

APPLICATION NO: 25/00520/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Victoria Harris
DATE REGISTERED: 28th March 2025		DATE OF EXPIRY : 23rd May 2025
WARD: Park		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Mr Shaun Packe	
LOCATION:	18 Bournside Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire	
PROPOSAL:	Proposed two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension, re model and dropped kerb.	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	18
Number of objections	12
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	6

17 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AL

Comments: 19th May 2025

(REF:- 25/00520/FUL). 18 Bournside Road

We appreciate the effort of the revised planning application which has been updated from the original proposal.

The removal of porch and columns
Toned down colour of weatherboard to a neutral palette
Additional change to Hip Roof design

Unfortunately, this does not change the over development on this plot and the effect on the street scape and surrounding neighbourhood.

This still leaves little more than a corridor pathway at the side of the properties of the new large extension. This will also rob neighbours and public of sunlight in the evenings and much-loved views of preserved listed trees growing at the back of no.18 on the border of a conservation area.

Old Trees have already been felled in No.18's back garden in preparation for the proposed extension which may alter the water table to an area already prone to water logging and flooding.

At the rear of No.18 this 3 story house will have a massive impact on neighbours' privacy to the sides and rear of the property and looks more like an additional floor than a modest loft conversion.

Although the roof design has been revised in the new submission the roof height appears much higher than previously. According to the submitted streetscape plan / drawing

which is difficult to gain any accuracy with the scale provided and no horizontal scale supplied.

The existing symmetrical classic design of No.18 , much admired by the public will be lost forever with this proposed over development.

The overall floor space proposed in this build is nearly three times that of the original floor plan.

Being on the cusp of a conservation area and possibly being included in this area in the future, surely this classical house of this 1950's design should be preserved and not be redesigned beyond recognition. Space is surely needed to appreciate architecture at its best as specified in the Local government recommendations of buildings and alterations. If we are to avoid , the affect of terracing between existing houses.

It is surely against the local and national housing policy for the above reasons. This may become a trend or template for future planning applications within a classic 1950's tree lined road.

I would request this application is rejected.

Comments: 21st April 2025

I wish to object to the proposed application (REF:- 25/00520/FUL). 18 Bournside Road

1. The changes from classical original brick built 1950 design to a "New England" style, no other property of this type or design is in the road.
2. Increased size of development will change the street view significantly to the detriment of the other houses in Bournside Road .with an excessive Increase in size to the original house.
3. Will reduce 25% of available light for the neighbours.
4. This is a complete overdevelopment of the building both in height and width.
5. Addition of a Third Floor will affect overall street view and privacy of neighbours.
6. Conversion of a loft space as another floor as living space with bathroom and other rooms adds to the over development.
7. The Ability to view directly into neighbours' properties due to the greater height plus balcony to the rear of the building.
8. Reduction of space between adjacent properties. This exceeds the recommend planning limit of approval
9. External Light Green Cement board cladding proposed colour is not in keeping with any other property in the road.
10. Suggested Choice of roofing material and colour is not in keeping with existing houses built in the Road.

By approving the proposed application, it will change the whole character and privacy of Bournside road, to the detriment of the local community and citizens who reside as neighbours and the general community.

It is surely against the local and national housing policy for the above reasons. This may become a trend or template for future planning applications within a classic 1950's tree lined road.

I would request this application is rejected.

15 Northcroft
The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2NL

Comments: 21st April 2025

I am concerned at the scale of extension here with ensuing loss of privacy for properties to the rear. In particular the attic conversion doors/balcony will overlook neighbouring properties' gardens, and more concerningly directly in to bedrooms. This is less of an issue in the summer as there is currently foliage partially obscuring the view, but in the winter there is a direct line of sight in to other properties.

I am happy to support extension and modernisation, but this is direct visual intrusion on an unacceptable level. A dormer window, or even regular windows would reduce the impact. The scale of the current plans effectively creates a large viewing platform affecting many surrounding properties, and I would be grateful if this could be reconsidered.

16 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 21st May 2025

Ref.25/00520/FUL. SUPPORT

Re. Your letter 8th May 2025 - Revised Plans - 18 Bournside Road.

Having seen the proposed revisions, we see no objection to the development.

20 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 17th May 2025

Summary

I appreciate the effort the owners of No. 18 Bournside Road have made to update the original proposal. However, it unfortunately does not resolve the fundamental issues of overdevelopment and loss of privacy.

Response to specific claims

Claim 1: "The width of the side extension has been substantially reduced to provide a full 1 metre side access along the boundary with no 20... This will further improve the sense of space between the buildings and materially reduce build mass..."

Answer 1: This change reduces the building's width by 30 cm (the gap to the boundary has increased from 0.7 metres to 1 metre), which is less than 12 inches. The 30 cm reduction in width is negligible, representing a decrease of less than 2% in the building's width. It is unlikely that a passerby would perceive the change in width as 'substantially reduced' or detect an 'improved sense of space' or possibly even notice a change.

Claim 2: "The previously proposed rear conservatory has been removed to further reduce massing and development density between Numbers 18 and 20."

Answer 2: It is the three-story extension that contributes to the massing and development density, not the rear conservatory. Therefore, removing the rear conservatory does not reduce the massing or density of the development.
Reducing the extension to a single-story garage would reduce the massing and development density.

Claim 3: "The width of the Juliet window has been significantly reduced to minimise perception of overlooking and reduce the visual appearance of a third story at the rear"

Answer 3: The remaining full-height Juliet balcony and window continue to create the visual impression of a third story at the rear. This full-height Juliet balcony does not reduce the potential for overlooking the neighbours' gardens. The neighbouring gardens are long and have clear, line of sight views to the 3rd floor bedroom with the Juliet balcony.

Claim 4: The Mocked-up streetscape shows how the street will look after the extensions are added

Answer 4: The mock-up streetscape has a vertical scale but lacks a horizontal one. A disclaimer states, 'Illustration purposes only to depict street scene variation,' indicating an issue with the horizontal scale because it has been omitted. The horizontal gaps between some houses seem too large, suggesting a different scale in these areas. It is puzzling why the architect would provide a vertical scale while omitting the horizontal one. The streetscape also omits depth and the side of buildings giving a spaciousness to the layout that doesn't reflect reality. An accurately scaled streetscape would be beneficial. However, the absence of the horizontal scale, depth, and the inclusion of the disclaimer limit its value.

