

APPLICATION NO: 26/00257/FUL	OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren
DATE REGISTERED: 14th February 2026	DATE OF EXPIRY : 11th April 2026
WARD: Leckhampton	PARISH: LECKH
APPLICANT:	Mr And Mrs Charlotte And Anthony Mee
LOCATION:	10 Halland Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire
PROPOSAL:	Rear and side single storey extension, new gable end to attic and 2no. dormers.

REPRESENTATIONS

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

9 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 10th March 2026

Letter attached.

9 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 11th March 2026

The plans by Aj Architects Ltd need to be corrected:

EXISTING_REAR_SIDE_2_ELEVATIONS-1711798

PROPOSED_REAR_SIDE_2_ELEVATIONS-1711804

Both plans should show the central drainage hoppers and down pipes. The partial presentation of these is probably the result of a mistaken erasure. These down pipes are a material planning matter.

It would be more straight forward if the boundary line was shown on rear elevations and not an arbitrary line through number 9 property. This certainly led to me believing that there was a gap between the properties to provide for no 10 maintenance.

Planning Application: **26/00257/FUL**

Site Address: **10 Halland Road Cheltenham GL53 0DJ**

Dear Ben Warren, Planning Officer, Cheltenham Borough Council,

We wish to object to the above planning application.

We live at No 9 Halland Road which is adjacent to the proposed development.

Our objection is based on the following planning concerns:

Conservation Area & Keeping the Character of the Houses & Visual Amenity Impact

The property is in a Cheltenham Conservation Area and any changes have to *preserve or enhance* the area's appearance and special character. Cheltenham Borough Council's policy says new extensions must be well designed, in keeping and must not harm the area.

Losing the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses is a problem for our property in terms of retaining its character in the conservation area, where the Council is required to protect the character of buildings and rooflines. As we have a converted loft space we know that the proposals could be amended to retain symmetry and still provide a significant size of valuable space in the attic.

Raising the sill and reducing the size of the rear east window on the south elevation to allow a higher pitched roof to the extension alters the symmetry and character of the period pair of semis.

So, while we appreciate that No 10 developer does not see a major issue with the change in appearance, it is a material planning concern.

Scale, Massing and How Close the Build Is

The proposed extension is very large, and from No 9 side feels overbearing. The planning rules expect developments to fit sensitively with neighbouring homes and avoid dominating the boundary. This comes under design policies like JCS SD4 and Cheltenham Plan D1, which set out expectations on respecting context, scale and massing. The plans on the south elevation have a very misleading party wall line, which we only discovered from careful examination. It would have been much more helpful to ourselves, planners and councillors for the boundary to be clearly demonstrated.

We also note the drainage, and rainwater goods proposals are not clarified on the plans, particularly the ones for the rear elevation, which are in the centre of the property. These are the ones which would reveal and clarify the true impact on our property.

Having the wall within about 10cm of our fence is extremely close. It does not give either party enough room for maintenance, managing gutters and managing fencing. It will be difficult to ensure water does not run onto our side. It also means the full height and mass of the building would be imposing when we are in the garden.

There is planting along our east facing border. The proposed boundary will be disruptive to the mature fig tree on our side.

A setback of around 75cm to 1 metre would make a massive difference and be a much more neighbourly approach. It is what the Council's extension guidance generally expects—extensions should avoid creating "unneighbourly" boundary conditions.

Drainage & Structural Concerns

This is the part we are very concerned about.

The Sustainability Statement states:

a soak away will be provided to service surface water drainage collected from the roof of the garage/dwelling. Hard standing surfaces will be constructed with a fall in order to drain water naturally

away from the property. The above will be implemented in order to eliminate additional demand on the existing drainage infrastructure in the locality.

In correspondence to us the neighbour at No 10 states that all run-off water will be connected to the existing drainage. The Parish Council advised us that soak ways do not work in the Leckhampton area. This has left us very confused.

The soil type here (sandy base) and the fact the extension would sit so close to our boundary means we are really concerned about longterm water movement and what that could mean for the stability of our foundations.

Cheltenham's planning rules say drainage must *not* increase flood risk or affect neighbours, and must have a proper plan to show water is managed safely (JCS INF2). [\[gloucester.gov.uk\]](http://gloucester.gov.uk)

Right now, there's no drainage plan showing:

- how the extra roof area will drain,
- how the existing roof will drain since central outlet will be covered by new extension
- where water will go during storms,
- how overflow or gutter failure (which does happen) will be controlled, or
- how run-off will be prevented from moving toward our property.

In sandy soil water can shift and erode the ground faster than in clay. This means even small changes in water flow can put foundations at risk over time. This fact cannot be ignored especially where the new wall is essentially right on the boundary.

We would like to formally request that the Council require a full drainage strategy before anything can be approved. This is a normal expectation in planning terms when a development is close to a boundary and increases roof area or impermeable surface.

We're not drainage engineers—but this is exactly why the burden is on the applicant to provide the proper calculations.

We will need to appoint a party wall surveyor to ensure that the work is done fairly and safely for us,

LongTerm Maintenance Problems

Another issue with being so close to the boundary is the practical reality of:

- maintaining gutters,
- checking downpipes,
- preventing damp and splashback,
- and avoiding rainwater spilling directly onto our side.

Even with the best builder, gutters move over time with weather and building movement. If the extension is right up against the boundary, *any* problem with guttering instantly becomes *our* problem too.

A setback of 75 to 100cm does not eliminate the need for maintenance, but it does prevent the extension from becoming a permanent maintenance nuisance to us and allows both owners to maintain their property properly.

Privacy & Roof-lights

The roof-lights may give angled views into our neighbouring garden. Frosting them would reduce this and does at least provide compromise.

Solar panels increase glare compared to a standard roof tile. As we love to be in our garden this is a concern for us.

This is again part of the amenity issues that planning policies (JCS SD14) say must be protected.

Summary

We understand why No 10 wants to extend, but we are objecting to the proposed extension for the reasons we have outlined. We cannot support the current version of the plans because of:

- The size, scale and proximity of the extension
- The loss of symmetry and negative impact on visual amenity
- The new attic windows overlook the property
- The lack of a proper drainage plan (in sandy soil)
- The extremely tight boundary relationship
- The longterm maintenance and water run-off risks

A design set back 75cm–1m and with a fully thoughtthrough drainage plan would go a long way to addressing a lot of what worries us.

For these reasons we respectfully request that the council refuse this application, or require significant changes to address these concerns.

[REDACTED]

9 Halland Road, Cheltenham GL53 0DJ