

PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

Date: 21 September 2021 at 5:00 pm

Venue: Parmoor House

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

Apologies: Judy Hodson, Dawn Williams

Declarations of interest: None

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

Next Meeting: Monday 25 October 2021 at 5:00 pm

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

- 2.1 21/02019/FUL I Various external works within the grounds of Cheltenham Minster (St Mary's) to include improvements to the paving and connection pathways; improvements to the lighting; restoration of historic artefacts; improved vehicular access; provision of formal seating areas; and enhancements to biodiversity I St Marys Church Well Walk Cheltenham Gloucestershire
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QZ29VVELHU300&activeTab=summary>
SUPPORT in principle but a lot of concerns. The Civic Society Planning Forum support this scheme in principle, Cheltenham Civic Society having contributed significantly to the consultation process so far. A different consultant to the one carrying out the earlier consultation has been used to draw up this design, and they have missed many of issues which were raised in that first consultation.

There is a real opportunity to permanently change this area of the town for good, but it requires brave decision making. If money were no object, the council could think big and create a large open landscape setting linked to the High Street. This would be mutually advantageous to the Minster and to the High Street shopping experience.

This proposal fundamentally ignores the heritage significance of the site. This would not happen to any other Grade I listed building. The tomb survey is good. The setting of a Grade I listed building must be handled with great care, and there are significant historical constraints on new interventions. Why then does the designer insist that these new interventions should be 'contemporary and standout'? This is neither best practice nor desirable.

Paths

Key access and egress routes seem to have been omitted from the scheme. More should be made of existing desire lines when planning the paths. If there is a need for the P7 path in the south, implement it now rather than wait for it to be retrodden and undermine the scheme. Why are 'Tobermore Mayflair flags' being used? How does this (alongside the contrasting proposed Cotswold stone gabions) reflect the context and setting?

We are pleased to see that the raised metal grating walkway is to be omitted. It is far too industrial and inappropriate to the setting.

Street Art

The Civic Society Planning Forum strongly objects to the plans for 'painted art'/ street art on the back of Cheltenham House. Parts of Cheltenham House are now Grade II listed. The earlier consultation specifically warned against inappropriate street art in this setting, as required by NPPF para 199. We were therefore surprised to see it included in this application.

Gabion Seating

The gabion seating is hideous and does not relate in any way to the Grade I Minster, contrary to NPPF para 199. The desire to introduce biodiversity seems to have magically usurped this requirement. Who wants bees and wasps buzzing around their heads when having a sandwich, lunch or coffee, especially children?

- 2.2 21/02038/FUL I Demolition of all existing buildings and erection of 24 dwellings comprising seven houses and 17 apartments (Use Class C3), and other associated works including access, infrastructure, landscaping, and parking I 320 Swindon Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 9JT
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QZ5Z4HELHV700&activeTab=summary>

OBJECT

There has been a good consultation exercise, although little local engagement.

The proposal is disappointingly unattractive. Even social housing should employ the principles of building with beauty and should be exemplary - indeed could be award winning.

This is a prominent site, especially the corner with Swindon Road. The mass and boxiness on this corner with the flat roof and high parapet does not match with the local vernacular. It could be softened with pitched roofs like the other blocks of flats in this area. The design is lacking in any local references in its form or its materials (brick palette). It has also failed to reference the local historic importance of the Maud's Elm site in either name or planting.

Bin storage is badly thought out. Putting cars and bins round the back would improve the appearance of these homes.

We support the provision of much needed social housing and the commitment to sustainable energy provision and high insulation standards.

- 2.3 21/01727/FUL I Enlarge part of the existing garage with a first floor extension over to accommodate a gym room. New vehicular access to the garage from Back Montpellier Terrace. I 67 Montpellier Terrace Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1XA
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QWZTBUDELHD900&activeTab=summary>

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum strongly objects to this application. There is no mention in the submitted papers that this is a Grade II listed building. The appalling drawings do not allow proper assessment of context, present state or proposed state. The application contravenes Cheltenham Plan Policies D1 and HE1 and para 7.2 and JCS Policy SD9.

The Planning Forum does not think that an application as inadequate as this, which does not give sufficient information for an assessment, should be accepted by the council's planning officers.