Objections

The essence of the original objections remains. All objections are referenced against the Cheltenham Local Development Framework, specifically the Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Alterations and Extensions.

1. Overdevelopment

The build maximises the size of the house that can be constructed, constrained only by the property boundaries.

The Residential Alterations and Extensions framework states in 2.0; 2. Subservience

An extension should not dominate or detract from the original building, but play a 'supporting role'. Generally, the extension should not be higher than the original. A well-designed extension is normally set back from the main elevation...

The large three-story extension to number 18, which increases the width of the house to its boundaries and the height of the house to the street maximum, does not fulfil a supporting role, as recommended by the local Development Framework. The overall usable floor space in the proposed build is still nearly three times that of the original house and the balance of the original symmetrical design is lost.

The Residential Alterations and Extensions framework states in 2.0; 3. Maintain spaces between buildings

Cheltenham has a reputation as a spacious town. This spaciousness derives from the spaces at the front, back and at the sides of buildings. Glimpses of trees, gardens and surrounding hills are essential if the spacious character of the town is to be maintained. The Council will maintain such spaces between buildings to prevent a terracing effect between existing houses. This may mean that a gap can only be partially closed.

The new extension will reduce the gap between No. 18 and the boundary with No. 20 from 4.3 metres currently to 1 metre, for the full height of the extended house and obstructing 24 square metres of view from the street to the rear. The view from the street of the listed Horse Chestnut trees at the rear of both houses will be significantly restricted by both the scale and depth of the extension, meaning that the trees at the rear of the houses will only be visible if one stands directly in front of the gap between the houses. The bottom of the rear gardens marks the edge of the Cheltenham Central Conservation Zone. The views from the Conservation Zone, through the current gap between 18 Bournside Road and 20 Bournside Road to Hatherly Park, will also be severely impacted. As the Residential Alterations and Extensions framework says the spaces between houses are essential and the loss of space between the two houses is not preserving this space, deemed essential in the guide.

A single-story extension to the side would maintain the symmetry and preserve the views from the street to the Horse Chestnut trees and from the conservation area to the park.

2. Attic as a Third Floor

The Residential Alterations and Extensions framework states in 3.4 Extending into the roof space

Loft conversions should not have the appearance of an extra storey on top of the house - a dormer window should always be set within its roof. This is because the original character of the building could be affected; there could be overlooking of neighbouring properties and the character of the street would be altered if all properties increased their storey height.

The loft conversion still appears as an extra floor because it features vertical sections that create the illusion of walls, specifically with the tall glass doors of the Juliet balcony. This directly conflicts with the Residential Alterations and Extensions guide 3.4, which states that a loft conversion should not have the appearance of an extra floor.

The roof shape has been altered, resulting in a change to the balcony's shape. The Juliet balcony is no longer as wide as it was previously; however, it appears to occupy approximately a third of the roof face, enhancing the appearance of an extra floor.

Replacing the Juliet balcony with flush or Dormer windows will allow light into the room, provide a view of the hills, and prevent the conversion from resembling an additional floor.

3. Juliet Balcony

The Residential Alterations and Extensions framework states in 3.2 Rear Extensions, Design Principles

Balconies can affect a neighbour's privacy. The council will require careful consideration of the location and design of any balcony to avoid this problem.

In section 4. Maintain Privacy, it states

Balconies can threaten the privacy of neighbours but skilful design can prevent overlooking across a boundary.

The view from the newly designed Juliet balcony, three floors up, will be terrific; however, the Juliet balcony still infringes on the right to Privacy of at least five neighbours. None of the houses on the northeast side of Bournside Road have a Juliet or any other type of balcony; this would be the first and a significant change to the skyline facing the Cheltenham Central Conservation Zone.

The council's guidelines clearly state that balconies must not compromise a neighbour's privacy or overlook adjoining properties. This amended proposal violates both guidelines. Due to the length of the neighbouring gardens, it is impossible to design the balcony to prevent the occupier from overlooking the boundary.

By removing the Juliet balcony and replacing it with skylights or small dormer windows, we can eliminate the risk of neighbours losing their privacy. The occupier would use these windows primarily for light or to look outside (such as to check the weather), rather than sitting around with the windows open to enjoy the view over to the hills (and unfortunately the neighbouring gardens and the neighbours).

Comments: 18th April 2025

A. Introduction

I object to the proposed extension at 18 Bournside Road (Planning Application Reference: 25/00520/FUL) on the grounds that it is contrary to the Cheltenham Local Development Framework SPD, the Residential Alterations and Extensions (RA&E) guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposal would result in significant harm to the character and amenity of the area, specifically through loss of daylight, loss of privacy, overdevelopment, and harm to the established streetscape.

A.1 Context

The Cheltenham Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Residential Alterations and Extensions (RA&E) document states in its Introduction "Cheltenham has an image of an elegant, spacious town with groups of well-proportioned buildings set in generous gardens, with open space extending into the heart of the town. The spaces between the houses, the greenery and the nature of the front boundary fences, walls, hedges (or the lack of them) all contribute to this character... Good design is as essential here as it is in the historic parts of the town."

The northern part of Bournside road is probably the best example of 1950's housing conforming to this image in Cheltenham. If you walk from the northern tip of Bournside road down to the bend in the road with the house from the Butterflies TV series, there are 30 detached houses, in Spring the road is lined with blossom trees and daffodils (planted by residents in the verges), the detached houses are all different, individually designed and as you walk down there are large gaps between the houses at first floor level with views through to the large horse chestnut trees to the east and to the trees in Hatherly park to the west. This part of the road implements this planning goal perfectly - (albeit with one exception at present). The proposed changes to number 18 conflicts with the Planning Office's stated goals and the conflicts are explained below.

The relevant National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document, paragraph 135c) states "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, while not preventing or discouraging innovation or change (such as increased densities)." This development is not innovative, does not increase the number of families living in the house and is not sympathetic to local character or history. Hence, it does not comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

A.2 Poor Design

The proposed development extends the whole width of the plot and increase the size of the current house threefold. The overall character does not reflect the original house nor its setting. The only aim that it satisfies is getting as much house as possible on the plot to the detriment of good design and the character of the area.

B. Streetscape

B.1 Maintain space Between Buildings

The RA&E design principle 3 is Maintain Spaces Between Building. This design constraint states Cheltenham has a reputation as a spacious town. This spaciousness derives from the spaces at the front, back and at the sides of buildings. Glimpses of trees, gardens and surrounding hills are essential if the spacious character of the town is to be maintained. The Council will maintain such spaces between buildings to prevent a terracing effect between existing houses (which would also undermine the road's low-density characteristics). This may mean that a gap can only be partially closed.

