

APPLICATION NO: 18/01620/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Gary Dickens	
DATE REGISTERED: 23rd August 2018		DATE OF EXPIRY : 18th October 2018	
WARD: Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Mr Remo Potente		
LOCATION:	Wellesbourne Oakfield Street Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Single storey rear extension (part retrospective)		

REPRESENTATIONS

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

Bevington
1 Oakfield Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UJ

Comments: 23rd August 2018
Letter attached.

Hanley Villa
Oakfield Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UJ

Comments: 10th September 2018

We are writing to object to the planning application, submitted retrospectively, for a rear extension to Wellesbourne, Oakfield Street.

Wellesbourne is semi-detached with our house and shares our northern boundary. On the other side of its lot, a passage-way separates Wellesbourne from 1 Oakfield Street.

Wellesbourne previously had a small extension that was in poor repair. We are not surprised that the new owner wanted to replace this, but we are shocked by the unneighbourly way in which he has approached this, and by the overwhelming impact of the new building.

The owner of Wellesbourne did not submit a planning application prior to starting work. His neighbours were not alerted to the nature of his plans prior to the work starting (he says he knocked on our door when we were on holiday). The speed with which the work took place, much of which happened while we and the neighbour at 1 Oakfield Street were on holiday, has meant that the main structural elements were erected before anyone had a chance to comment.

We consider this to be underhand behaviour, with the effect that there has been no opportunity to discuss the proposed design of the extension and to suggest alterations that would have less

impact on the neighbourhood. The owner of Wellesbourne also did not serve a Party Wall Notice, thus failing to give us the opportunity to review the proposals.

Oakfield Street is in a Conservation area, characterised by small lots with mainly terraced housing, separated at the rear by mature gardens. This distinctive character is threatened by the erection of large extensions which not only disrupt the appearance and scale of the existing buildings, but also impinge upon the gardens.

In our view, the extension at Wellesbourne has not been designed to "respect the character and scale of the existing buildings or group of buildings", as required by Paragraph 4.18 of the Local Plan. The new building extends across almost the entire width of the property, leaving only a small gap with the property wall to the north (adjoining 1 Oakfield Street). It also extends out considerably further than the previous extension. As a consequence, the area of garden has been considerably reduced; although not visible from the street, this has an impact on the overall character of the area and its enjoyment by its residents.

The height of the extension contributes to its overbearing effect. The height is at its maximum on our boundary because a parapet has been added to the roof line; the necessity for this is not clear from the plans submitted.

The impact of the height is keenly felt by the neighbour in 1 Oakfield Street since the extension casts significant shadow on her property, to a degree that will cause unacceptable harm to her enjoyment of her house and garden. The amenity value of her property is further damaged by the fact that the new side elevation, now significantly closer to the property line, has been designed with bifolding doors. It appears from the plans that the existing back door of Wellesbourne will be turned into a window, so it must be assumed that the bifold doors, either to the side or the rear, will be used as the new back door. With large bifold doors on both the side and rear extensions we can expect an increase in noise levels that could affect several neighbours, as well as a reduction in privacy for 1 Oakfield Street.

While recognising that there has been a shift in policy towards more leniency in approving proposals, we believe that this should be considered an important test case for the acceptable limits to development within a conservation area, and within a neighbourhood built to a scale where neighbours' use of their own property can have a significant impact on the amenity of others. We are aware that there has been significant turnover and 'improvement' of properties in Tivoli in recent years, some no doubt with a view to quick resale. We have also observed some common features to recent 'improvements' that constitute a shift in the character of the area; increases to floorspace don't just have a visual impact but also increase property prices and thus exclude less affluent households. It would be sad if a neighbourhood with such a special character was altered by builders who know that, by constructing too quickly for anyone to object, they will be allowed to push through developments that are out of keeping and affect the lives of their neighbours. And once a few are allowed to do this, we can only expect more to follow suit.

1 Oakfield Street
Cheltenham
GL50 2UJ

23 August 2018

Dear Sirs

Re. Planning Application 18/01620/FUL

I am writing to strongly object to the retrospective planning application at Wellesbourne, Oakfield Street on the following grounds.

1. Local Plan Policy CP7 requires development to be of a high standard of architectural design and complement and respect neighbouring development

Paragraph 4.18 of the Local Plan advises that '*Extensions to existing buildings need to be carefully designed to respect the character and scale of the existing building or group of buildings. The most important consideration is that an extension should not detract from the original*'. Further design guidance in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Alterations and Extensions (February 2008) advises one of the five basic design principles is that, '*an extension should not dominate or detract from the original building but play a supporting role*'.

The benefit of a retrospective planning application is that the design can now clearly be seen. The extension has an unacceptable level of overbearing and not in character with the surrounding area. It extends beyond the rear of the property by approximately 3.8m and measures almost the full width of the property. The plans submitted do not allow for the roof and the overhang which when taken into account increases the overall size and height to an unacceptable level. The side elevation extends beyond the rear of the property by approximately 4.3m. This is excessive, has an overbearing effect and dominates the original building. It is out of keeping with the scale and design of the original house and is harmful to its original character.

In addition, the side wall of the extension and roof overhang is not parallel to the original house and extends beyond the line of the neighbouring extension on the opposite side which conflicts with the submitted plans. It is also out of proportion to the attached neighbouring extension and unbalances the symmetry of the semi-detached properties.

Furthermore, the property is in a Conservation area. Whilst the extension may not be visible from the road, an extension of this size does not preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area.

2. Local Plan Policy CP4 refers to development not causing 'unacceptable harm to the amenity of adjoining land users'.

The extension has bifolding doors in the side elevation. The open plan nature of this design will mean that sound will carry a lot easier when the doors are open compared to a solid brick wall. This will result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance adversely affecting my property and amenities. There is less than 1m between the side elevation with the bifold doors and the seating area in my garden and approximately 3m to my kitchen window. The design, position and size of these doors also creates overlooking into all the rooms at the rear of my property. This will cause significant harm to the enjoyment and privacy of my garden and habitable rooms at the rear of my property.

This should be avoided by only placing doors in the rear wall of the extension in line with other extensions in the area.

Please see the attached photos in support of my objections.

Yours faithfully

