

PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

Date: 25 October 2021 at 5:00 pm

Venue: Westhall House

Present: Andrew Booton, Judy Hodson, Sue Jenkins, Andrew Kitching, Adrian Philips, Mike Sheppard, Mike Richardson, Peter Sayers (Chair), Tess Beck (Secretary),

Apologies: Dawn Williams

Declarations of interest: None

Distribution: Those present + Trustees.
Section 2 only to Planning Comments Box dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk

Next Meeting: 30 November 2021 at 5:00 pm Westhall House

Ref	Item	Action
1	Declarations of interest	
1.1	None	
2	Applications considered	

- 2.1 21/02148/FUL I The erection of 2 dwellings I Land East Of Leckhampton Reservoir Leckhampton Hill Cheltenham Gloucestershire <https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=consulteeComments&keyVal=QZZ7WOELI1600>

OBJECT

This is a very sensitive site on the edge of the AONB. Ideally it would not be developed, but given that permission in principle has been granted, it is important that any development is scrutinised and managed to ensure that it is sympathetic to its surroundings, and is not to the detriment of an important landscape.

The proposed buildings are very prominent. If they followed the contours of the land, rather than being square on, they would sit in the landscape better. Reducing the height of the Plot 2 building, or introducing pitched roofs would help with this.

The Civic Society Planning Forum's concerns include:

- Trees

Most of the mature trees on the site are ash and are likely to succumb to ash dieback (many have already). The replacements proposed are hedgerow trees; hawthorns and field maples. Replacement planting should be mature trees. Whilst we acknowledge the extent of development of the site makes it difficult to accommodate this replacement planting, perhaps permission can be secured for mature trees at the perimeters of the site.

- Public Right of Way

The footpath is the historic tramway, and should be protected, especially from heavy plant during the construction process, as well as ensuring public access and right of way throughout.

-Traffic

We share others' concerns about the road entrance onto a road which is already busy with fast moving traffic coming down the hill, and two nearby junctions. The entrance needs a much wider visibility splay, for vehicles turning out, which could be achieved by moving the boundary wall/ hedge of Plot 2 further from the road. The entrance needs to be 2 cars width at entrance.

- Water run-off

How will water run-off be managed, given the extent of the development of the site?

2.2 21/02211/LBC | Re-painting of shopfront and replacement of external signage, internal refurbishment works and alterations | WHITE STUFF
102 - 104 Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1NB
[https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/
applicationDetails.do?keyVal=R014RBELI5600&activeTab=summary](https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=R014RBELI5600&activeTab=summary)

SUPPORT but with recommendations

It is good news that this retail unit on the Promenade is being filled. Julian Dunkerton's companies have invested heavily in Cheltenham, with many of their interventions are exemplary, including some nominated for Civic Awards. Hopefully this development will be of a similarly high standard.

Ideally, the drawing in the submitted application would have shown the colour as proposed (i.e. off black not yellow).

The pilasters of the shop front should provide visual support to the fascia and floors above (Shop Front Design Guide SPD 3.3). The proposed colour scheme fails to distinguish between the pilasters and the horizontal elements.

While the Shop Front Design Guide SPD does not generally support illuminated signs on period buildings, internally illuminated letters are acceptable in some cases. Modern LED lighting means that such lighting is less obtrusive than it would have been when the SPD was adopted in 2007.

2.3 21/01962/FUL I Internal and external alterations, to include: removal and replacement of windows and doors, removal and relocation of cloakroom, removal of internal walls, installation of veranda to the rear, installation of gate across driveway. I 125 Hales Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6ST

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QYQS9ZELHR200&activeTab=summary>

OBJECT

The design and access statement is inaccurate. As the planning officers and committee members well know, the listing status covers the entire building, internal and external, not just the front elevation as is claimed here.

The proposed removal of the walls of the rear reception room would fundamentally change the layout of the house and would, in the process, destroy the cornices and doorway in the rear reception/ hallway.

No information is given about what is planned for the basement level, and it is hard to make an informed decision from an incomplete application. But from the ground floor plans, it appears that a staircase connecting the ground floor with the basement is being removed to make space for a lavatory. Again, this would fundamentally change the layout of a listed building and is not acceptable. The basement would also lose its rear light well.