28 of 30 properties along this part of the road maintain large gaps between them at first-floor level, establishing a clear pattern of development. The planning guides state this is a desirable goal.

The RA&E states "The space between ... houses is essential. But the sense of space can be completely lost when ... owners decide to create two storey extensions."

Combine this with the requirements of CP7 that development will only be permitted where it c) "complements and respects neighbouring development and the character of the locality."

Therefore, we have one requirement to maintain spaces between buildings and another requirement to respect the characteristics of the neighbourhood which is characterised by detached houses with large spaces between them at first floor level. The proposed development does not maintain the required space between itself and the neighbour's building at the first-floor level and will reach to 60cm of the boundary.

Hence, the 2 extra floors on top of the proposed garage should not be permitted, at least at its current size.

B.2 Subservience

The RA&E design principle 2 is Subservience. "An extension should not dominate or detract from the original building, but play a supporting role."

The proposed development is increasing floor space by nearly 3x, dominating the original building by adding a garage with two more floors on top of it and an extension at the rear. This will be an overbearing property and represents over-development of the site.

The original building is a symmetrical red brick detached property, the proposed design lacks symmetry and appears to be designed to maximise living space, rather than to complement the existing streetscape. It doesn't fit in.

B.3 Maintain Character

The R&E design principle 1 is Maintain Character. The characteristics of the house and its settings should influence the extension. The principle states "As a rule, if there is an established pattern of acceptable design features in the street, you should aim to use them in your project." The established pattern of acceptable design features in the street is clearly defined and visible. This part of Bournside road with over 30 houses along a straight stretch of road, has a clear streetscape identity. The proposed design doesn't fit in with this streetscape identity because:

1. It is oversized for the plot width - the other houses all look proportionally balanced within their plot - it would constitute overdevelopment of the space.
2. It won't have space between the buildings, preventing views from the street to the trees, and eroding the road's sense of low-density housing.

There was one house approved along this stretch of road, which is viewed as filling its plot and it does not have sufficient space between it and its neighbours, so it can be deemed similar to this proposed development. The planning officer explained in his report that he approved that build because...

"The design results in a contemporary take on the existing general style. It is not overtly contemporary, but it could be considered as a representation of a twenty first century update to the basic design. The two neighbours who have written in clearly consider that it is not appropriate in the street but there are clear variations within the houses in Bournside Road and this would simply be yet another."

If the planning committee is considering the same logic for this proposal, may I ask you to also consider the following:

1. If it is a twenty first century update to the basic design, then it is not representative of the streetscape (which is not a 21st century streetscape). And therefore, doesn't comply with the streetscape requirement.
2. If it is considered just yet another variation in the style of houses, then which houses is it being compared with - the houses along Bournside road from the bend to the northern tip are all of a similar age and style forming a consistent streetscape. Hence if you compare it to these it would fail. The houses around the corner and down the hill are a mix of housing styles. But this part of the road cannot be physically viewed at the same time as the part of the road where the proposed build is, therefore, they form two distinct

and separate streetscapes. And you should compare the proposed development to houses in the same streetscape because this is where it will have the impact.

The proposed development represents over development of the plot.

Approving the development will harm the character and appearance of the area. And it will make it harder to deny other similar requests to build properties which don't support the streetscape.

C. Loft Conversion

The RA&E states "Loft conversions should not have the appearance of an extra storey on top of the house - a dormer window should always be set within its roof. This is because the original character of the building could be affected; there could be overlooking of neighbouring properties ..."

C.1 When is a loft an Extra Floor?

A loft conversion can look like an extra floor if it has the following characteristics:

- A large flat roof to increase headroom across the floor
- Vertical sections giving the impression of walls (in this case floor to ceiling glass doors)
- Loss of original sloping roof features
- Large glass windows making the room inside visible
- Juliet balconies

The proposed development has all these features in its proposed loft conversion. The reason it makes it look like a separate floor is because that is exactly what this proposal is - it is creating a separate floor, rather than just converting a loft to an accessible space. The purpose of the Dorner windows is to bring light into the room. The purpose of large sliding glass doors is to extend the room into the outside space. It is this expansion of the space into the outside that causes the privacy and noise concerns. With just Dorner windows for light, this risk disappears.

C.2 Impact on Privacy

The risk of the separate floor is explicitly stated in the guidance, there can be overlooking of neighbour's properties, which leads to a loss of their privacy.

The large glass doors and Juliet balcony exacerbate this loss of privacy. An upstairs bedroom window is typically looked out of when opening curtains and checking for rain. A Juliet balcony typically has chairs beside it for drinking tea during the day and wine in the evening and watching the world go by through the window, meaning many hours can be legitimately spent at the window. This 'Eye of Sauron', with its full height opening glass doors, from the height of 3 floors will see in all the neighbours' gardens, and in the gardens in the properties at the rear, as well as living rooms and bedrooms of the houses at the rear of the property.

I've checked other properties in the neighbourhood and found some around Hatherly Park with Juliet balconies. Can I point out the people living in homes with gardens overlooking Hatherly Park do not expect to have privacy in their gardens since they are overlooked by a public park, hence Juliet balconies are acceptable there. But, people who already have privacy in their gardens, their private amenity space, expect it to be maintained and not lose the right to a neighbour's extension or loft conversion.

Also, the flat roof could be used as a balcony in the future, with its corresponding loss of neighbour's privacy. This adds another reason to deny the proposed loft conversion.

C.3 Impact on Noise

The proposed loft conversion creates one of the largest rooms in the house with large opening floor-to-ceiling glass doors and a Juliet balcony which overlook neighbours' gardens and directly into the bedrooms of the houses behind. This would be an ideal room for parties and social gatherings with access to fresh air, light and views with the space to entertain. From the outside it will look exactly like a third-floor room. The RA&E clearly states noise should be considered too. Parties and social gatherings in this room would be both visible and heard across the neighbourhood to the rear.

