

APPLICATION NO: 21/01591/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Claire Donnelly
DATE REGISTERED: 10th July 2021		DATE OF EXPIRY : 4th September 2021
WARD: College		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Mr M Rayner	
LOCATION:	52 Fairfield Parade, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire	
PROPOSAL:	Rear extensions and internal alterations	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	1
Number of objections	1
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

50 Fairfield Parade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PJ

Comments: 26th July 2021

Thank you for allowing us to make comments on the above planning application. We find ourselves in a difficult position in that we certainly don't want to object to the principle of the owners extending their property, for their enjoyment. Afterall, we have benefited from an extension ourselves when we purchased no.50. But equally, we have some genuine concerns which we would be grateful if you would take into account when considering the application. Our hope is that the plans can be amended accordingly, so that we can all continue to mutually enjoy living in this locality.

Our current position is that we don't object in principle to an extension at no.52, but we would like to place on record that we object to the current plans submitted. My comments are submitted through observations but equally in relation to the Local Development Framework (LDF) - SPD Residential Extensions and Alterations, adopted by the council in February 2008.

From the outset, I would like to state that the current proposed plans have not considered the impactful harm that will be created on the existing surrounding properties. This 3-storey conversion will become a dominant feature, which I would suggest is out of place in relation to the other houses, detracting from the character and good design currently in evidence across the boundaries of Fairfield Parade. Moreover, the protruding elevation is much longer than the other rear elevations in this neighbourhood. The design rather than being mindful of "good design" principles outlined in the LDF, contrasts with the surrounding properties in this historic part of Cheltenham. Put simply, the proposal is on a significant scale, squeezed in a protruding space to maximise the square footage for no.52. The plans appear to be principled on how much maximum space can be achieved, irrelevant on the harmful and visual impact, privacy, and amenity of other local houses but in particular, no. 50 whose partitioning boundary is a feature of these current designs.

I recognise although not the originator of our rear extension we do benefit from the additional space this provides at the rear of the house. However, the aesthetics of the extension reflects the character of an historical Edwardian house. In other words, our extension is in keeping with the character of our house and is sympathetic to the character of the surrounding properties. It

complements and respects neighbouring development and the character of the other local properties. This is in complete contrast to the current proposals for no. 52. The proposal will without doubt alter and impact on the character of the immediate surroundings. The surrounding houses all have 1 or 2 storey extensions with loft conversions. I cannot identify a property out of character with the others including the existing elevation for no.52 which includes a kitchen extension and loft conversion. There is an established pattern of good design that is evidently a feature of previous planning applications. This plan is in complete contrast in design and scale to any extension that have previously been undertaken in nearby properties.

We have made alterations to the rear of the house including a raised decking that extends the kitchen via bi—folding doors to create an additional "room" adjoining the kitchen. The proposal for no.52, will protrude so far along the boundary between both properties that the current decking will be excluded from light and the outdoor dining area will be dominated by a 7ft wall significantly altering the open space we currently enjoy. Moreover, the rear of the house is North facing. We accepted this when purchasing the house as the current natural light is adequate and does not affect the kitchen, albeit less so in the autumn and winter. Natural light as a consequent of these current designs will be reduced significantly and will alter the amount of light in the rear kitchen immeasurably for all seasons. I believe this will be potentially a consideration for future purchasers of no. 50 and consequently may impact on the value of our property. The decking is a feature of the house that we use in all seasons and will become an area we no longer will be able to enjoy. This is also an unacceptable erosion of the open space around the existing building as set out in the LDF, 02/08 on p.2.

I am unable to view one of the current elevations on the west side based on the plans submitted to Cheltenham Borough Council. The west side will dominate our view from the rear of the garden where the garden design has a seated area looking towards no.52. I question why such important visual evidence has not been included and formally request that the current planning application is suspended until those designs are submitted in the application. There is a gap between our boundary and the proposed second storey which would suggest a further loss of privacy. The west elevation may include windows but currently we are unable to identify and comment on this. I would argue that there would be due prejudice to give these plans the go ahead with crucial missing information.

In summary the current design of the proposed extension particularly the extended rear boundary is simply too large for the site and will deprive no.50 and 54 of significant daylight and is an unacceptable erosion of the open space around the existing building. The designs are out of character with neighbouring development and will alter the character of the locality. The plans will significantly alter the character of no.50. As referenced in the LDF as best practice, I would query the extent that the architect has stood back to look at the plans in relation to no.50 and how these alterations will be viewed by ourselves. The LDF outlines this as an important feature for attached neighbours.

