

APPLICATION NO: 22/00708/FUL	OFFICER: Miss Michelle Payne
DATE REGISTERED: 15th April 2022	DATE OF EXPIRY : 10th June 2022
WARD: St Peters	PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Mr Z Kwinter
LOCATION:	37 Market Street Cheltenham Gloucestershire
PROPOSAL:	Proposed side and rear extensions (revised scheme following refusal of application ref. 21/02361/FUL)

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	4
Number of objections	4
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

31 Market Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3NJ

Comments: 6th May 2022

Further to the recent revised proposal, please accept my comments as follows. I'm sorry I didn't meet the deadline of 5th May, however I would be grateful if my comments could be taken into consideration.

I reiterate my concerns previously raised. In my opinion, this planning proposal is purely for financial gain.

I am extremely concerned about the planning proposal, reference above, which will have an immediate impact on the surrounding environment and the residential amenity for me and my neighbours.

This property is already rented out, with the downstairs rooms being used as bedrooms. Additions to the house would mean that there could potentially be a total of 6 bedrooms. The proposal makes it sound as though it is a family house that will be extended, not a multi-let property.

This is a residential neighbourhood, primarily occupied by families and people who have lived here for a considerable period of time, owner occupiers such as myself. If this property is extended further, I am concerned that this will continue to be let, but to more occupants. Bearing in mind this is not necessary for the occupants of the house to enhance their living circumstances and it is purely for financial gain, I am angry about the potential impact on the rest of the neighbourhood.

In addition, building works would be incredibly intrusive for us all and would have a major impact on the already difficult situation with parking.

I look forward to hearing from you.

30 Market Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3NH

Comments: 1st May 2022

As I haven't seen any tangible changes outside of adding a proposed toilet, I reiterate my objection on the planning permission for this property.

As a resident of the street who works from home throughout the week I have noted the following observations and challenges. I have noted the objections below as this will not have been considered by the property owners with the proposed development.

Parking

Parking is limited on the streets for the residents. There is no note within the plans whether this will block parking spaces but looking at the plans it would seem to require this - This will cause disruption to residents obtaining parking. Secondly, it would seem the intention of the development is to increase the number of people renting within the building - I do not believe the additional strain in parking has been considered by additional residents on the street.

Street

The street is a single lane dead end road and connects to 2 other streets at the bottom of the road. It is in heavy use by residents as well as deliveries etc. The plans for development will likely require partial closure of the street which is unacceptable to residents as they will be unable to leave or arrive in the area. The significant disruption on the streets alone would have a significant effect on residents.

Pavement

I also register concern that the pavement will be unsafe during the works on the side of the road of the property. This will cause significant disruption not only the residents but they many people who go through it each day. I have observed a significant number of children (including my own) using this pavement throughout the day as well as pram users and disabled people. As there are a number of schools and a park 50 metres down the road, I'm concerned that the safety of the public has not been taken into account with the proposed development.

Length of Time

No length of time has been included within the plans - how long will the residents and the public have to deal with the disruption.

Noise Pollution

To follow on from length of time - what would the level of noise pollution be? It would seem the levels would reach unreasonable due to the nature of the work. As I work from home (as do others on the street) and I also have a young child who has naps within the day and due to the noise created will severely impact the quality of life we have. This will interfere in peaceful enjoyment living within our properties.

Overdevelopment

It would seem this property is already occupied as a HMO - I'm concerned at this proposed development as it seems out of ordinary for the street as well causing parking

strain due increased people living within the property. It would seem that the intention for the proposed development is to get in as many people into the property as possible to maximise the rent obtained from the property. The development could also cause damage and issues for neighbouring properties due to the overdevelopment.

I implore you to consider the above points in consideration on the permission of this proposed development and how the proposal should be rejected.

35 Market Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3NJ

Comments: 3rd May 2022

I strongly oppose the revised plans for 37 Market Street on the grounds that this is a gross overdevelopment of a terraced HMO which currently houses 5 unrelated tenants and is neighboured by modest owner occupied 2 bedroom residential properties.

Unsurprisingly the revised planning proposal recently submitted has done the bare minimum to address the Head of Plannings grounds for refusal of the previous application, following Planning Committee Review, which stated "The proposed development would be inadequately served by sanitary facilities with only a single shower room and toilet to serve a four double bedroomed property. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the aims and objectives of policy SD14 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017) which requires development to "protect and seek to improve environmental quality. Development should not create or exacerbate conditions that could impact on human health or cause health inequality." Additionally, the development would fail to meet the provisions of paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which highlights the need to ensure that design proposals are of a high quality, and create better places in which to live and work".

On plan the smallest shower room possible has been squeezed in between the 2 additional double bedrooms in the side extension which if approved will have the potential to increase occupancy from the current 5 tenants housed in the 2 existing bedrooms, living room and dining room to 11 tenants housed in 4 upstairs double bedrooms, living room and dining room. This begs the question aside from the sanitary facilities will the planned kitchen facilities be sufficient?

Lastly but most importantly from a personal prospective the revised proposal has done nothing to address my concerns regarding loss of privacy and loss of light to the rear garden and courtyard of my property 35 Market Street which I have detailed in my previous objection correspondence. I would again like to invite representatives of the planning dept to visit my property to gain a perspective of the scale of the plans for 37 Market Street and the detrimental effect the development will have on the neighbouring properties should approval be given.

39 Market Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3NJ

Comments: 3rd May 2022

I would like to make clear my strong objection to the revised plans for 37 Market Street on the grounds that this is a gross overdevelopment of a terraced HMO which currently houses 5 unrelated tenants and is neighboured by modest owner occupied 2 bedroom residential properties. Already extended twice 37 Market Street is currently run as a 4 bed roomed HMO in which the existing ground floor rooms named in the proposal as sitting room and dining room (front) are let as bedrooms and the property is currently housing 5 tenants.

The revised planning proposal has done the bare minimum to address the Head of Plannings grounds for refusal of the previous application, following Planning Committee Review, which stated "The proposed development would be inadequately served by sanitary facilities with only a single shower room and toilet to serve a four double bed roomed property. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the aims and objectives of policy SD14 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017) which requires development to "protect and seek to improve environmental quality. Development should not create or exacerbate conditions that could impact on human health or cause health inequality." Additionally, the development would fail to meet the provisions of paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which highlights the need to ensure that design proposals are of a high quality, and create better places in which to live and work".

On plan the smallest shower room possible has been squeezed in between the 2 additional double bedrooms in the side extension which if approved will have the potential to increase occupancy from the current 5 tenants housed in the 2 existing bedrooms, living room and dining room to 11 tenants housed in 4 upstairs double bedrooms, living room and dining room. This leads me to wonder if the kitchen facilities will be adequate.

I still have concerns about the amount of light which will be able to get through to my downstairs kitchen and bathroom windows if the rear ground floor extension is to take place. The view from my kitchen window will be of a concrete alleyway. Equally my upstairs back window will be affected by the proposed first floor smaller extension. I would urge you to consider the responsibility of the council under the Human rights act in particular protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which include the home and other land.

Even with previously provided photographs It is difficult for us to articulate the very real impact this development will have on our homes. And I'm sure it is difficult for you to picture it. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our homes to illustrate our objections first hand before a final decision is made.

