

APPLICATION NO: 22/00312/FUL	OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren
DATE REGISTERED: 18th February 2022	DATE OF EXPIRY : 15th April 2022
WARD: Charlton Kings	PARISH: CHARLK
APPLICANT:	Mr And Mrs Aghera
LOCATION:	2 Church Street Charlton Kings Cheltenham
PROPOSAL:	Single storey rear extension, second storey addition to side/rear and alterations to front facade

REPRESENTATIONS

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

Oldbury
Sandhurst Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6LJ

Comments: 3rd March 2022

The property changed use from a newsagent to residential in 2020 and the development of the shop area is part of this. As a shop, with its colourful hanging baskets and canopies, it was pleasing to the street scene close to the church and village centre. As a closed shop, with living accommodation to the rear and above the shop, it does not currently look as pleasing and the shop area has not been refurbished as living accommodation to date.

Clearly, the proposed development has been carefully considered, it will enhance the current building and the proposed extension will actually help the street view from the side by hiding more the roof extension at 4 Church Street, adjacent to the property, which is itself not very pleasing but was permitted in 2011.

The alterations to the front façade will improve the external appearance and will complete the redevelopment from a shop into residential accommodation.

We are however concerned about the details of the pre-planning advice received included in the application form and believe this to be unhelpful and almost obstructive.

First, we do not understand the first statement at all that 'the principle of the first floor extension is not considered to be acceptable'.

This might suggest that any first floor extension would be considered to be unacceptable. More detail is given and it is noted that the extension should be in conformance with the Cheltenham Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Alterations and Extensions adopted in February 2008.

We see nothing in the application that conflicts with this. To the points made that 'the extension would be too large and would result in a dominant addition to the rear of the building, the extension would therefore not achieve the required level of subservience as required in the design policies and within Cheltenham's Supplementary Planning Document', we would like to comment as follows.

We are not sure why the extension is considered to be too large. The proposed extension, described clearly as a second storey addition to the side, brings the second floor exactly into line with the current second floor extension at the rear and is complementary to the total development.

In terms of it being too large, it adds approximately 27% or just over a quarter of the floor area to the second floor space. Is this too large? There seem to be many extensions in the village and at Ham that exceed this and have been completed in recent years. Equally, owing to its careful and considered design it does not appear to be a dominant addition to the rear of the building. The height is unchanged from the existing building.

The design style shown in the proposed side extension 1 appears to exactly match that in the existing side extension 1. The sole difference is that the second storey comes into line at the rear with the existing second floor and ground floor and now in line at the side with the front of the building.

Referring to the paragraph on subservience in the Planning Document, this proposed extension does not dominate or detract from the original building and in fact actually enhances it. The extension is not higher than the original. The extension matches the style of the original building in every way.

A tree in the grounds of the church hall, behind the old village stocks, also partially hides the extension, especially when in leaf in the spring, summer and autumn months.

Secondly, officers feel that more thought should be given to the alterations to the front elevation to achieve an acceptable design appropriate to this sensitive location.

The property is not in the conservation area but is close to its boundary. While there are some pleasing aspects of the village, especially the historic church and churchyard and a few older cottages nearby, the village unfortunately has not been sensitively developed over the years and contains many buildings of varying vintages of rather poor design, certainly not in keeping with the earlier buildings.

Regarding centralisation of the front door, many of the older cottages in the village do not have doors in the centre of the building and more traditionally are towards one side of the building. In fact, the proposed doorway is where an original doorway has been found and the existing door was placed there when the building became a shop. Its current location does not suit the redevelopment where it would open into the centre of a new lounge area.

The windows could be aligned with those on the upper floor and this might be more pleasing, although this could be problematic in resiting the door to its original position and there are examples in the village of properties where the windows on the ground floor align with those on the first floor and equally many where they don't. We are sure an acceptable agreement can be found here.

We trust that this pre-planning advice will not present material problems to this application proceeding and would be pleased to see this development progress.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

Comments: 5th March 2022

This is just a further submission to support the revised plans which were added at around the same time as my comments on the original application.

The only changes appear to be to the layout and design of the windows on the proposed front extension, the types of windows in the proposed rear extension first floor and the types of windows in the proposed side extension 1.

The front elevation was commented on by the Planning Officer in his pre-planning comments and this revised plan appears to address those concerns.

The changes to the windows at the rear and side just appear to match more closely the style of those at the front.

All in all, this seems to give the property a more pleasing appearance and we commend the revised plans.