

APPLICATION NO: 21/02330/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Claire Donnelly
DATE REGISTERED: 22nd October 2021		DATE OF EXPIRY : 17th December 2021
WARD: Leckhampton		PARISH: LECKH
APPLICANT:	Mr Phil Marsh	
LOCATION:	1 Halland Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire	
PROPOSAL:	Alterations and extensions (revised scheme to previously approved planning application ref. 20/01107/FUL)	

REPRESENTATIONS

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

2 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 10th November 2021

As the adjoining neighbour, I wish to strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons:

1) The proposed side and rear extension is a huge brick box tacked onto the side of a house that otherwise displays a wealth of architectural features. It does not fit with the distinctiveness, visual appeal and historic character of the house - which sits within a Conservation Area. In the existing plans which were approved in 2019, efforts were made to match the extension with the style of the main dwelling by employing pitched slate roofing and matching fascia boards on the front elevation. These new proposals have abandoned any effort to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the house or the neighbourhood. The Design and Access Statement asserts that the extension will use "decorative fascia (sic) boards which matches the existing and adjoining property to be in keeping with the road frontage and nearby properties". This appears to be untrue since there are no decorative fascia boards on the designs currently under consideration.

2) The intended front elevation is not in keeping with other domestic building extensions in the area. The arrangement of buildings in the neighbourhood preserves spacing between houses even when they are extended. The width of the proposed front elevation, with construction right up to the boundary with the neighbouring Richmond House, is oppressive and not in keeping with current patterns of construction in the Conservation Area.

3) The proposed site plan appears to show the extension projecting slightly beyond the current building line at the rear of the house - although the poor accuracy of the drawings makes this difficult to assess. If this is indeed the case then I believe it represents

overdevelopment that would damage the character of the neighbourhood and could set a precedent for other rear extensions in the area.

4) The height of the proposed rear extension is overbearing, dominates the existing property and is not in keeping with the Conservation Area. In order to build to this height 7 courses of bricks will be added to the top of a pitched roof at the rear of my house creating an ugly and oppressive expanse of wall overshadowing my property and garden.

5) The proposed elevations show 2 brick pillars atop the roof of the side extension. The purpose of these ugly constructions is unclear. If they are intended to add architectural detail then they do not match with the character of the existing house and do not fit with the nature of the Conservation Area. If they are intended to be used as chimneys (if not now then perhaps at some future time?) then I note that the property lies within Cheltenham Borough Council Smoke Control Zone, and I am concerned that given their low height smoke would blow onto my property.

6) The proposed rear elevation appears to show that the flat roof on the rear extension is so high that it will partially obstruct the 1st floor rear-facing window in the existing house. Any rear extension should not damage the existing symmetry of the 1st floor between number 1 Halland Road and my adjoining house.

7) The proposed floor plans show a 1st floor room at the rear of the house which can only be accessed from the kitchen below and does not appear to be a bedroom. Given that this room is adjacent to the Party Wall I am concerned that the intended usage of the space is unclear.

8) The Party Wall section detail shows a 50mm void between the Party Wall and a timber wall in the proposed rear extension. I am concerned that this void could be prone to dampness and subsequent damage to our Party Wall.

9) The Design and Access statement states that surface water will be discharged to soakaways in the rear garden. I am concerned that this does not mimic natural drainage patterns and will increase the risk of flooding to my property and others in the area.

10) The Design and Access statement states that "there (sic) development will be carried out in normal working areas (sic) to reduce any noise impact to neighbours and local area." This sentence does not make sense. Whilst these may be simple grammatical errors I believe they are indicative of a wider lack of thought, care and attention to detail in creating and presenting these plans.

Comments: 1st January 2022

As the adjoining neighbour, I wish to reiterate my objections to this amended planning application for the following reasons:

1) The planned rear extension remains an over-sized brick box tacked onto the side of a house that otherwise displays a wealth of architectural features. Whilst the pitched roof on the side extension is preferable to the previous design, the rear extension has not been reduced in height. On the front elevation this results in an ugly triangle which is visible at the end of the valley between the pitched roof of the side extension and the pitched roof above the porch. Given that the property is within a Conservation Area, the proposed design does not fit with the distinctiveness, visual appeal and historic character of the rest of the house or the neighbourhood.

2) The amended plans show no change to the width of the proposed side and rear extensions. The arrangement of buildings in the neighbourhood preserves spacing between houses even when they are extended. The width of the proposed extensions, with construction right up to the boundary with the neighbouring Richmond House, is oppressive and not in keeping with current patterns of construction in the Conservation Area.

