

APPLICATION NO: 18/01796/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Joe Seymour	
DATE REGISTERED: 7th September 2018		DATE OF EXPIRY : 2nd November 2018	
WARD: Oakley Ward		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Matthews City and Country Estates		
LOCATION:	61 Whaddon Road, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 6 no. apartments		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	3
Number of objections	3
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

92 Whaddon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5NF

Comments: 1st October 2018

Serious concerns with regards to adding more people to a smaller area. Parking provisions - although there will be ?4 spaces available, this does not take into account that in some cases residents may have more than one car. As a resident that lives directly opposite this development I am concerned that I will be unable to access my property efficiently should more cars begin to populate the area, we already have enough of this problem with users of the businesses a few doors down.

88 Whaddon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5NF

Comments: 3rd October 2018

I live at 88 Whaddon Road and wish to make an objection to the planning application 18/01796/FUL 61 Whaddon road.

I object for the following reasons:

- 1 - Parking
- 2 - Noise and nuisance
- 3 - Street scene
- 4 - Overdevelopment

Parking

It is proposed there will be 6 flats, 4 with parking spaces within 61 whaddon road, with another 2 spaces on adjoining land in robbins close. Im concerned there will be problems with parking and cars parking on the street. Firstly, the application does not provide any details as to the agreement with the adjoining land owners regarding the two additional parking spaces, and this may not be a long term arrangement. If the land is not being purchased from the adjoining land

owner, there is a risk the agreement could be terminated, particularly if the agreement is by way of licence. Even if the agreement is by lease, this could, of course, be terminated in the event of breach. This would, therefore, reduce the number of parking spaces to 4 between 6 flats.

Additionally, the application pre-supposes, that each flat will be occupied by one person and/or that there will be one vehicle per flat. The number of occupants and vehicles per flat cannot be guaranteed, and it would create parking issues if there is more than one vehicle per flat.

There are already issues with parking in the area, as a result of the lack of parking and those occupants parking on the street and visitors in nearby shops which affects the free movement of traffic and causes congestion.

Noise and Nuisance

It is proposed that these flats are built next to an existing development, of 16 flats. There are lots of noise issues from the existing flats, with noise and anti social behaviour in the early hours of the morning. Building additional flats next to an existing block of noisy and problematic flats will compound and exacerbate the existing noise and nuisance problems.

Street Scene

The application states that the proposed construction materials will be comparable to materials used on other properties located on Whaddon Road. I consider this to be inaccurate. The vast majority of properties in the immediate vicinity on Whaddon Road, are older properties dating back to early 1900s. The one exception to this in the immediate vicinity, is the block of 16 flats next to the site in question. Whilst the proposed construction is in keeping with the adjacent block of flats, it will further diminish the historic character of the local area in Whaddon Road.

Overdevelopment

The erection of 6 one bedroom flats will result in an overdevelopment of the area. Whilst it is proposed they will be one bedroom flats, it is entirely realistic that there could be 12 occupants and 12 cars. It is noted that an application for the erection of 4 one bedroom flats and a bungalow, was refused as the site was not considered to be of sufficient size to sustain both the buildings proposed and car parking. As to the current application, the same number of bedrooms is being proposed as in the application that was refused. There is a scant lack of detail as to the arrangements with the adjoining land owner, and the proposed development site. This may not therefore be any bigger than when the 2006 application was refused on the basis of size and over development.

10 Bafford Approach
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9HP

Comments: 18th November 2018

The initial reaction from Cheltenham Tree Group was that the proposal meant that the trees were so close to the building that they would inevitably be lost through a combination of the initial work demolishing the bungalow, creating the foundations and building the proposed six flats.

At least two of these trees are fine mature specimens.

We then worked through the developers' various plans and their proposed modifications. It did not appear from the drawing that the canopy would in fact be as unaffected as was claimed. The middle tree would seem to be the one most at risk.

We assume that the concrete pillars and beam system for the foundations is generally recognised as an effective means of solving the question of intrusive roots. It looked to us as if the light deprivation issue for the side of the building closest to the trees had not been totally solved as there were still some windows facing the trees and we wondered whether the height of the building would be such that it would shade out part of the canopy as we did not know the projected height of the building.

However the big issue to us is that so much depends on the plans being carried out meticulously. We would question whether parts of the demolition of the bungalow and the insertion of the foundations would actually all be carried out by hand as proposed to avoid root severance using the pull back and soft system as promised, given that the roots are likely to be so near the surface. It is unclear to us how a building of this size can be built without consequential compaction when the machinery required would be so close to the trees.

The problem to us is that it is so difficult to remedy the situation once a tree has been lost despite its TPO. We assume there no means of making it financially too expensive for a developer to run the risk. We would therefore totally support the trees having TPOs on them but have grave doubts about their survival with the plans as they are proposed.