

APPLICATION NO: 22/01990/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren	
DATE REGISTERED: 11th November 2022		DATE OF EXPIRY : 6th January 2023	
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Ms J Dodds		
LOCATION:	20 Southfield Rise Cheltenham Gloucestershire		
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a single storey rear extension. An extension to front dormer window and a single storey front extension, including an entrance porch.		

REPRESENTATIONS

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

18 Southfield Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LJ

Comments: 29th November 2022

We are objecting to the planning application on the grounds of loss of light and its overbearing impact on the back of our property at the ground level. There is a significant loss of amenity to us in both our living and dining rooms.

Our property is semi-detached to no 20 and the wall of their new rear extension is next to the wooden boundary fence (which we maintain) between the properties.

We have a single storey dining room extension at the rear with a large window directly facing towards no 20 (not shown on the plans) and set of patio doors to our garden facing east (shown). We also have a window from our living room looking east (shown).

The plans submitted aren't correct. As this is a retrospective application we don't see any reason for this. All the exterior building was complete before CBC planning enforcement asked for this application. They can confirm this. We expect the plans to represent what has actually been built.

On the plans the height of the rear extension is 3.1 metres. Its actually 3.34 metres, 8% higher. The plans show an angle between our dining room window (directly facing it) and the extension wall of 25% - its actually over 30%. They also show the angle between our living room window and the wall is 45% - its actually over 50%. We want these errors in the plans recognised and corrected as a first step.

Unlike previous applications for no. 20 from 2020, the impacts of this new application are clear as its already built. It's causing significant impacts to our use and enjoyment of the

rear of our property on the ground floor. We welcome any Council Officers or Members of the Planning Committee to come and visit our property and see for themselves.

We're experiencing a significant loss of light to our living and dining rooms. We need to put lights on more often and earlier in both rooms every day, but especially on darker days and in autumn / winter when the sun is lower. Indirect light is affected, direct light is obscured by the extension wall and the wall's shadow affects both rooms. It has significantly changed, for the worse, the nature of both rooms in terms of their utility and the light they get.

Also, the wall is overbearing. It's a large physical presence that creates a feeling of oppression at the rear of the house in both rooms. From our south facing dining room window the only thing you can see is the wall, just 2.9 metres away. And it also dominates the living room where it adjoins the right hand side of the window.

The quality of workmanship of the wall facing us is poor. It's a large badly built brick wall. Whilst some attempt seems to have been made to point the brickwork for several courses above our boundary fence, no attempt has been made on the top 8 courses, creating what looks like an unfinished wall. We can only assume that this was a deliberate decision as the top 8 courses were added by the same builder using the same method as the lower ones. This only increases its overbearing nature as we have no option than to look out on this poor workmanship every day.

The application includes a note from us on 11th August saying that we didn't want anyone on our property working on the extension. It suggests that this has impacted aspects of the build that haven't complied with previous permission or have changed. In fact by the time we sent the note the applicant had moved out of the property, it was empty and building was underway. The applicant had two years to ask us about access but didn't as the note states. Again we can only conclude that this was a deliberate decision not to do so.