Our request of Cheltenham Borough Council is as follows:

- I. The design of the extension be in keeping with the surrounding properties, respecting the scale and massing. At present we would suggest this isn't achieved.
- II. Any extension does not extend beyond our own, respecting the uniformity of the locality, and is set back from the boundary so the footings do not need to go on our land. To do so would need a party wall agreement and cause damage to our decking which I am sure you would appreciate, we would not find acceptable.

We hope that after reading this letter you understand that our concerns are based on the rationale, the principles and spirit set out in the LDF "good design and good community spirit."

Finally, I would be grateful if you could advise us of the date of the committee meeting as it would be helpful if we are able to address the planning committee directly.

Comments: 10th September 2021

Thank you for allowing us to make further comments on the above revised planning application. Although we acknowledge and welcome the modest changes to these revised plans, we continue to find ourselves in opposition not to the principle of the extension, but in our view, the proposals continue to have a negative impact on the surrounding area and significantly on No. 50, our home. For the benefit of all, could we please ask that further, modest changes be made as detailed below.

Having read the Local Development Framework (LDF) - SPD Residential Extensions and Alterations, adopted by the Council in February 2008 again, I would respectfully ask the Officers and Members whether the revised proposals are a significant enough alteration in the spirit of the principles set out in the LDF?

I would like to state that the revised plans do not address the impactful harm that will be created on the existing surrounding properties. Although I welcome the change from a 3 to 2 storey conversion, this remains a dominant feature, which I assert is out of place in relation to the other houses, detracting from the character and good design currently in evidence across the boundaries of Fairfield Parade. The scale of the extension in our view is not proportionate in relation to modest scale of the original building. In essence, the current plans would nearly double the living space and is not in keeping with similar extensions in the locality of Fairfield Parade. As I view the neighbouring houses to the left and right, this proposal remains out of character in terms of scale and design. The extension remains out of context, is too great in scale and would not add to the beautiful townscape that is Cheltenham.

Moreover, the protruding elevation remains much longer than the other rear elevations in this neighbourhood. The proposal remains on a significant scale, squeezed in a protruding space to maximise the square footage for no.52. Our main concern is that no.50 whose partitioning boundary is a feature of these current designs will be dominated by these plans that remain in place. The second storey protrudes 0.6m beyond our rear boundary and will therefore impact significantly on the amount of light available in the garden during the day.

We stated in our previous objection how we have made alterations to the rear of the house including a raised decking that extends the kitchen via bi—folding doors to create an additional "room" adjoining the kitchen. Again, I welcome the reduction in height by 350mm of the single storey extension. However, the revised proposal for no.52, will continue to protrude over 2.3 metres along the boundary between both properties (over 3 metres when the bi—folding doors in this plan are retracted) so that the current decking will be excluded from substantial light and the outdoor dining area will be dominated by the 2.64m wall significantly altering the open space we currently enjoy. I have attached 3 photographs to illustrate the significant change in our living arrangements because of the revised plan. One photograph illustrates how the right hand bifold door will be excluded from significant light and create a permanent light exclusion on the right panel. In addition, this will further impact on the quality of light in our kitchen space, and open plan downstairs living area.

Although I recognise that a 45-degree light test has been employed this is a formula that doesn't involve any physical observation from the rear of no.50. I believe that if Officers or Members can view the attached photographs and therefore place themselves at the rear of the property then they will understand that despite the amendments, the impact of this extension remains significant. I would like to convey that the outdoor living space is frequently used in all seasons. Therefore, I would like to implore both Officers and Members that a further revised plan is considered that is in parallel to the rear of no.50. I feel that this is a modest request that will have an immense positive impact on our wellbeing. I believe this will allow our neighbours to maintain a significant floor space for their extension. I do recognise that wellbeing is not a planning consideration, but there is a human side to development, and I do believe that this discreet change will not only meet technical requirements, not be of detriment to the applicant and have major positive benefits to our family and our enjoyment of our home.

Please note that I continue to be unable to view one of the current elevations on the west side based on the plans submitted to Cheltenham Borough Council. I remain concerned that there are unexplained plans in relation to this proposal and I would respectfully request a rationale for why this is not a requirement. Moreover, the revised plans do not show a site plan with bird's eye view. I remain concerned why such important visual evidence has not been included and therefore gives only a partial understanding of the plans provided, leaving us uninformed and at a disadvantage.

Our modest and limited request of Cheltenham Borough Council is as follows:

I. The design of the extension be altered further in keeping with the surrounding properties, respecting the scale and massing. At present we would suggest this has not been achieved.

