

APPLICATION NO: 22/00764/FUL	OFFICER: Mrs Lucy White
DATE REGISTERED: 27th April 2022	DATE OF EXPIRY : 22nd June 2022
WARD: Battledown	PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Stratford Developments
LOCATION:	1 Coltham Fields Cheltenham Gloucestershire
PROPOSAL:	Erection of 1no. two storey dwelling on land adjacent 1 Coltham Fields

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	7
Number of objections	5
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	2

36 Rosehill Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6SJ

Comments: 22nd May 2022

Concerns over the balcony area and as it's located so near the road, despite obscured glass, residents will still be able to see directly into our garden and property, invading our privacy.

An alternative design must be considered.

Kartchilie
Rosehill Terrace
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6SW

Comments: 17th May 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

With regards to the planning request 22/00764/FUL, as a concerned resident on the impacted street for this proposal [that has not been consulted with despite the clear interests of all residents and users of the street], I have the following concerns to note around this proposed development.

During the course of discovery around this proposal [after notification from properties close to the proposed development], I also note that other related development proposals have been sought - without consultation with any of the users of the affected street. That shall be a matter for the local councillor to review as part of a general petition from affected residents against this planning application in the first instance.

With regards to the current planning request, I have a number of objections which I list below:

1. Proximity to the boundary of the property - I note that the property proposed is to be built right up to the edge of the boundary facing the road. With the road being a single track lane, there is limited visibility for vehicles and pedestrians using the street [and indeed entering the street from proposed property]. There have already been several

near misses on the street in the past several months and this will continue to be the case without adding to the problem!

If the property were built set back from the road by, say, a couple of feet this would (i) improve visibility for all, (ii) reduce the risk of the property being damaged by goods vehicles etc passing. I recommend you visit the street to see how tight it is when the refuse vehicles come on collection day or the fire engine at 3am when a car is on fire!

Notwithstanding the above there is an unacceptable impact on the other street users during construction - due to scaffolding and the like this will restrict access to home owners [22 properties to the east of this development on this cul-de-sac have regular vehicular access requirements] and council refuse and emergency vehicles will not be able to pass. This is an unacceptable risk to all of the house occupants on the street considering in the past year we have had several Police, two ambulance and one fire service attendance.

If you were to determine if the property is revisited by being set back, this might reduce the impact during construction with scaffolding being within the boundary and the property will have the advantage of reduced risk of damage from passing vehicles [like the others on the street!!!].

2. Illegal [?] removal of tree prior to planning permission removal -

As you will note on their planning application the applicant has marked that there are no trees on the site. I disagree with the applicant! In fact if you look at the applicants own planning permission letter on page 2 you will plainly see in the picture that there was a tree! Quite a mature tree! I say was as it was strangely cut down in middle to late 2021 but we now know why! The stump and logs from said tree remain on the site so I request that as part of the planning permission review that this is investigated and if the tree was of consequence that a replacement should be incorporated into the design of property as would normally be recommended when trees are impacted by developments.

3. Balcony - the proposed balcony area on the property is going to create future noise issues with local residents that reside closer to the property. It will not be sufficient to have a 1.8m "screened front" to the street to diminish noise when this will be the only outside space for the property. Further, whilst the "balcony" to the back may not currently overlook residential properties - indeed it would overlook the eyesore of Tim Fry's scrap yard if one could see over the tall wall that backs onto the proposed development - but there is no guarantee that said scrap yard will not become residential in the future. Indeed his recent proposals imply this could be coming in a few year's time and future residents will then be overlooked if this current proposal is approved as is. From previous experience of others the Council does not readily approve balconies and this should be the case for this property too. indeed the entire elevated outdoor space should be removed.

4. Property as an HMO and future anti-social behaviour impacting residents - the plan as drafted is plainly geared by the developer as a future HMO for the rental market with the separate entrances to the bedrooms and en-suites. This is not a family home by design. HMO's will have added vehicular requirements and this property only has one parking space. There is no other parking available on the street and existing residents already face antisocial parking habits from visitors to the street that do not take into account the access requirements of the street this will only exacerbate the situation!

To quote the developer: "Future occupiers would not be reliant on the private car and this proposal would not result in a material increase or change in the character of traffic in the area." I disagree - yes the local town centre is within walking distance but a probable HMO means at least 2 cars of which only 1 will be catered for especially as the probable rents would mean salaries above those to be earned within walking distance.

In summary, this derelict piece of land could, and possibly should, be developed e.g. into a 1 bedroom home or a 2 bedroom more suitable for a small family [as are most of the rest of the properties on the entire street!!] but the currently proposed property will attract antisocial behaviour with parking and noise issues which are frankly unacceptable. This is not in keeping with the developers own statement: "Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that "good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities""

The construction phase will create absolute havoc on all the residents and impact on the delivery of services that we pay the Council for. Being on a private road there will probably be no recourse to GCC for control and access of the road users - this was exhibited just this week with Severn Trent thinking they could shut the road.