C.4 Potential Counter Arguments

We imagine the following counter arguments:

1. The council has already approved house x on Bournside road with a Juliet balcony;
 - 1a. This is irrelevant, the purpose of the Planning guidance is to introduce a set of design constraints we can follow. If one counter example is allowed to form the basis of approval, then every design constraint can be ignored.
 - 1b. The National guidelines and the local guidelines do not provide for guidelines to be ignored based on a counter example.
 - 1c. I've checked other properties in the neighbourhood and found some properties which back on to Hatherly Park with Juliette balconies. Can I point out the people living in homes with gardens overlooking Hatherly Park do not expect to have privacy in their gardens since they are overlooked by a public park, hence Juliette balconies are acceptable there. But people who already have privacy in their gardens, their private amenity space, expect it to be maintained and not lose their right to privacy for a neighbour's extension or loft conversion.
2. The loft conversion looks like a loft from the front, it only looks like a 3rd storey floor from the rear.
 - 2a. The rear of the house, with its extra floor, is visible to neighbours, and the houses on the estate at the rear and will be visible from the public road there too.
 - 2b. For this to be a valid reason to accept the loft conversion, would mean the rights of neighbours are different from the rights of the man in the street and would ignore the rights of neighbours to privacy and protection from noise via the planning guidance.

C.5 Recommendation on the Loft Conversion

The loft conversion removes the neighbour rights to privacy, increases the risk of noise and explicitly breaches RA&E guidance.

We ask the loft conversion in its current form to be rejected and believe the proposed conversion should comply with the guidance by removing the flat roof, the Juliet balcony and replacing the sliding glass doors with Dorner windows.

D. Access to Daylight

The RA&E lists 5 basic design principles the extension must comply with; Number 5 is Ensure adequate daylight.

Adding a garage with two additional floors above it, the first floor and a second floor in the roof requires a larger roof and the house will block 25 percent more light than the current house does, with an adverse impact on neighbouring properties (including the ones in Northcroft behind the back garden) and their gardens. The loss of light will have an impact on the neighbours' gardens and make our pathway from the front of the house to the rear much darker, possibly damper and risks introducing a wind tunnel effect.

It would be appreciated if the committee requested a sunlight and daylight assessment to determine the impact of this proposed build on neighbours' properties.

E. Summary

The National Policy Planning Framework states in paragraph 135:

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting...

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

I explicitly ask the planning authority to refuse this proposal on the grounds that it is contrary to local and national planning policy and would result in significant harm to the character and amenity of the area and adversely impact neighbours' rights to privacy and protection from noise.

23 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AL

Comments: 20th May 2025

Response to the Revised Planning Application

I appreciate the attempts made by No 18 to revise their original plans, I am afraid it does not go far enough to reduce the overall gross over development of the site, my original objections still stand. In addition, these are my comments on the revisions:

1) Alteration to Roof Design.

The revision has just made the roof look even bigger, looking at the street scene plan it looks even higher than the original plans too.

2) Reduction of Rear Juliet Window

Whilst there has been a reduction in the size of the window, it is on the 3rd floor addition which in its self-causes an evasion of privacy to the neighbours.

3) Increased Side Access/Spacing Between Properties

My understanding is that the revised spacing is merely 30mm which really is an immaterial reduction.

4) Removal of Rear Conservatory

This is also immaterial as this could be added at a later date & does not really contribute to any significant reduction to the overall mass development.

5) Adjustment of Cladding Colour and Extent.

Again the colour is really insignificant as this could be changed at a later date, you will note from the street scene that was provided with the update, that there are significant changes to the character of the building, the Cheltenham Plan 5.8 advises that you would be expected to use materials which match the original building, this is not the case. The original brickwork is a feature that needs to be maintained, to ensure that the house retains its 1950' character & remains in keeping with the other houses on Bournside Road.

6) Removal of Front Porch and Column Posts

This is a welcome amendment.

I cannot see that the amended plans have changed the overall mass of the development, I certainly would not say it is visually in tune with the varied character of Bournside Road. I have lived in Bournside Road for over 30 years the character of this road needs to be preserved for future generations, we must not allow such mass development to be permitted, I therefore object to this application.

Comments: 21st April 2025

I object to the proposed extension at 18 Bournside Road (Planning Application Reference: 25/00520/FUL) on the grounds that it is contrary to the Cheltenham Local Development Framework SPD, the Residential Alterations and Extensions (RA&E) guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposal would result in significant harm to the character and amenity of the area, specifically through loss of daylight, loss of privacy, overdevelopment, and harm to the established streetscape.

The relevant National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document, paragraph 135c) states "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, while not preventing or discouraging innovation or change (such as increased densities)." This development is not innovative, does not increase the number of families living in the house and is not sympathetic to local character or history. Hence, it does not comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The RA&E design principle 2 is Subservience. "An extension should not dominate or detract from the original building, but play a supporting role;"

The proposed development is increasing floor space by nearly 3x, dominating the original building by adding a garage with two more floors on top of it and an extension at the rear. This will be an overbearing property and represents over-development of the site.

The original building is a symmetrical red brick detached property, the proposed design lacks symmetry and appears to be designed to maximise living space, rather than to complement the existing streetscape. It doesn't fit in.

Bournside Road comprises houses of individual character built in the 1950's, it is a highly sought after road because of the beautiful, designed houses it is very important that we retain the character of the houses on this road.

This proposal fails to respond & respect positively to the character of the site & its surrounding & provide extensions that do not harm the architectural integrity of the building. The proposal would disproportionately increase the width & size of the house, to 3x its original size & is totally out of keeping to other properties in Bournside Road. The addition of a third floor is unacceptable as it infringes the privacy of the neighbours & is an unnecessary addition to an already overdeveloped proposal.

As per The Cheltenham Plan 5.8 Extensions to existing buildings need to be carefully designed to respect the character & scale of the existing building, they would normally be expected to use materials which match the original building.

This proposal completely contravenes the above, I also strongly object to the loss of the original brickwork which is proposed to be replaced with cedar tea green weatherboard & render, this is not in keeping with the present style of the property or other properties on Bournside Road.

24 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 21st May 2025

Although we were really pleased to see the modifications to the original plan and appreciate the effort involved to produce and communicate these, unfortunately, the plans still show a house that is oversized for the streetscape; this is particularly in width, taking up the whole width of the plot apart from a metre gap on one side and in height. If the extension was not at first floor level over the garage, and the roof wasn't so high it would blend in much better with the houses around it.

Comments: 21st April 2025

I object to the proposed extension for the following reasons:

Overdevelopment of the plot - The plan shows an extension that extends to the whole width of the plot and increases the size times three. It dominates the original in size and 'the loft conversion' creates a separate floor which would impact neighbours' privacy.

