

## PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

**Date:** 23 August 2021 at 5:00 pm

**Venue:** Parmoor House

**Present:** Andrew Booton, Sue Jenkins, Adrian Philips, Mike Sheppard, Peter Sayers (Chair), Tess Beck (Secretary)

**Apologies:** Andrew Kitching, Mike Richardson, Dawn Williams

**Distribution:** Those present + Trustees.  
Section 2 only to Planning Comments Box [dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk)

**Next Meeting:** **Tuesday 21 September 2021 at 5:00 pm**

---

Ref	Item	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Declarations of interest</b>	
1.1	None	
<b>2</b>	<b>Applications considered</b>	
2.1	21/01688/PRIOR I Proposed installation of 18m high 'slim line' Phase 8 H3G street pole, wrap around cabinet and 3no.cabinets I Land At Central Cross Drive Cheltenham Gloucestershire <a href="https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QWOPBPELHB700&amp;activeTab=summary">https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QWOPBPELHB700&amp;activeTab=summary</a>	
	<b>OBJECT</b>	
	Comments already submitted	

2.2 21/01746/FUL I Single storey and two storey rear extensions, and demolition of existing delapidated coach house and construction of new coach house I 271 Gloucester Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AA

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage> SUPPORT / OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum objects to this scheme on the grounds that it (1) requires the demolition of the charming coach house. Though ostensibly in poor condition, it could be saved; and (2) the extension to the main building is excessive and overbearing.

271 Gloucester Road is a locally listed building (alongside its neighbour 267 Gloucester Road) and as such is defined by NPPF as a Heritage Asset.

The proposed extension is excessive and overbearing. According to the borough council's Index of Buildings of Local Interest Supplementary Planning Document, adopted June 2007

*"Extensions and new buildings will preserve the scale, character and setting of the building. They will normally be subservient to the main building in height and massing".*

We have some concerns about the effect of this increased height and shape on its neighbour, 273 Gloucester Road.

The scale of the extension necessitates the demolition of the coach house, an attractive building in its own right. With its ornate detailing, form and obvious relationship with the principal residence, the existing coach house building makes a strong contribution to the site and to the wider setting. Demolition makes no sense, just to remove and replace it with a less attractive building on a similar footprint in a different part of the plot. Again, referring to the council's 2007 Supplementary Planning Document,

*"3.2 Locally, the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan establishes a policy basis for preparing the Index and protecting the buildings on it in Policy BE30A, which states that "The demolition of, or loss of features of special interest or character on, a building on the Index of Buildings of Local Importance will be resisted."*

*5.4 Any proposals should respect the Indexed building's character or interest and should preserve or enhance it. This does not mean that it should be preserved exactly as it is – but that any alterations should be carried out in a sympathetic manner, using high quality design. Where there is control over demolition, it will normally be refused unless there is a strong justification.*

*5.5 It is hoped that the unique qualities of the building, recognised through its inclusion on the Index, will encourage owners to take pride in its care. This will be particularly important where the proposals are outside the control of the Council. In such cases it is intended that this document will act as a basis for good practice.*

Demolition is very damaging to the environment due to the release of embedded carbon and the need to replace with a new structure, which contravenes JCS policy SD3.

There is no evidence of attempts to reuse the building as it stands and too much emphasis placed on its apparent dilapidation, for which

- 2.3 21/01687/FUL I Installation of new gates and railings at East and West Approach Drives and associated alterations, and restoration of c19th steps to the front of the Pump Rooms I Pittville Pump Room East Approach Drive Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 3JE

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QXKF9REL08300>

**NEUTRAL**

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports the proposals in principle, but feels that this is not the right scheme, and questions whether this the best use of public money.

Ideally there should be an overall plan for the whole of the area around the Pump Room. It is important to get it right rather than going in piecemeal with alterations which could prevent anything better in future.

There is an opportunity to do more with the steps, e.g. create a small amphitheatre by widening the steps with an arc. The steps are more likely to be used as seating than for access, and this should be considered in the design. There should be an area of paving at the base of the steps to prevent this area becoming muddy. And ideally the sea of tarmac in front of the Pump Room should be addressed. A more ambitious plan could attract funding from local societies and interested stakeholders.

It would be nice to have seen historic references for the proposed gates.

