

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	4
Number of objections	3
Number of representations	1
Number of supporting	0

Bevington
1 Oakfield Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UJ

Comments: 23rd August 2018
Letter attached.

Comments: 15th October 2018

Further to my previous objections and the applicant's letter of 11 October 2018, CBC Enforcement Officer visited the site on 7 August 2018 and advised the applicant planning permission was required. An application was received on 8 August 2018 however, work did not cease at the point and did in fact continue at the property (including electrician, plasterer and roofing contractor) up until 31 August 2018 when the planning officer visited the site. Photograph evidence can be provided of this.

If the applicant did believe that the work was within permitted development, neighbours should have still been shown plans and been given the opportunity to discuss the design before the work commenced so that we can all continue to benefit from the invaluable accommodation and amenity the applicant refers to in his letter . Sadly, we were not afforded this opportunity.

Despite this, a gesture of goodwill was made to the applicant via the case officer to change the design but was refused.

My neighbours at Hanley Villa were not consulted about the work on the joint boundary wall and were only alerted when the applicants roofing contractors were on their roof on 13 August 2018 without permission removing their felt.

The other extensions referred to in the applicant's letter in the immediate vicinity, do not support the applicant's view and actually undermine it.

Comments: 10th November 2018

My understanding of the decision to defer at the last meeting was an 'olive branch' extended by Members to the applicant to listen to his neighbour concerns and reach some form of

compromise and reconciliation. I received one email, exacerbating the unneighbourliness of this retrospective application.

Sadly, rather than listening to our concerns and taking on board the comments of Members at the last meeting, the applicant has submitted a proposal which is not revised at all, other than with a condition that the bifold doors will not be opened. We would be naïve to believe that anyone who lives in that property, either now or in the future, will not want to open those doors or any windows. Our enforcement officers are already overstretched and it would be incredulous to expect them to police or enforce such a situation. History will only repeat itself again.

Therefore, my previous comments on this proposal still stand. I consider the nature of the development overbearing, the design intrusive, the overall height, overhang and thickness of the roof a detrimental impact and makes an already dense and compacted area more cramped.

The proposal of bifold doors fixed shut in a 3.5m side elevation a metre from the boundary is contrived and would significantly compromise the amenity of my property.

For all these reasons, the application should now be refused.

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.

Wellesbourne
Oakfield Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UJ

Comments: 12th October 2018
Letter attached.

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





Wellesbourne
Oakfield St
Cheltenham
GL50 2UJ

The Planning Team
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham
GL50 9SA

11th October 2018

Dear Mr Dickens,

Ref: Wellesbourne, Oakfield St – Proposed Rear Extension

Further to my application for part retrospective planning permission for my single storey extension I would like to make the following points;

1. I apologise for the premature commencement of building work. This was solely due to inaccurate advice and my mistaken belief that my extension comprised permitted development. As you will be aware, as soon as I was notified of the exemption from permitted development for properties in a conservation area, I ceased all work and submitted my application.
2. I have and continue to address my neighbours concerns regarding our joint boundary. The wall and roof were constructed in their present form to rectify what would have otherwise been a water ingress hazard. The parapet and roof have been designed to provide; i, structural integrity and a clear junction, ii, drainage and diversion of rainwater for both properties, iii, aesthetics and proportion.
3. I note that both objections oppose my application on the grounds of loss of amenity to 1 Oakfield Street due to alleged; i, loss of privacy and ii, noise and disturbance. In these respects the double glazing in the North and East elevation are more than compliant with FENSA acoustic and thermal specification and have a value of 1.4 UV. If I did not replace the previous elevation with the proposed extension there would have been no acoustic protection from the same area of external space.
4. With regard to the character of the conservation area, I am aware of numerous extensions similar to mine which provide invaluable accommodation and amenity. My extension is only as visible as my garden from the upper floor of a few neighbouring properties, not from the road. To the South, at Zlin House, there is a double extension. I am sure that I don't need to draw your attention to my neighbours extension to the South, nor the permission granted to my neighbour at 1 Oakfield Street (17/00790/FUL).

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