Overall Design - The plan is not in keeping with the original house nor the houses around it, bar one (i.e. the black and white house, which we do not believe, should be used as a precedent as it does not seem to comply with local and national planning policies from my understanding of the documents available.)

The proposed extension does not complement in terms of style or materials - 'New England' composite cladding, dark roof tiles and a porch with pillars are not 'sympathetic to local character and history', including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Indeed, this road is a proposed extension to the Cheltenham Conservation Area and as such is particularly important.

I could not see any detailing regarding a front gate, wall or fence. Have these been made available as these should also be in keeping with the character of the area?

30 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 21st April 2025

I object to the proposed extension at 18 Bournside Road (Planning Application Reference: 25/00520/FUL) on the following grounds:

It is contrary to the Cheltenham Local Development Framework SPD, the Residential Alterations and Extensions (RA&E) guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposal would result in significant harm to the character and amenity of the area, specifically through loss of daylight, loss of privacy, overdevelopment, and harm to the established streetscape.

The proposed changes to number 18 is not sympathetic to local character and history of Bournside Road and is not sympathetic to local character or history. The proposed build will result in over development of the plot. The developed property will triple the size of the existing house.

The original character of the original house is lost with the cedar tea green weatherboard.

The overdevelopment, width wise and height wise of the plot will lead to overfill and loss of the good design and the character of properties of the area.

Bournside Road has already sadly seen overdevelopment of several plots due to lack of public neighbourhood awareness and resultant lack of objections. This has already resulted in the loss of the wonderful character of the 1950's road made famous by the much-loved Butterflies television series. The plot overdevelopment into another carbuncle of a property, grandly overshadowing and visually shrinking neighbouring original properties on the road due to the unnecessary three storey overdevelopment.

This proposal represents a further example of oversized development detriment to the character of this very loved residential road.

Yours sincerely

30 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
GL51 3AH

68 St Stephens Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AE

Comments: 21st May 2025

As a resident of nearby St Stephens Rd I frequently walk down Bournside Road and have been aware of No. 18 for a number of years. The property sits in a large plot of land and has so much potential, and it is such a shame to have seen it sitting empty and become increasingly rundown.

As someone who lives in a property that has benefitted from substantial renovation, I've been watching the proposal for 18 Bournside Road with interest. The revised plans look great, it's clear that a lot of care and thought has gone into them, and the result would be a huge improvement, both for the street and long-term future of the property.

I'm very supportive of this application. Bringing a neglected property back to life through renovation should be encouraged, and I look forward to seeing this home fully restored and occupied once again.

19 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AL

Comments: 21st May 2025

We are pleased to see the proposed revisions to the existing plans for 18 Bournside Road.

Therefore, we have no objection to the revised development.

The property has lain empty for over a decade in our lovely street and we look forward to seeing it come back to life.

22 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 21st May 2025

Having previously objected to this planning application on the grounds of invasion of privacy and unacceptable and invasive use of space, I find the alterations for the subsequent application in no way addresses the issues I raised!

The reduction in the sideways extension is minimal and the inclusion of the balcony will still be, in my view, voyeuristic!

The size and extent of the rebuild smacks of greed and has no consideration for the neighbours right of privacy and the general ambience of Bournside Road. In my opinion, if planning permission is granted, then this will result in a plethora of similar outsize rebuild requests and an unacceptable change to what is a picturesque and leafy location. I sincerely hope that common sense prevails and this application is rejected and a more acceptable plan is produced for genuine consideration.

Regards,

22 Bournside Road

Comments: 21st April 2025

I believe that this planning application is neither in keeping with the aesthetics of and privacy aspects of our beautiful road. It appears to me that the application has been made for the maximum possible room space for financial gain rather than housing necessity and has no consideration for the surrounding dwellings. If built as planned, the rear aspect of the property will result in an invasion of privacy of a number of houses and in particular, the proposed balcony attached to the roof interior development will be unacceptably voyeuristic! I wish to object in the strongest sense and hope that the planners reject this application in favour of something more acceptable both in size and keeping with more consideration for the ambience of the location and the well being of the residents. Thank you for your understanding.

30 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 13th May 2025

Having viewed the revised planning application, we are pleased to see that the applicant has considered many of the objections that were raised with the original application in the updated proposal presented.

Comments: 21st April 2025

I am writing to object to the proposed extension at 18 Bournside Road (Planning Application Reference: 25/00520/FUL) on the following grounds:

This development would lead to further detrimental erosion of the established streetscape and character of Bournside Road, in particular the visual space between houses and the associated vistas and greenery. This would not be in line with the principles stated in the Cheltenham Development Framework and local planning guidance.

The large total size of the proposed extension is NOT subservient to the house being extended.

The current proposed attic room effectively creates a three storey building with oversized windows at the rear, which are over proportioned and unsympathetic to the original roof, and also represent an unnecessary invasion of the privacy of the neighbouring houses and those to the rear of the property.

This proposed, over proportioned extension needs to be reduced in size. It currently represents an attempt to push the local planning criteria beyond reasonable limits of interpretation. Allowing this cumulative, negative impact, detrimental trend to continue to occur will result in Bournside Road becoming an increasingly built up urbanisation with little visual space between oversized houses. This would make a mockery of a planning process that should be aimed at controlling overdevelopment in residential roads in Cheltenham and complying more with the Cheltenham plan framework's principles.

Finally, I should add that I am not generally against house extensions on this road and acknowledge the benefits that sympathetic extensions can bring to the road as a whole, in addition to the benefits to the relevant house owners. Indeed, back in 2010, and of relevance to this objection, we submitted our own planning application to add a second storey to the side and rear of our current house at 30 Bournside Road. This was designed to be sympathetic to the original house character and was within the original house's footprint. However, this application was refused by Cheltenham Council at that time, based on its proposed size. However, during the period since then, the applications for house extensions on this road that have been agreed have incrementally and gradually become bigger and bigger in size, to the extent that recent agreed ones now make our past refused extension definitely modest in comparison. Therefore, I suggest that a key strategic question that the planning committee need to give adequate consideration to with this application is - for how long will the local planning process enable the incremental increasing size of non subservient house extensions on Bournside Road be allowed to continue, together with the associated cumulative negative impact on the streetscape of this, for now, still lovely Cheltenham residential road? Further supporting a continuation of this development trend surely undermines the strategic intentions and principles within the Cheltenham planning framework and therefore local residents faith and confidence in the planning process involved.