3) No changes have been made to the height of the proposed rear extension. This results in an extension that will dominate the existing building and would not be in keeping with construction in a Conservation Area. In order to build to this height 7 courses of bricks will be added to the top of a pitched roof at the rear of my house creating an ugly and oppressive expanse of wall overshadowing my property and garden. In addition the drawings of the proposed rear elevation appear to show that the flat roof on the rear extension is so high that it will partially obstruct the 1st floor rear-facing window in the existing house. This will destroy the existing symmetry of the 1st floor between number 1 Halland Road and my adjoining house.

4) The proposed floor plans show a 1st floor room at the rear of the house which can only be accessed from the kitchen below and does not appear to be a bedroom. Given that this room is adjacent to the Party Wall I am concerned that the intended usage of the space is unclear.

5) The Party Wall section detail shows a 50mm void between the Party Wall and a timber wall in the proposed rear extension. I am concerned that this void could be prone to dampness and subsequent damage to our Party Wall.

6) The Design and Access statement states that surface water will be discharged to soakaways in the rear garden. A label stating 'New soakaway 5m from building' has been added to the amended site plan, presumably in an effort to allay these concerns. This is completely inadequate as it does not include the essential details about the location and form of this soakaway, which will presumably be expected to handle the large amount of water draining from the roof of the rear extension. I remain deeply concerned that this does not mimic natural drainage patterns and will increase the risk of flooding to my property and others in the area.

7) No effort has been made to amend the Design and Access statement, which still states that "there (sic) development will be carried out in normal working areas (sic) to reduce any noise impact to neighbours and local area." These mistakes remain indicative of the lack of thought, care and attention to detail in creating and presenting these plans.

Richmond House
Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 10th November 2021

We would like to formally submit our objections to revised plans for works at 1 Halland Road.

As neighbours to the property (Richmond House, Halland Road) the proposal will negatively impact our own property and quality of life.

The plans are a revision of already large-scale extension submitted Dec 2019. The deviation from the original planning document is significant and will impacts us in the following ways:

We believe the extension is overbearing to our property

- It would be dominant against our boundary, covering c.80% of our property
- The majority is built up against our boundary - this is not in keeping with the road. It also imposes on our property and impacts landscaping to the side of our house. The addition of a side return would reduce this impact
- The significantly increased height is overbearing along the full length of the extension facing our property. The "single story" would level with our 2nd floor windows.
- The projection at the rear goes beyond the natural flow of adjacent properties. It is imposing against our patio area and due to its excessive height, will block both light and air from the West, impacting our evenings

Further to the impact directly to our property, we believe the increased height isn't complimentary to the rest of the property and represents significant over development.

Finally, a point of clarification on the garage / proximity to our boundary. The revised drawings are difficult to interpret but show an unspecified gap between our boundary and garage. The current slab goes right against our boundary, can you confirm exactly what gap from our boundary to the extension is agreed please?

Comments: 3rd January 2022

We would like to formally reiterate our objections to further revised plans for works at 1 Halland Road. As neighbours to the property (Richmond House, Halland Road) the proposal will negatively impact our own property and quality of life.

The plans are a revision of already large-scale extension submitted Dec 2019. While the pitched roof for the front garage is a slight improvement of itself, it impacts the harmony of the building by showing the increased height of the rear extension in the "V" between the garage and entrance, which is visible from the street. This is not in keeping with the road and further highlights the original objections relating to the excessive height of the rear extension.

It does not appear that our other significant concerns have been considered by the revised plans, namely:

- The dominance next to our boundary and resulting appearance of being on top of our property is not in keeping with other extensions in the road
- There has been no attempt to include a side return (visible on all other properties) which would go some way to alleviating this
- There has been no change to the height and length of the proposed rear extension. Both of which are imposing to our property, blocking light and air. An extension inline with the previous rear wall / building (length & height) would be a vast improvement and maintain the visual appeal / conformity with the neighbour on the other side

We have repeated our original objections below for reference:

We believe the extension is overbearing to our property

- It would be dominant against our boundary, covering c.80% of our property
- The majority is built up against our boundary - this is not in keeping with the road. It also imposes on our property and impacts landscaping to the side of our house. The addition of a side return would reduce this impact
- The significantly increased height is overbearing along the full length of the extension facing our property. The "single story" would level with our 2nd floor windows.
- The projection at the rear goes beyond the natural flow of adjacent properties. It is imposing against our patio area and due to its excessive height, will block both light and air from the West, impacting our evenings

Further to the impact directly to our property, we believe the increased height isn't complimentary to the rest of the property and represents significant over development.

Finally, a point of clarification on the garage / proximity to our boundary. The revised drawings are difficult to interpret but show an unspecified gap between our boundary and garage. The current slab goes right against our boundary, can you confirm exactly what gap from our boundary to the extension is agreed please?