The proposed Crittall steel frame doors/ windows are inappropriate.

- 2.4 21/02217/FUL I Reinstating the building as a single dwelling house, internal alterations, two storey rear extension, various external alterations and re-introduction of historical accurate front boundary railings I 117 London Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6HL <https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=R0JL8EELI5B00&activeTab=summary>

SUPPORT

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports the proposed improvements to bring a very neglected building back into use, and the largely sympathetic approach.

There is clear delineation and contrast between the modern rear extension and the existing building. We commend the photo mock ups of the rear elevation, though we have concerns that the rear glass wall may cause a loss of privacy to future occupants, given the very built up area and elevated position.

We object to the proposed roller shutter garage door, as we previously objected to a similar one at the rear of Clarence Square (21/01340/LBC). Both the conservation officer and the Civic Society Planning Forum objected to the timber effect roller shutter doors onto the rear lane proposed in that case, and the plans were amended to indicate timber folding gates. Timber gates would be much more appropriate for this property, both to define the boundary of a listed building and to front a lane within a conservation area.

3 Planning Forum Review Update

3.1 Criteria for selection - continue as currently, but define for newcomers.
[criteria below subsequently circulated by Adrian to be agreed at next meet]

- *schemes that seem likely to threaten the integrity of Cheltenham's historic heritage, both at the Conservation Area and listed building level*
- *schemes that seem likely to threaten the integrity of Cheltenham's relationship to the surrounding countryside, especially the Cotswolds AONB*
- *large schemes that are likely to have a significant impact on the town*
- *smaller schemes that are illustrative of a kind of poor quality development - e.g., unsympathetic design, damage to the street scene, neglect of trees and green space - that is occurring more widely and which could be held up as examples of "how not to do it"*
- *exemplary schemes that could set new standards for development in the town and be considered as potential entries for our Civic Awards scheme*

Restrict to 4 or 6 applications at most per meeting. **Agreed**

Relate to local & national policies wherever possible. **Agreed**

Recommendation of planning conditions where appropriate.

At end of meeting agree on any matters or policy arising for further action.

Adrian would like this to be an annual review to be subject of meeting with CBC.

Do we wish to follow up each decision? Mostly no, though Andrew B would like to - e.g. to note where CCS advice has been taken, and to identify possible Civic Award nominees.

Reviewing how we work in future.

Should we exclusively respond to planning applications? **No**

Should there be an additional forum for decisions around major schemes? This could be challenging.

Policy initiatives - responding to local and national policy initiatives/ consultations - should this continue to be delegated to the Planning Forum - or should it be a separate forum - **try this once**.

TB

4 Civic Awards update

4.1 The long list has been distributed has been to the judges. They just have to do the grand tour.

Date for awards now 13 December (moved due to change of date of council meeting). 7:30 pm at Pip and Jims.

5 AOB

- 5.1 Tree works in conservation area given approval, without time for scrutiny or oversight. Sue to look at what the policies are SJ
- 5.2 Cambray Court
Next stage would be for the Civic Society to put in a full planning application for our proposals. (the cost needs to be approved by CCS trustees, both for the application and civil engineering advice). This would be an opportunity for the Environment Agency to formally comment as well as putting our scheme in public domain, hopefully getting support from councillors and Cambray Court freehold and garage owners. Andrew K disagrees and feels that the Civic Society should be an observer not the applicant. Put to the vote: 7 for, 1 abstention, 1 against. CCS Trustees
- 6 Next Meeting**
- Selector for next meeting. Adrian Philips AP
Tuesday 30 November at Sue's again.
-

Extra note from Tess:

This is the link to the River Chelt audio trail which Christina Poulton did during the first lockdown with funding from the SPTM Big Local
<https://rivercheltrail.co.uk>

Interestingly, it appears that CBC may be planning to change the public facing bit of the Licensing part of the Planning Portal, as the website is not as clear with deadlines and representations as it could be, and they acknowledge that this is an issue with other functions apart from licensing. According to Martin Horwood, the cabinet member responsible, there is a major piece of work in hand to improve all CBC's public facing software. Early days but there should be some progress to report in the new year. Lead officer with oversight of this is Darren Knight. This came out of a recent statutory consultation on sexual entertainment at the 2 Pigs, where objections were being blocked by CBC's email filtering software.