Yours sincerely

30 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
GL51 3AH

30 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 21st April 2025

The proposal represents a significant addition to the original dwelling in terms of size and scale representing what appears to be a near 50% increase in size and scale compared to the original dwelling, and a significant erosion to the character of the existing dwelling. It should be noted that this proposal appears to represent the largest increase in size and scale over the original dwelling when compared to the extensions implemented by all the immediate neighbours. Furthermore, the proposal incorporates no step down from the existing dwelling as such this does not represent a subservient design in this case, causing significant conflict with relevant design policies.

The proposed rear roofline appears unsympathetic to the existing hip roofline in terms of pitch and shape as such to cause a conflict with the design guide. The proposed design of the dormer does not reflect the character of the original dwelling, and it would appear out of context.

Reducing the physical space between the proposed property and boundary line of 20 Bournside road to be less than a metre following the two-storey part of the side extension will cause the sense of space to be lost and produce a terracing appearance between the two properties, causing visual harm to the street scene.

Materials are completely out of context with the existing dwelling, conflicting with relevant design policies.

Whilst there has been an accumulation of larger modern extensions being approved along this road over the current local plan period, somewhat eroding the original character of the street scene, approving an extension of this size and scale would signify an increasingly weakened ability for the council to constrain cumulative negative harm caused to local street scenes. As such an increasingly negative precedent would be set for all other proposals within the local area, weakening the integrity of relevant design policies within this local authority.

Therefore, it is necessary for this proposal to be significantly reduced in size and scale as an absolute minimum, otherwise the current proposal would cause significant harm to relevant design policies and should be refused.

30 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
GL51 3AH

6 Banady Lane
Stoke Orchard
Cheltenham
GL52 7SJ

Comments: 21st May 2025

We met the applicants when they moved into Stoke Orchard in 2016. They are a lovely couple who quickly became part of the Stoke Orchard community regularly attending events at the local community centre and helping out when we held street parties for VE Day 75 and the Kings Coronation to name two.

We believe whilst they loved living in Stoke Orchard their heart was always set on moving closer to the town they adore, Cheltenham, and this dream came true when they found the property at 18 Bournside Road.

I visited the property on Bournside just after the applicants purchased it and it was clear from the start, that whilst the property needed a lot of work to modernise it, it would be their 'forever' home.

The applicants passion to make the Bournside property their dream home was evident to me from the moment I set foot in the house.

I have seen the plans and believe they will significantly improve what is a very run down and neglected property. I also think the applicants design will compliment the other varied properties on Bournside Road.

The applicants are definitely community focussed and will be a great asset to the road and wider area.

10 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 22nd April 2025

See my comments submitted 21st. April

Comments: 21st April 2025

Having studied the plans for the proposed development the resultant building will, in my opinion, conflict with the general appearance of the road in which the majority of the houses are spaced out. The planned white render and tea green weatherboard will result in a garish appearance more in keeping with a seaside property. How sad that perfectly acceptable red bricks will no longer be visible. The character of the road in which most of the properties were built in the 1930s and 50s will be eroded.

24 Marsh Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9JB

Comments: 21st May 2025

I am writing in strong support of the revised planning application for 18 Bournside Road. While I am not a direct neighbour, I've lived in Cheltenham for 10 years and frequently run through this road on my way to the beautiful Hatherley Park. I know the applicants personally, and I'm aware of the huge efforts they have made to follow the planning process and respond constructively to neighbour and planning officer feedback. Their approach has been transparent, proactive, and respectful throughout.

I'm a graphic designer by profession, and as such, I have a trained eye for proportion, balance, and visual harmony. From that perspective, this proposal represents exactly the kind of high-quality, design-led enhancement that should be welcomed in a diverse and forward-looking town like Cheltenham.

*

I also find the tone and language used in some of the public objections troubling. Inflammatory, insulting, and assumptive rhetoric have no place in a constructive planning dialogue. Comments should be factual, respectful, and rooted in planning considerations, not based on repetition, red herrings or pressure tactics. Misusing the public forum in this way undermines the integrity of the consultation process and risks setting a damaging precedent for future applications.

I trust the council will see past the noise and assess this application on its planning merits. It is a well-considered proposal that reflects responsible home improvement, and deserves fair consideration.

20 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AH

Comments: 18th May 2025

Response to the Revised Planning Application.

I recognise and appreciate that No. 18 has revised their original plans, for the "extension" of their property, to try and accommodate some of the objections raised to their planned changes.

Unfortunately, many of these changes appear to be cosmetic, which are appreciated, but are not addressing the significant issues with the building mass, loss of privacy, and the

loss of space between No. 18 and No. 20 Bournside Road, which affects the "streetscape" of the northern part of Bournside Road.

Proposed Changes and Claims by No.18 Bournside Road

1. Alteration to Roof Design

Examining the newly provided streetscape diagram, the roof changes appear to have significantly increased the roof height, particularly with the "pitched" roof design. The total floor space does not appear to have decreased; only the detailed usage of the space has changed, ie more storage. This revised roof design does not appear to reduce overall massing and visual bulk, as indicated by No. 18. This is an extremely large loft conversion that will visually appear bulky, overdeveloped, and will impact available light.

2. Reduction of Rear Juliet Window

I recognise that the width of the Juliet balcony has been reduced as a consequence of the roof change. A Juliet balcony, regardless of its size, on a roof will give the appearance of a third floor. In this case, since the Juliet balcony occupies a third of the large pitched roof facing the garden, it resembles a Juliet balcony on a sizable third floor.

The cladding appears to highlight certain aspects of the house, namely between the upper and lower windows, at the front of the gym, and at the back of the ground floor. This cladding on the third level at the back will almost certainly draw attention to the Juliet balcony and the visual aspect of the third floor. The Juliet balcony and the loss of the original sloping roof features are in direct conflict with the RA&E, which states, "Loft conversions should not have the appearance of an extra storey on top of the house - a dormer window should always be set within its roof."

Due to the third-floor appearance, this loft conversion directly conflicts with RA&E principle 2 of subservience, as it not only increases the building footprint to the width of the entire plot but also significantly increases the height of the building to add a third floor.

A dormer window on a smaller roof would fit in with the RA&E recommendations.

The Juliet balcony not only lets in light but also provides a fantastic view across gardens to the hills. However, this will remove the privacy that people have a right to.