45 Eldon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TX

Comments: 4th August 2022

I live locally to Coltham fields and am a frequent visitor, knowing the site well. It seems crazy that it would be left as an eyesore and not be used for a house for someone that needs it. There is a desperate shortage of housing in Cheltenham. There is no problem driving up or down Coltham Fields when I'm there all the time.

1 West Way
Coltham Fields
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TH

Comments: 1st July 2022

As a resident of Coltham Fields in Cheltenham we have received revised information regarding the proposed planning in this street.

I would like to know how two properties have already had planning approved without any of the residents being informed.

The impact that these two would have on traffic safety is a concern as the junction is on Hales Road and is also a passing place for cars on a very narrow street.

This information needs to be made public to the residents as we believe that it is not legal, as not following the correct procedure.

The revised plans for the third property are still not acceptable. This street is a family street and a property of multiple occupancy is an ill fit. Also parking is very limited, how can a property of dual occupation have only enough space to park one car.

The proposed plot also has bats living in an old shed, has this been considered?

A mature tree was cut down before planning and we would like answers to how this has happened.

Thank You Matt Babbage for coming to see us and listen to our concerns. We want this to go to a public meeting with all concerned.

We as a residential group are considering legal action to stop this building work until the proposal fits within certain parameters.

24 Rosehill Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6SJ

Comments: 16th May 2022

Apart from the obvious problems that will be caused during construction, the new building will look directly into the bedroom and garden of my house. The plan to put the living rooms on the first floor will mean that the occupants of the new build will be overlooking my properties for much of the day. I feel that this will be a major intrusion into my privacy. Coltham fields is a small single track lane. I feel that it has reached its capacity for traffic. Another 2 or three cars using the lane daily will inevitably cause more problems for the local residents. Please consider our quality of life before permission is granted to cram even more houses into this very small lane.

1 West Way
Coltham Fields
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TH

Comments: 9th May 2022

Reasoning for objection;

- 1) Existing garage type building presently on the land appears to be made of asbestos. This needs to be removed by specialist teams - will it be, who will be responsible for overseeing this?
- 2) Bats regularly seen in and around the area and look to be living in aforementioned building on the land.
- 3) There was a fairly mature tree on the land and is seen in fact on some of the drawings/plans. This was cut down completely out of the blue some months ago. Done prior to planning application to avoid the need for a Tree Survey?
- 4) Balcony, how is this even being considered when other properties in the Coltham fields area and surrounding have been refused due to future impact (I believe its called). The Balcony is the only area of any significant outside space, so will be in constant use. At elevation and overlooking surrounding properties and my garden (even with the obscurity panel/frosted glass at head height) it won't prevent noise travel in an otherwise very quiet dead end road.

5) House of HMO, this property is clearly aimed at HMO with the two double ensuite rooms having their own individual access. HMO will mean at least two cars if not more and the property is being built with parking for only one car.

6) Parking is already a massive issue and real problem for many in the road. We have our own space yet regularly faced with people parking in it without permission. Forcing us to park elsewhere some streets away in one instance.

Vehicular access is already a problem. Bins go unemptied as refuse vehicles cannot always get up the road. Ambulance and Fire Pumps not had easy access on recent emergencies in the road.

7) Will permission be granted on the two floor house only for a 'Room in the Attic' be approved, made of different materials increasing it to three stories and blocking out light? (note properties off Albert Road by the same developer where this happened).

I note that construction impact is of little interest or relevance, however there are a number of points that need mentioning:

Building plans look to be upto the very edge of the plot - where will scaffolding be sited? It can't take up any space on an already narrow single car width lane without causing disruption. Home Deliveries, access for children to and from school, access for elderly / disabled residents further up the street etc - all will be effected during and after construction.

Construction cannot be allowed to happen before 7am and after 5pm on week days. No building at weekends or Bank Holidays.

Where do the construction vehicles plan to park? Parking opposite the site is private and access needed at all times to these spaces. Children live and play in the area, an increase in traffic will make this very unsafe.

In short, I am not against development in housing. In fact I support it but this stinks of someone just making money at the expense of others and moving on. Please note further planning of 21/02616, 22/00492. All Mr ***** (who developed garages off Albert Road).

I will be copying in the local councillor and requesting a meeting with them to discuss these matters.

Kind regards

40 Pilley Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ER

Comments: 5th August 2022

We need more small houses in sustainable locations near the town centre. This site is untidy and unused. It's ridiculous not to build a home here.