

APPLICATION NO: 20/01599/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren	
DATE REGISTERED: 16th September 2020		DATE OF EXPIRY : 11th November 2020	
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Ms J Dodds		
LOCATION:	20 Southfield Rise, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire		
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a single storey and two storey rear extension. Extension to front dormer window and single storey front extension including porch (Revised submission to 20/00798/FUL)		

REPRESENTATIONS

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

18 Southfield Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LJ

Comments: 1st October 2020

We are objecting the the application on the following grounds

Overshadowing / loss of light to dining room extension - our single storey extension at the rear of the property is a dining / living room used throughout the year. It has a single set of patio doors at the back (facing east) and a large window on the side (facing south, towards the boundary with no. 20 and the proposed development - the view labelled 'side north' on the plans).

The proposed development fails the standard 25 degree light test for this south-facing window (windows directly facing developments) laid out in the Council's design principles designed to protect our right to daylight, based on the BRE guidance on site planning for daylight and sunlight.

This south facing window is the primary source of outside light for this room. The proposed development would have a significantly adverse impact on the light into this window and hence this room (significantly reducing daylight throughout the year, casting a shadow over the window in months when the sun is lower). This room currently requires little artificial light or heat for large parts of the day - the proposal would seriously impact this.

Overshadowing / loss of light into the east-facing living room window

Our ground floor window faces east and provides light into the main living room. The proposed single storey extension on the boundary would not comply with the 45 degree guidelines (BRE guidelines) used by the Council from a plan perspective from this window and it is not clear to us that it complies with the 45 degree guidelines from an

elevation perspective. Once again, this would result in a significant loss of light into a main living room with similar impacts as in the dining room.

Impact of proposal on character of the immediate surroundings - we feel that the scale of the proposed development (including the large first floor extension with a near full-height pitched roof) will dominate the surroundings and have a significant impact on our levels of amenity at the rear of our property. The length of our garden is relatively modest which means that the scale of development would be very significant. These impacts would be exacerbated by this being directly on the boundary between our 2 semi-detached properties to the south side of our property, the pre-dominant direction from which light comes.

Whilst these proposals differ from a previous application, it doesn't change the potential impacts on our rights to light and amenity as described above.

There seems to be a misunderstanding in the application about the role and importance of the south facing window to the dining room extension (not referenced in the drawings). As described above, this window is crucial to the use of the dining room extension. This was clearly confirmed in the original refusal to application no. 20/00798/FUL which stated that it is '...an existing side, south facing window which serves a habitable room... there would be a loss of outlook for occupiers using this room due to it being built in such close proximity'.

The photos that we've submitted clearly show the importance of the south-facing window to the light available in the dining room.

On this site, plot size and layout orientation, this proposal would have both a severely adverse impact on our ability to enjoy our property and would dominate the local outlook from the rear of our property and our garden.

Overall, there would be an unacceptable loss of light to our dining room and a loss of outlook for us in that room due to the development being in such close proximity. This amounts to a failure to maintain a high standard of amenity for us. The outlook from the living room would also be compromised.

In summary, we feel that this proposal contravenes Local Plan Policy Guidance by failing to maintain a high standard of amenity for the neighbouring property, the same reason that the original application was refused.

We are happy to provide additional information / photos as required or be able to arrange a visit to the site should this be useful.

19 Southfield Approach
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LN

Comments: 1st October 2020

The amended plans do not address the problem of our lack of privacy.

For the following reasons:-

1. The large first floor window directly removes our privacy.
2. The first floor window does not have obscure glass.
3. The depth of the extension has not been reduced very much.
4. The depth of remaining garden will be less than 10 metres from our boundary.

I have already supplied photographs supporting my previous complaint (20/00798/FUL).