Notably, this Juliet Balcony directly overlooks the land at the bottom of the garden to No.18, which according to the Site/block plan on the portal belongs to No. 20 - see the Site/Block plan on the planning portal. The Juliet balcony directly overlooks the garden of No. 20 Bournside Road and should not be allowed.

3. Increased Side Access / Spacing Between Properties

The proposed width of the house, along the garage and utility room, has been reduced by 0.3 of a metre, increasing the gap between the extension and the boundary from 0.7 metres to 1 metre. This represents a reduction of less than 2% of the entire extension; this reduction is not "substantial" (meaning large in size, number, or amount), as claimed. The small gap between the two houses, both in width and height, is likely to create a wind tunnel between the buildings. Others on the road who have experienced the same issue have brought it to our attention through their own experiences.

No. 18 has stated that the changes will provide "a generous 2.4 metre gap between the proposed side elevation at Number 18 and the existing elevation at Number 20". The current gap between No.18 and the boundary is 4.3 metres, which is generous. The newly proposed gap between No.18 and the boundary, to 1 metre (a change of 0.3 metres), is not significant and is not a "generous" gap.

Hence, it does not satisfy the RA&E framework section 2.0;3, which states This spaciousness derives from the spaces at the front, back and at the sides of buildings. Glimpses of trees, gardens and surrounding hills are essential if the spacious character of the town is to be maintained.

The view from Bournside Road between Nos. 18 and 20 of the listed Horse Chestnut trees at the rear of both houses will be significantly restricted. To note, the edge of the Cheltenham Central Conservation Zone is at the bottom of both rear gardens. Hence, the views from the Conservation Zone, through the current gap between 18 Bournside Road and 20 Bournside Road to Hatherly Park, will also be significantly impacted.

It's not only the gap between houses that matters; the new extension's three floors also increase the mass between the houses. The 0.3 meters increase in gap will provide very little "additional light between houses," as suggested.

5. Adjustment of Cladding Colour and Extent and the Removal of Front Porch and Column Posts

It is great to see these changes. I don't think they go far enough for the house to blend in with the other houses on the road, especially since there is still plenty of cladding on the proposed extension, particularly at the back, which emphasises the perception of a third floor.

29 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AL

Comments: 22nd April 2025

I am objecting to this proposal on the grounds of overdevelopment and erosion of street character and landscape.

I have been living on Bournside Road for 7 years now and in that time have seen a huge amount of development, more than half of which I would call excessive and not in keeping with the charming character of the road. We have extended our own property recently and it was of paramount importance to us to maintain our homes original features and character and also not make it 'too much house' for the plot and overshadow our neighbours homes and gardens.

The proposed development of 18 Bournside Road seems to have little intention of keeping any of the existing property and its features. It is one of the most beautifully symmetrical properties on Bournside Road, standing in a large plot of land, benefitting

from a huge amount of 'breathable' space around it. The new proposed development will erode all of this beauty and character and significantly gobble up the surrounding space to the detriment of all of those who live around it.

This proposal represents a significant overdevelopment of this plot and will set a detrimental precedent for future developments of which there will be many. I would urge full consideration to be given to protect the charm and character of Bournside Road - as many residents have already done so with their developments.

18 Bournside Road is a beautiful property which stands within a large plot of land. It has plenty of scope to create a more considerate, yet modern dwelling fit for this century whilst still paying full consideration to its character and that of the streetscape and surroundings.

21 Bournside Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AL

Comments: 21st May 2025

We have seen the revised planning application for 18 Bournside Road and wish to comment further.

In our previous objections, a High Court judgment we quoted included the conclusion of the Judge about the necessity to not regard neighbours as only those living in adjacent properties etc. The neighbourhood and its existing character are very important. We do not understand how such a seemingly important judgment was not taken on board by this Planning Department who maintain that they are not required to put up planning proposal notices on this road or to notify more than the immediate neighbours and so did not do this with this application.

The gap between between 18 and 20 Bournside Road

We see just how little the distance between the two houses has been increased 18 Bournside Road has been increased. in fact, the distance from the new garage wall wall to the fence has increased only from 0.7m to 1.0m. In other words- by the length of a school ruler. Not much can fit along that width, in fact.

However, more importantly is the great reduction in space between 18 and 20 resulting from the the proposed three storey side extension which will have the effects previously mentioned which includes the 'massing' effect visually and the loss of light.

Roof Design

'Summary of Amendments to Revised Planning application 25/00520/FUL: 1. Alteration to Roof Design

'The steeped and angled height reduction over the side extension means this will now read visually as a two-storey addition (with just storage space to the loft conversion) further eliminating any appearance of a third -storey to the front elevations'.

Comment:

What is meant by 'just storage space' in such a huge increase in house size (something like 3x the original) is not clear but this very high angled roof above it means that the storage space is very large, as seen on the plans, so that with the addition of a dormer window or roof light any time in the future it has great potential as a further 'attic' room. Attic spaces should, therefore, be replaced by Dormer windows or windows in line with the angle of the roof. This would remove objections about invasion of privacy.

Changes in the appearance of the planned house alterations.

The removal of the columns at the front door and the Tea Green New England type cladding on the front elevation are an improvement, although the neutral/cream tone, at least, of cladding has been used over rather extensive areas- including on the second floor (or third floor- as both have been used to describe the third storey) around the very large Juliet window- which can hardly be described as being anything other than substantial. Privacy of those around has, again, not been the prime consideration but this is not the reason for installing a Juliet balcony. Rather it is so that anyone using that room will enjoy the views - especially in the late Autumn to early Spring.

Cladding on so many areas in an urban house is contentious- especially if it does not blend with the styles of houses in this section of the road. It has been tried once before and does stand out as being not in keeping with the style and building materials of this road.

There is no respect for the fact that this house stands out on the road in both style and extremely fine brickwork- despite being constructed in the 1950s. It is altogether as if, without actually demolishing this house, it is to be rebuilt.

The huge scale of the height of the roof, the very large three storey side extension and the virtual filling of the width of the site, and the effects on neighbours of lack of privacy from the 'attic' Juliet balcony and being too close to 20 Bournside Road, along with the obliteration of most of the brickwork with cladding and rendering means that we remain opposed to the present plans.