As Pittville is Cheltenham's biggest and most popular parks, there is likely to be significant public interest in these plans, and the council should have made more effort to consult on this beyond putting it on the Planning Portal.

- 2.4 21/01741/SCOPE I Application by Gloucestershire County Council (the applicant) for an order granting development consent for the M5 junction 10 improvements scheme (the proposed development) I Land For M5 Junction Improvements Tewkesbury Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QX1QZKEL08300&activeTab=summary>

**No comment submitted**

- 2.5 21/01821/ADV I New fascia sign I 60 Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1LY

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QXO9T3ELHIL00&activeTab=summary>

**No comment submitted**

- 2.6 21/01667/FUL I Replacement of existing timber framed shed with a single storey outbuilding I 79 Pittville Lawn Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 2BP <https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QWLKB1EL08300>

**OBJECT**

The Civic Society Planning Forum objects to this proposed replacement outbuilding. It is much larger than the existing shed, and closer to the listed building. The style is heavy and the rustic timber finish is not appropriate to the location. It does not contribute positively to the heritage asset or the Conservation Area. As such it is contrary to the NPPF and the JCS policy SD8.

If the applicant wants a contemporary style building, it should be much lighter and more transparent, with the lightest amount of framing. It should be clearly subservient and complementary to the house.

- 2.7 21/01733/CACN I Works to various trees as detailed in Barton Hyett's survey and report July 2021 I Cheltenham College 138 Bath Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 7LD <https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QX0341EL08300>

**No Comment Submitted**

**3 Planning Forum Review Update**

- 3.1 Not everyone had received/ read the latest draft of the review. Adrian to resend the latest version, and we will discuss it at the next meeting AP  
Adrian & Mike have not yet had everyone's case studies. Please send your case studies to Adrian by 1 September. Please use the format of the case studies already listed in the review. All

**AOB**

**4**

- 4.1 Locally listed buildings.  
Andrew B to send index of locally listed buildings to PF members. This list should be reviewed regularly, but last review appears to have been in 2007. AB

- 4.2 Tree maintenance and policies  
 Ongoing issue of trees being maintained by contractors who are not doing it competently - leading to trees being destroyed. There is no opportunity for consultation. The council's tree officer can advise but has no real powers.  
 Ideally there would be a mechanism for trees to be replaced possibly in other locations, e.g. like CIL - perhaps a flow chart.. There needs to be a guide to best practice for tree maintenance and holding contractors to this. Could CCS hold a list of recommended contractors?  
 Issue of stumps left without being ground out for some time (months/ years later)  
 How can we help Chris Chavasse?  
 Sue and Andrew B to liaise AB, SJ
- 4.3 Andrew B reported on attending CBC Planning Committee last week, where he was one of only 2 members of the public addressing the committee.  
 Committee member Cllr Bernie Fisher commended CCS in the case of Clarence Square pergola, then when it came to the Coach House which Andrew B spoke against the coach house, Cllr Fisher criticised CCS for wanting to preserve everything in aspic  
 Andrew B spoke for 3 minutes  
 Emma, the planning officer gave brief address to the planning committee, but did not make it clear that the application was retrospective, or explain the issue with the materials.  
 It was clear that at least some of the planning committee did not understand the issues. The coach house was approved.  
 Andrew B to type up notes. AB  
 Recommendation that members of the planning Forum and wider CCS should attend Planning Committee on a regular basis. But that addressing the committee should be reserved for special occasions only. All
- 4.4 Andrew B to have meeting with Tracey and Daniel and head of planning (currently Mike Holmes but only interim). Dave Oakhill not coming back from his current project. Need to think about agenda for this meeting.
- 4.5 Cambray Court  
 Andrew B to draft letter to the freeholder. He spoke to the chair of Cambray Court residents' association (RA) last Friday - and addressed a meeting of the RA the previous week. Plans for project are on the noticeboard. Issues raised by RA: ASB (linked to nearby nightclubs), illegal parking, people wandering into their garden. Possible solutions: rocks on river banks, defensive planting. The plan at this stage is still a concept - not a detailed planting plan. But an opportunity to save money, and possibly enhance the property value. No news on the freeholder yet. Next step: letter to freeholder inviting to a meeting with Cllr Paul Baker, AB, John RA chair AB

## 5 Next Meeting

5pm Tuesday 21 September 2021 at Parmoor House  
Tess to make selection.

TB