- 2.4 21/01993/FUL I Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings, construction of replacement dwelling with garaging I Pinewood 12 Battledown Drive Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6RX
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QYUHSOELHSG00>

NEUTRAL

There is no mention of landscaping or sustainability in the application.

- 2.5 21/01899/LBC I Alteration to existing single storey extension at rear, alterations to roof to include dormer at rear, replacement of windows and guttering, render repair and repainting the property I 1 Lansdown Terrace Lane Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2JU
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QYA3XQELHN700>

OBJECT

This is a listed building that, whilst run down, is the first building one sees as one approaches the arch. It has important group value but its heritage context has been completely ignored.

The scheme has ripped the heart out of this building and fails to consider NPPF Part 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, notably para 90: the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place. Yet again, dark grey aluminium windows are completely unsuitable for this sort of building. Just because the manufacturer calls them 'heritage' windows does not mean they are suitable for listed buildings in a conservation area. The windows should have wood frames. A sharp modern aluminium window is wholly inappropriate and contravenes Cheltenham Plan Policy D1 and HE1 and para 7.2 and JCS Policy SD9.

- 2.6 21/01856/FUL I Erection of temporary structures in connection with festivals and special events including an ice rink in Imperial Gardens for a maximum of 75 days for one period being 2020/2021 (November 2021 January 2022) inclusive of rig and de rig. This is in addition to the current planning permissions for festivals and special events on Montpellier Gardens and Imperial Gardens I Imperial Garden Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=QXXAQGEL08300&activeTab=summary>

SUPPORT

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports this application but it will be important to monitor adherence to the conditions. Longer term, there needs to be a strategy for holding events such as this in the town which does not depend so heavily on using parks and green spaces and brings more benefit to the town centre's retail and hospitality businesses.

- 2.7 21/01969/LBC | Alterations to shop front plus internal alterations and refurbishment of ground and basement floors to accommodate a new art gallery and ancillary office and storage space. | 27 Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1LE
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QYQS4DELHQW00>

SUPPORT

This is a light touch application and a positive use for the building.

- 2.8 21/02013/LBC | Painting of the whole building in Dulux Salisbury Stone and advertisements comprising 1no. fascia sign, 2 no. plaques and 2 no. menu signs Installation of:- 1 set of non illuminated fascia text 2 non illuminated plaques 2 internally illuminated menus | 43 Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1LE
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QZ1W8ZELHTW00>

NEUTRAL

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports painting the woodwork, but objects strongly to the proposal to paint the stone columns. This would contravene Cheltenham Plan Policy D1 and HE1 and para 7.2 and JCS Policy SD9.

3 Planning Forum Review Update

- 3.1 Who is the audience for this review? Should we include names? Acronyms? Written for us. But if it goes on the website would need to be amended.
 Annual meeting with planning committee? Build into council calendar? Useful conclusions. Different audiences for different parts of the report, so should not make public as it stands in its entirety. Selected highlights to go to stakeholders e.g. CBC or as before in articles in Our Town. Tool to engage with potential planning forum members. Adrian suggests one report from this to CCS committee, and another to CBC officers (recurring themes and issues). Identify what actions and priorities we want to come out of it. E.g. policies outdated and incoherent. Lack of an environmental standards policy to back up their Carbon Zero policy. Policy needs to be pro-active. Lack of consistency makes it more difficult to uphold standards and enforce.
 Lack of masterplans or heritage strategies. AP/MR
 Next
 (1) Recommendations specifically for PF AP
 (2) Draft report for CBC (to be reviewed by PF members) - need to have some asks
 (3) Carry on coming up with ideas (like Cambray Court) for CCS to put forward for public to engage with
 AB to come up with agenda points for meeting (still to be scheduled) with

4 AOB

- 4.1 Sue Jenkins to make selection for next meeting SJ
- 4.2 Actions arising from applications considered:
- (i) Andrew B to request meeting with council officers re Minster Churchyard AB
 - (ii) Andrew B to write to Tracey Crews re validation/ acceptance of poor quality applications (e.g. inadequate drawings) such as 21/01727/FUL 67 Montpellier Terrace. AB

5 Next Meeting

5pm Monday 25 October 2021 at Parmoor House (probably)

.