

84 East End Rd
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham

09/06/23

Application Ref 23/00430/FUL

Dear Mr Warren,

I have serious concerns over the way you have handled this application, and how factually inaccurate your report is. You have shown a clear bias towards the applicant and have not applied fair balance or logic to your findings. I would appreciate it if you could send this to all committee members, so they are fully furnished with the facts before Tuesday's site visit.

I sent you the below photograph on 27th April clearly showing a solid non-glazed permanent kitchen door and yet in your report of 7th June you state that it has an opaque film that has been applied to the glazing temporarily and that there has not been a permanent replacement of the glass. You failed to contact us to confirm that this is the case and the onus is surely on you to be factually correct when making such statements. Instead you have only been guided by the applicants 'inaccurate and misleading reports'. We put the solid door in following comments you made at the first site visit, when you advised that people do put solid doors in when faced with these situations, we are now happy with the improved insulation and privacy it offers. I cannot understand how this can be considered a source of light still. The applicant was told that the rear door does not transmit light before they put the application in, but still went ahead and listed it as 2 windows to a single room, I asked you to have this corrected, but you did not.



Photo 1 sent to planning officer on 27th April clearly showing non glazed door.

Photo 2 taken from applicants Surveyors report dated 11th May showing an old photograph has been used to give the impression the door is glazed.

I told you that the surveyors report submitted was inaccurate as obvious by the above photographs and you have ignored this also. As the rear door is not glazed then the report is not worth the paper it is written on and you should not be quoting from it. I would like to point out that although invited to visit our property to carry out the daylight survey the surveyors have not visited at all, if they had they would have seen the solid door and possibly produced an accurate report. The surveyors report states that we are putting a burden on the applicant by having a solid kitchen door in our own house, (surely that is our own choice!). The truth of the matter is the applicant is putting a burden on us by proposing to build an overbearing 2 storey brick wall, blocking up to 6hrs of sunlight daily from our kitchen window, and that will be a permanent burden. The applicant has still not carried out a daylight assessment as requested by the Parish council and myself on numerous occasions, I would have expected you to have requested it also, as it would have given you the facts to make a fair decision.

I also wrote to tell you the block plan was inaccurate (in the applicants favour) with the kitchen window being shown a lot smaller than the rear kitchen door, I gave you the dimensions for both but you have not had this fully corrected and it still shows the rear door being wider than the window which it is not. This block plan is also incorrect on their additional Surveyors report. Supporting letters have stated inaccurate facts taken from an inaccurate application with many of the objection letters highlighting the untruths, you have not made any reference to any of these in your report.

I also sent you a video showing clearly how the dining room will be impacted also by the loss of light from the kitchen window. I would appreciate it if you could show the committee members the dining room during the site visit on Tuesday so they can see for themselves.

The main facts here are that the applicant has not paid any attention to the reasons for the 1st application being refused by the committee -

‘By virtue of the scale, form and position of the proposed extension, the development would result in an unacceptable loss of light and unacceptable loss of outlook to the ground floor side elevation window within number 84 East End Road. As such, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to this adjacent land user and is therefore contrary to policy SL1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020) and policies SD4 and SD14 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017).’

The alterations proposed are below and the measurements are so minimal, we are talking mm’s, that they will give little if any improvement to the daylight and amenity at no.84. Again a daylight survey would have confirmed this had it been carried out.

A reduction in the width of the extension resulting in the extension being set in from the existing side elevation by 225mm

A reduction in the eaves height of the two storey extension by approximately 400mm

A reduction in the ridge height of the proposed two storey extension by approximately 600mm

You state the proposed two storey extension would fail the basic 25 degree light test to this window, officers therefore acknowledge that light to this window will be impacted by the development. You then incorrectly claim that the kitchen space is also served by an additional light source in the form of a French doors in the rear elevation of the two storey wing. This opening will not be affected by the proposed two storey extension as it will be of a similar depth to the neighbours existing rear wing. You state that the rear door opening will not be affected by the 2-storey extension, but conveniently omit the fact that the single storey extension protrudes 1.4m beyond our rear wing and as it is so close to the fence will have a great impact on the light hitting the kitchen door. Please can this be pointed out to the committee members on the site visit, I will mark the fence to show how far it encroaches into the rear garden. They will also notice that no other property in the neighbourhood protrudes so far into the back gardens as can be seen clearly from the applicants Surveyors photograph below, which also shows how heavily extended the property already is, a fact you conveniently brush over.



As mentioned previously we have no objection to a sympathetic extension, to give a further bedroom if really needed, even though the house is already heavily extended. I do hope the committee will agree that the new application does nothing to address their original reasons for refusal and will support us again, as if approved it will have a major impact on our quality of life and the home we have enjoyed for 50 plus years. As mentioned by a committee member previously it will make the house very depressing. As a planning officer it goes without saying you have let us down as we expected a fairer, more accurate and balanced representation from the council planning dept.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]