

<b>APPLICATION NO: 24/00318/FUL</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren</b>	
<b>DATE REGISTERED: 24th February 2024</b>		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY : 20th April 2024</b>	
<b>WARD: Pittville</b>		<b>PARISH:</b>	
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr and Mrs J Cox		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	2 Walnut Close Cheltenham Gloucestershire		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Single and two storey extensions and remodelling works.		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>3</b>
Number of objections	<b>2</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>1</b>

4 Walnut Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3AG

**Comments:** 1st March 2024

I think the design looks great and will fit in nicely with a lot of the newly refurbished and new build properties that are appearing now on the close.

3 The Gardens  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 4QE

**Comments:** 18th March 2024

I object to the proposed upper floor extension to the south elevation.

No 2 Walnut Close occupies a relatively small plot which looks directly onto the side of no. 2 The Gardens and also onto no. 3 The Gardens.

The side and ground floor rear extensions will have some impact on the sense of space and privacy enjoyed by no.3 both from the house and from the garden but this should not be severe. However, the substantial upper floor rear extension is half the width of the house and would also protrude closer towards the boundary with no. 3, materially affecting the privacy of both the garden and the rear rooms of the house. At present, the south elevation of no. 2 Walnut Close does not overlap the north elevation of no. 3, and for good reason - its provides privacy and a sense of space. The proposed top floor extension with its full height roof will negatively impact this.

I am the son of the owner occupier and write with their agreement and support.

2 The Gardens  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 4QE

**Comments:** 29th March 2024

We note the recent minor revision to the plans regarding the windows of the proposed rear upper storey. This in no way alleviates our original objection, which concerns the bulkiness of the upper storey including its gable roof. It is this which has considerable impact for the visual impact upon all of our rear rooms and garden.

We understand that the applicant would prefer to have a wider extension at the front (as we have suggested) since it would provide them with more usable additional space and would be cheaper. It would be interesting and helpful to know whether planning regulations absolutely forbid or preclude such a proposal as it would have little visual impact for neighbouring properties and would be a win-win all round, or whether there is scope within them for such a compromise in this particular case given the locations of the properties concerned.

**Comments:** 4th April 2024

We gather that the possibility of extending further at the front (ie the full width of the property) was discussed with the applicants' agent, and that from the officer's perspective, this would move a new two storey extension closer to the shared boundary. We also gather that the officer has said that the distance between the rear elevation of number 1 The Gardens and the potential relocated 2 storey extension to the front would fall short of the minimum distance of 12 metres usually required (it would be 10.5 metres).

And yet at the same time the already proposed full width extension of the side of the property, which we understand the officer is minded to allow, would move that extension to exactly the same point as the suggested full width extension at the front of the property. The distance between the rear elevation of Nr 1 The Gardens and the proposed side extension would be 10.5 metres and the distance between the rear elevation of Nr 2 The Gardens and the side extension would be 9.3 metres - both well short of the 12 metres distance usually required.

It seems odd that the side extension should be allowed but the full width extension at the front should be disallowed when both fall well short of the usually required 12 metres distance.

A full width extension at the front would cause only the same impact on Nr 1 The Gardens as the side extension does on both Nr 1 and Nr 2. The proposed rear extension would significantly impact the aspect for the rear rooms and garden of Nr 2, albeit that its distance from Nr 2 would be about 15 metres.

We ask that the suggestion of a full width extension at the front, which we understand to have been the applicants' preferred (and less costly) option, should be reconsidered.

**Comments: 8th March 2024**

We live in the house which looks directly on to the side of 2 Walnut Close. As such, its outlook is very different from those of other houses in the area which are to the side of properties which have had similar extensions recently. Our breakfast room, kitchen, lounge and 2 upstairs bedrooms look out directly on to 2 Walnut Close.

We have every sympathy with the desire to extend that property to meet modern day needs. We offer no objection to the proposed extensions at the front, to the side above the existing garage, nor to the ground floor at the rear. However, the proposed upper storey at the rear would be only 5 metres from our garden. With a full roof height, it would thus have some impact on the light for our house; equally if not more importantly, it would significantly impinge on the outlook from all four of our rear rooms as well as from our garden, thus having considerable visual impact for the rear of our house and garden. It would also make our property less attractive to prospective purchasers as it would be more hemmed in.

Our property is exactly the same design as 2 Walnut Close. We extended it to the side above the garage 16 years ago and this provided adequate extra space to accommodate 4 bedrooms and 2 en suites, even without a ground floor extension at the rear or upper floor extension at the front. We suggest that the applicant instead develops plans that incorporate a wider first floor extension at the front of 2 Walnut Close and that they should be approved. Not only would this provide almost as much additional space as a first floor extension at the rear but its visual impact not only on our house but also on neighbouring properties opposite and to the side would be negligible, and the resulting frontage would be in keeping with other recent extensions in Walnut Close. It would be a win-win for all concerned.

If at least the rear 3 metre ground floor extension goes ahead, the rear fence for which we are responsible would be impacted by the work. At least 1 1/2 of our fence panels would need to be removed, and there might also be repercussions for our patio and garden. We would expect all this to be made good.

Finally, it is not clear from the plans where any boiler might be located, but we would oppose any boiler vent that outlets into our garden.

\*\*\*\*\*