Design: Attention should be given to the design of the enlarged structure, particularly where the flat roof and the existing pitched roof join. The 'box' now projects into the roofspace, through the eaves. The officer's report accepts that this relationship is '**awkward**'. The council's policy CP7 requires high standards of design, not 'awkward' ones. The scheme falls short of that requirement. The supplementary design guidance states that extensions should be **subservient** 'an extension should not dominate or detract from the original building, but play a supporting role'. If one stands in front of this building it is clear that the enlarged forward box extension is not 'subservient', so the policy requirement is clearly not met in this case. This point is not addressed in the report.

Loss of daylight: We would ask that you come into our property to assess the impact on the light entering our kitchen. It has only one direct light source through the side obscure glazed window. Light is also provided from 'through light' from the original breakfast room (currently being reconstructed). This would be 5-6m away from the top end of the kitchen. Officers initially reported this as a bathroom window; which it is not. The extra two courses of blockwork do have a further detrimental impact on light entering this room. A detailed light calculation has not been undertaken. Only a subjective assumption has been made. The policy requirement is to protect an 'existing amenity'. The increase in height detracts from that amenity, thus not meeting CP4's policy requirement.

Justification: The increase in height is described as an 'oversight'. However, in February, the applicant made a non-material minor amendment for changes to windows and other minor details. This demonstrates a clear understanding that consent is required for deviations from the approval. The majority of the structure is a balcony with a very generous internal height. Achieving consistent internal ceiling heights through to a balcony is not adequate justification to override compliance with adopted planning policy.

Conclusion: You will probably be advised that this addition in height is marginal. It is not. The additional two courses of blockwork change the design and appearance of the extension; pushing into the roof, breaking all normal design principles and causing additional impact to us, the only neighbours, as stated above. This is a fresh application and should be dealt with on its own merits and we consider the application to be in clear conflict with the council's adopted policies.

Yours sincerely



Your ref: 18/00934/FUL
Our ref: MD/sb

Date: 18/06/2018

Ms Tracey Crews
Cheltenham Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham
GL50 9SA

Dear Ms Crews

**PLANNING APPLICATION – 68 SANDY LANE, CHARLTON KINGS, CHELTENHAM, GL53 9DH
REFERENCE 18/00934/FUL**

I refer to the committee report which was published on your website at 5.00pm on Wednesday 13th June prior to the end of the stated consultation period. Subsequent updates were also uploaded on Friday, including a submission from the Parish Council.

It is quite clear the item needs to be deferred from the meeting on the 21st June for three substantive reasons:

1. The change in description.

Following our representations, the original consultation letter was re-issued dated 30th May for a period of 14 days seeking comments to be made 'no later than 13th June 2018'. The letter to residents and the website was uploaded with the amended description below:

"Single storey front extension, single storey extension to the rear of the garage, first floor side extension, application of render and timber cladding and replacement windows and doors (revised scheme to previously application ref. 17/01984/FUL, changes to include an increase in the overall height of the first-floor addition by approx. 400mm. removal of fascia/guttering detail and removal of the first-floor side elevation cladding (part retrospective)".

The description now within the committee report contains the following:

First floor front extension, single storey extension to the rear of the garage, first floor side extension, application of render and timber cladding and replacement windows and doors (revised scheme to previously approved application ref. 17/01984/FUL, changes to include an increase in the overall height of the first floor addition by approx. 400mm, removal of fascia/guttering detail and removal of first floor side elevation cladding) Part-retrospective.

Clearly there has been material change in the description of development which I made clear was in error in my earlier letter, yet this was not made as part of the consultation process. Therefore it must follow that you will consult on the amended description to ensure that it is accurate and that representations are made on the proper description.

25 Old Burlington Street, London W1S 3AN
T: 020 7493 3043 E: info@bidwells.co.uk W: bidwells.co.uk

2. The lack of clear drawings upon which members can base their decision.

The applicants have been very candid in their supplemental statement saying the current scheme does look “boxy” but the key phrase here is the following sentence which says “A 2d black and white drawing does not give a fair representation of the eventual look”. Unfortunately, that is all your members have to go by and it is not in my view acceptable to expect them to make decisions on drawings that do not give a “fair representation of the eventual look”. This is fair to both parties I would argue. This is particularly salient in this case where the scheme relies on the execution of the detail to be successful. If you proceed as is, you are asking members to approve a scheme without a clear representation of the final appearance.

I would strongly recommend that some form of visual is prepared and consulted on.

3. You have still not required the applicant to demonstrate compliance with the BRE guidelines as is required by the SPD (your para 6.18 and 6.19). This is a new application and your guidance requires clear evidence that there will be no adverse loss of sunlight and daylight. The fact that you did not comply with your own guidance with the previous application is not reason not to require it now.

I would be grateful if you would confirm by return that the application will be deferred to allow clear plans to be provided, further consultation on the correct description of development and for confirmation on the sunlight and daylight point which I mention in this and my earlier letter.

Yours sincerely



Head of Planning