Comments: 20th April 2025

Objections to proposed alterations in appearance, size and side extension to 18 Bournside Road (Planning Application Reference: 25/00520/FUL)

I have lived on this road since August 1985- firstly at no. 74 and, since 2003, at 21 Bournside Road. Of course, ***** and I have seen many changes to properties- over the last decade in particular. Apart from one property, on our stretch of Bournside Road from its junction with Hatherley Court Road to the Bournside Road bend, which was allowed to have an outer appearance completely at variance with those of the other houses, extensions etc have been sympathetic, at least, to the essentially 1950s houses. People have managed to achieve their aims for larger houses without wanting to make dramatic departures from the overall feeling of the road. This is a leafy and very much loved road. Now there is the plan for 18 Bournside Road. This house is considered by very many of us as being special- it stands out as being unpretentious but so very lovely in architecture as it stands there. Yes, it is too small inside for modern day living so, when I first spoke to the new owners and was unsurprised to hear that they wished to expand it, I said all of this and hoped that their plans would be sympathetic. They are far from that.

The plans show a huge house occupying almost all of the width of the plot and it is, indeed, perhaps only about 60 cm from the boundary with 20 Bournside Road. There is also an extension into the back garden which has a third floor in the roof with a design which removes privacy from neighbouring gardens. There will be a three floor extension between 18 and 20 Bournside Road- where there was no extension before. This is

achieved by extending the roof line from the house to make a third floor for this new extension to accommodate an en-suite for Bedroom 1. The property will not keep its brickwork appearance but will be partly rendered. Very sad but even sadder is the idea to clad it as if it was a New England House on a distinctly non-New England road. Cedral Lap Fibre Cement cladding C76 Tea Green.....

As much house as possible is planned regardless of its impact on others and the character of the house, as it has at the moment, completely lost- even to the loss of the stone mullions

As for the effect of the planned extensions/alterations on 20 Bournside Road in particular, as we look across we can clearly imagine it. We leave it to them to state the obvious but lack of privacy, light, overdevelopment come to mind instantly.

We live backing on to the park and it is true that many houses have loft conversions with Juliet balconies. However, looking out onto the Park is hardly the same as spending your time looking out onto neighbours' back gardens since there is, realistically, nowhere else to look since the houses on the side of no. 18 tend to have very tall trees behind them and three storey houses backing onto them- without Juliet balconies as it happens- no doubt a planning restriction for privacy of Bournside Road houses! So not only are adjacent neighbours affected by a Juliet balcony and long windows/glass doors on no.18 but so are people in their bedrooms in the houses behind them.

It seems that people require so very much in their houses these days but to intend to build such an out of scale, overbearing property with no regard to the context of the locality is just far beyond what would be reasonable for this charming and well-built brick property. A gym could well have been accommodated in a garden studio/office....which are all the rage these days anyway.

In a case at The Royal Courts of Justice before The Hon. Mr. Justice Holgate on 3 February 2022

Between:

CAB HOUSING LIMITED Case No: CO/2763/2021 Claimant

- and -

(1) THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR LEVELLING UP, HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES

(2) LONDON BOROUGH OF BROXBOURNE

etc., with which you will be far more familiar than we are, where different defendants were seeking clarification about aspects of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 :

First, are the claimants correct in saying that a planning authority's control of impact on amenity limited to effects on properties contiguous with, or abutting, the subject property and are those effects limited to overlooking, privacy and loss of light? Alternatively, does that control embrace impact upon all aspects of the amenity of neighbouring premises, as the Secretary of State contends? Second, is the authority's control of the external appearance of the subject dwelling limited to the "design and architectural features" of its principal elevation and any side elevation fronting a highway, and is it further limited to the effects of those matters upon the subject dwelling itself? The claimants contend for that interpretation and they say that the authority is not allowed to consider the effects of external appearance upon any property outside the subject dwelling. Alternatively, is the correct interpretation, as the Secretary of State contends, that the control covers (1) all aspects of the external appearance of the proposed development, and not simply the two elevations specifically referred to in AA.2(3)(a)(ii)) and (2) impact upon other premises, and not simply the subject dwelling itself?

Paragraph 102: The Hon. Mr. Justice Holgate:

1. I summarise the court's main conclusions on the interpretation of Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO 2015:

(i) Where an application is made for prior approval under Class AA of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO 2015, the scale of the development proposed can be controlled within the ambit of paragraph AA.2(3)(a);

(ii) In paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(i) of Part 1, "impact on amenity" is not limited to overlooking, privacy or loss of light. It means what it says;

(iii) The phrase "adjoining premises" in that paragraph includes neighbouring premises and is not limited to premises contiguous with the subject property;

(iv) In paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(ii) of Part 1, the "external appearance" of the dwelling house is not limited to its principal elevation and any side elevation fronting a highway, or to the design and architectural features of those elevations;

(v) Instead, the prior approval controls for Class AA of Part 1 include the "external appearance" of the dwelling house;

(vi) The control of the external appearance of the dwelling house is not limited to impact on the subject property itself, but also includes impact on neighbouring premises and the locality.

When the one existing house on this stretch of Bournside Road was originally going to be entirely rendered but the plans changed to cladding, the Inspector said that black larch cladding was 'not considered particularly harmful to the street scene; to the front elevation,'. Why not? Many of us think otherwise. The interesting thing is that, at that time, the views of people living on this stretch of road in general were not sought- we did not even know that this was going to happen. Paragraph 102 : 1(iii) and 1(vi) show the need to inform more than next neighbours if impact on neighbouring premises and locality is to be judged. Surely this is down to more than a CBC Inspector's opinion as we live here. Thinking about a planning inspector's decision on the existing cladded house, the Inspector said that there were only 2 objections- hardly surprising if most of us had no idea of what was happening. It is not democratic when we are cut out of decision making by being kept uninformed. On top of which, some of us are reaching, or are, at advanced ages with health issues and may be unwilling to do what we are doing- raise our heads above the parapet and cause issues with a new neighbour when we feel that our voices will not be heard anyway.

Now we have the situation where the applicants can quote the cladded house and say that their house is not setting a precedent. Can you imagine this being allowed on Regency, Victorian and Edwardian houses on pleasant roads in Cheltenham? Why aren't 1950s houses given the same consideration? How can the tastes of an individual be allowed to affect the road so drastically? The Judge's rulings give the answer to this in that you are allowed to stand back and refuse aspects of an application if they are not desirable.

Please turn down this application and ask them to have more regard for the general 1950s architecture of the road, the house itself (definitely!) and for neighbours regarding scale and privacy.