II. As a minimum, the extension does not extend beyond our own, respecting the uniformity of the locality, and is set back from the boundary so the footings do not need to go on our land. This would cause significant and unnecessary disruption. We would like to reiterate that we view this as a modest request that will have an immeasurable positive benefit on aesthetics, our home and consequently our wellbeing. It will also allow our neighbours to benefit from an extension.

Finally, I look forward to the planning committee meeting on the 16 September where we would very much like to make further representations in person. Please can you clarify the time.

Comments: 10th September 2021
Photographs attached.

Comments: 8th October 2021

Thank you for allowing us to make further comments on the above planning application. Now I have received an additional drawing for the West elevation, I would like to make further objections in time for the planning committee on 14 October 2021. Our current position as outlined in letters on the 22 July and 9 September 2021 remains unchanged.

After visiting our property, I hope you have a better understanding of the impact the extension for no.52 will have in relation to the alterations we have made, including the raised decking that extends the kitchen via bi—folding doors to create an additional "room" adjoining the kitchen. Now that the measurements have been accurately calculated, it illustrates just how the proposal for no.52, will protrude so far along the boundary between both properties that the current decking will be excluded from light and the outdoor dining area will be dominated by a 7ft wall significantly altering the open space we currently enjoy. Moreover, the 450 light test which failed on the plan and just passed on the elevation view only goes to reinforce how the natural light as a consequent of these current designs will be reduced significantly and will alter the amount of light in the rear kitchen immeasurably for all seasons. In addition, we have an open plan house, and the light will be reduced though to the middle room. This supports my concern that this will be potentially a consideration for future purchasers of no. 50 and consequently may impact on the value of our property. As you will have established, the decking is a feature of the house that we use in all seasons and will become an area we no longer will be able to enjoy. This remains an unacceptable erosion of the open space around the existing building as set out in the LDF, 02/08 on p.2.

Thank you for sending me the revised plans for the West elevation - single storey. The submission of the West elevation single storey illustrates how the second storey protrudes beyond the rear boundary of our property at no.50. By moving this back a modest degree, I believe this will not impact on the design of bedroom 1 and the corridor leading to the staircase for the second floor at no.52. The owners will still benefit from a significant extension.

I am still unable to view the current elevation on the West side for the second storey based on the plans submitted to Cheltenham Borough Council. The West side will dominate our view from the

rear of the garden where the garden design has a seated area looking towards no.52. I remain concerned that such important visual evidence continues to not be included and respectfully request again that I have an oversight of this part of the design. You confirmed that this was an omission at the planning stage and yet there is only a partial resolution to this request. I hope you can appreciate, having now viewed both properties that there is a gap between our boundary and the proposed second storey which would suggest a further loss of privacy. The west elevation may include windows but currently we are unable to identify and comment on this or the materials that will be used. I would like to argue that there would be due prejudice to give these plans the go ahead as this agreed action has not been completely resolved.

Can I please emphasis that I am not trying to disrupt the planning process, but I am sure that you and the committee members will appreciate that I cannot make a fair objection in person on the 14 October, until I have had an opportunity to see the plans in their entirety. When we discussed this on the 5 October you stated that if the plans were not provided, then this hearing would be put back to the November planning committee. I apologise if when discussing this with you, I was not clear enough about what aspects of the West elevation I wanted to see.

In summary you asked that I make any further comments in writing by Friday 5 October 2021. As stated earlier, the current design of the proposed extension particularly the extended rear boundary is simply too large for the site and will deprive no.50 and 54 of significant daylight and is an unacceptable erosion of the open space around the existing building. The designs are out of character with neighbouring development and will alter the character of the locality. The plans will significantly alter the character of no.50. As referenced in the LDF as best practice, I would query the extent that the architect has stood back to look at the plans in relation to no.50 and how these alterations will be viewed by ourselves. The LDF outlines this as an important feature for attached neighbours.

Our request of Cheltenham Borough Council remains as follows:

- I. The design of the extension be in keeping with the surrounding properties, respecting the scale and massing. At present we would suggest this isn't achieved.
- II. Any extension does not extend beyond our own, respecting the uniformity of the locality, and is set back from the boundary so the footings do not need to go on our land. To do so would need a party wall agreement and cause damage to our decking which I am sure you would appreciate, we would not find acceptable.

We hope that after reading this letter and visiting the property you understand that our concerns continue to be based on the rationale, the principles and spirit set out in the LDF "good design and good community spirit."

Finally, I would be grateful if you would support us in being able to view the entire West elevation first and second storey by contacting the architects directly.







