

<b>APPLICATION NO: 19/00431/FUL</b>		<b>OFFICER:</b> Mr Joe Seymour / Mr Craig Hemphill	
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 6th March 2019		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 5th June 2019	
<b>WARD:</b> Hesters Way		<b>PARISH:</b>	
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Cheltenham Borough Homes		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Monkscroft Villas, Princess Elizabeth Way, Cheltenham		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site to provide a four storey block of flats comprising 18no. 1 bed & 9no. 2 bed units. Along with 2no. 2 bed semi-detached houses with ancillary car parking, cycle/bin stores and associated landscaping. Alterations to existing pedestrian and vehicle access.		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>4</b>
Number of objections	<b>3</b>
Number of representations	<b>1</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

33 Pinewood Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0GH

### Comments: 28th March 2019

1. The proposed development of 27 apartments by reason of its current four storeys design, size, depth, width; height and massing (as apposed to the existing detached two-storey terrace of three houses) would have an overbearing and unacceptable loss of privacy on our property.
2. The proposed development of 27 apartments by reason of its current four storey design, size, depth, width, height and massing will have a greater detrimental and long standing impact on the loss of natural light against our property (as well as neighbouring properties adjoining the proposed development) throughout the year. We therefore request an independent survey to be undertaken on all the properties effected and not rely on the overshadowing exercise undertaken using 3D modelling software (pg 22 of the D&A Statement Monkscroft) which does account of the fact that daylight hours start earlier in the morning and that by definition the natural loss of light due to overshadowing will be far greater than what is currently stated and indicated. The Overshadowing exercise undertaken using 3D computer modelling should have (by comparison) been reflective against the existing properties and its current impact on the adjoining properties.
3. The proposed development of 27 apartments by reason of its current four storey design, size, depth, width, height and massing will have a long standing and detrimental impact on light pollution at night due to the increase of lighting to support access amenity and building security illumination.
4. The proposed landscaping in its current design proposal does not offer any natural security (i.e. thorn bushes, or, bramble bushes to which the previous tenants upheld and controlled) against our property. In fact, the proposed location of the Two Tier Cycle Store (for 40 bikes) as well as a Refuse Store will provide easy access into our property as well as that of the neighbouring properties that adjoin the 'Site' boundary.

5. We believe that the proposed 19 car allocation of spaces against a development of 27 apartments is not only insufficient, but seriously underestimated, and will by design, lead to an immediate and detrimental impact on road traffic and highway safety along Princess Elizabeth Way as well as on Pinewood Drive by way of additional overflow parking.

Therefore, we ask that Cheltenham Borough Council refuse this Planning Application in its current design, and a smaller, less intrusive design that is more in keeping with character of this area be put forward for planning approval.

54 Pinewood Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0GH

**Comments:** 22nd March 2019

Following the issues with the construction of the GCHQ car park and considering the proximity to residential properties, should this application be passed it should be subject to a clear construction method statement which includes:

- 1) Sound proofing boundary between the construction site and the neighbouring properties. No construction must be permitted to start until this is in place.
- 2) Clear definition of approved working hours. I would suggest 0800-1800 Mon-Fri, 0800-1300 Saturday and no working permitted on Sundays.

Also as mentioned in the other comments, a clear undertaking from CBH to manage car use and parking so as not to impact on Pinewood Drive which already has significant issues which cannot be managed by CBC or GCC until the road is adopted.

22 Pinewood Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0GH

**Comments:** 11th March 2019

This development will be a eye sore and also cause the worsening of the parking situation on Pinewood Drive as the current designs does not provide enough parking for the number of flats even if everyone only had 1 car.

The unoccupied buildings currently have less of a effect on house prices than this development would do.

33 Pinewood Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0GH

**Comments:** 9th May 2019

All of the comments below relate to the revised drawing and submission (date Published: - 03 May 2019) of the Revised proposed elevations (Design Drawing Ref - 170980-1500-P04-Proposed Elevations:-

1. West Elevation 3 storey + roof terrace (rear facing) - overall height and mass of the structure, albeit revised, continues to remain an overwhelming visual impact from our property with considerable reduction in the amount of visible sky.
2. West Elevation 3 storey + roof terrace (rear facing) - again, due to the overall height and mass of the structure, there continues to remain a substantial loss of light (both sunlight and natural daylight) to our property which has not been addressed.
3. West Elevation 3 storey + roof terrace (rear facing) - there are a mix of windows (12 inc. patio door) all of which open (regardless of the type of glass used) and directly overlook our property.
4. West Elevation 3 storey + roof terrace (rear facing) - loss of privacy in both our garden and home by going from a terraced row of 2 storey properties to a 3 (plus roof terrace) / 4 storey block of 27 flats. The impact of this simply cannot be quantified.
5. West Elevation 3 storey + roof terrace (rear facing) - communal roof terrace (4th storey). In effect, this is a glass greenhouse open to everyone to look into our garden and home (along with neighbouring properties) with total disregard for our (and that of our neighbours) privacy. In addition, the design remains as the original submission in terms of height.
6. Design ref: 170989-1510-P04-Proposed Section A-A\_B-B &C-C.

Drawing Design 1 Proposed Section A-A Scale 1:200. The stated numerical distance of 17325 (from The Existing House to the Proposed Flats) is in conflict with the Design ref: 170989-1602-None-Proposed Site Distance Plan stating the line distances of 17650 (nearest point of Existing House to Proposed Flats). We also contend and contest that the proposed distance stated as 21660 should also be checked and validated as being correct. These 2 points are paramount considering the variation in natural landfall at this end of the site.

In summary, whilst we acknowledge that minimal revisions to the original submission have been produced, this does not go far enough in addressing the monumental impact this development will have. Our property is located at the narrowest and lowest lying land point of the proposed site development, and as a result we therefore suffer greatest by this development. We cannot stress highly enough the impact of this immense structure within metres of our boundary will have on privacy, light, noise and visual impact. We therefore continue to uphold our original position and seek from the Cheltenham Borough Council the refusal of this revised Planning Application in its current design and format and that a smaller, less intrusive design more in keeping with the character of the area be put forward for consideration.