

PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

Date: 30 November 2021 at 5:00 pm

Venue: Westhall House

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

Apologies: Dawn Williams. Mike Richardson has stepped down from the Planning Forum

Note: The whole Forum expressed their thanks to Mike Richardson for his contributions and wished him well.

Declarations of interest: None

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

Next Meeting: TBA

Ref	Item	Action
1	Declarations of interest	
1.1	None	
2	Applications considered	
2.1	<p>21/02412/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling house and erection of 1 no. replacement dwelling and associated works I Ham Hill Farm Ham Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6ND https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R1S18NELIFX00</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>This replaces a non-descript building in a prominent position with a larger building which is an improvement and applies the local vernacular well.</p> <p>We note the Cotswold Conservation Board's comment about light pollution. If lighting is to be a planning condition, how is the quality and quantity of light going to be measured? Could the permission specify no uplighters? Generally a good scheme, though we echo the tree officer's comments about replacing trees with native varieties suitable to the AONB, rather than suburban style planting.</p> <p>The dates on the planning portal make it unclear what the deadline date for comments are.</p>	

- 2.2 21/02454/FUL & 21/02454/LBC I Carrick House Lypiatt Road Cheltenham: Change of use of building from offices (Class E) to 12no. apartments (Class C3) with associated internal and external alterations and extension
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QUUF48ELGYB00>

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports the change of use in principle.

The heritage statement is good, but it has not been taken into account in the design. And we are disappointed that no street scene image has been submitted.

The over development of site compromises the scheme. The landscaping is dismal and does not enhance the listed building. The parking is poorly designed with little room for turning circles. There is too much hard standing. Where will the run-off go?

We suggest the applicant would do better to break up the main house into flats, rather than cramming all the flats into the auxiliary building. There is no information on detailing to 1980s building nor is there any attempt to improve the setting of the listed building.

- 2.3 21/02453/FUL I 16 Prestbury Road Cheltenham: The construction of 3no. 2-bed flats and 2No. 3-bed dwellings on the land surrounding the existing SimplyFresh store <https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R21DBSELIC00>

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum fully supports Environmental Health's objection to fixed windows.

While housing is a better use of land than parking, there is the possibility of conflict if there are not enough parking spaces, especially if residents are also competing for spaces with staff and customers of the store.

Existing building is locally listed.

The 2 rear bedrooms in the houses are too small. 5.1m² is small even for a child's bedroom. The houses should be two bedroom rather than three bedroom. But given the site layout, perhaps apartments would be a far better use of the available space.

The self coloured render is particularly susceptible to water stain, of which there are several examples blighting in the town. Measures should be taken to prevent this staining which is unfortunately so prevalent in new builds in Cheltenham.

The side return on the block of flats in dark grey in street scene is at odds with the rest of the building. There is no regard to 'building with beauty', or consideration given to the proximity to a locally listed building. If this is approved and built, this development is likely to be demolished and redeveloped within decades.

We suggest the applicant would have benefitted from pre-application

- 2.4 21/02505/FUL I The Paddocks Swindon Lane Demolition of the existing property and the construction of two 2.5 storey dwellings

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R2AMRTELIL500>

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum objects to this application to build two new buildings in Green Belt, contrary to both NPPF and JCS policy. Looking at the application history for this site, we can see the history of incremental development of the site, despite its Green Belt status. There is already permission granted earlier this year for subdivision of the plot (which in hindsight may have been a mistake). The plot has grown, but the footprint of the buildings should not be allowed to grow. We echo and support the comments of the Parish Council that “this is part of a series of ever-increasing applications. We are concerned that it will set a very dangerous precedent that would be exploited by speculative applications in the future. As we said about the previous application on this site (19/6/21) we have serious concerns that this is the start of a housing estate being created by stealth”.

Shockingly for a development in the green belt, the application lacks adequate detail relating to trees and landscaping as pointed out by the Trees officer.

- 2.5 21/02413/FUL Change of use from offices to a dwelling together with alterations to the building to include the demolition of an existing two storey side extension, the construction of a single storey extension, internal alterations, the construction of an outbuilding and the reinstatement of a vehicular access. I Cornerways University Of Gloucestershire The Park Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2SL

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R1S1C7ELIFZ00>

SUPPORT

The Civic Society Planning Forum commends the detail and quality of the application. Very pleased that the applicants are bringing it back into use as a residential dwelling and we expect the new owners will take much better care of it than the university.

It is largely a sympathetic conversion but we have concerns about the proposed replacement single storey extension abutting the pavement. Perhaps a better solution to create the additional space would be to create a separate annexe within the grounds.

- 2.6 21/02540/FUL 15 St Pauls Street South new dwelling <http://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=R211CUELIN>

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum has no objection to the development of the site. However, it faces Normal Terrace, a charming street with a modest vernacular style (as cited in the Lower High Street Character Area Appraisal and Management Plan). The industrial style and materials of the upper storey does not fit in with the terraced Victorian style of Normal Terrace.

It is a shame to lose a tree in such a built up area of town. If it cannot be replaced on site, e.g. in the front garden of 15 St Paul's Street South, perhaps it can be replaced off site near by e.g. in the High Street car park.

- 2.7 21/02456/FUL Proposed new extensions to existing curtilage listed building and internal and external alterations Cheltenham College <http://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=R21DJNELIJ>

OBJECT

It is a shame that the original Chandos cottage was not used as inspiration. This is below the standard we'd expect from Roberts Limbrick or from Cheltenham College, who have some excellent buildings. There is no continuity in form and the use of materials is more suitable to a suburban business unit than to a development within the curtilage of a grade I listed building. This is a disappointment. At least, this proposal makes better use of the space in front of the building than the last application.

- 2.8 21/02535/LBC & 21/02535/FUL 112-118 Promenade new shop front <http://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=R21DL3ELII>

SUPPORT

The Civic Society Planning Forum has no objection to moving the door to the corner. This gives a symmetry to the block complementing Joules.

- 2.9 21/01447/FUL Construction of single storey carport and garage building with pitched roof (retrospective) | Lypiatt House Lypiatt Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2QW <https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QUUF48ELGYB00>

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum are pleased that our earlier comments have been noted by the applicant. However, despite the proposed render and slate roof, the building remains agricultural in style. Its visual impact diminishes the setting of the locally listed building in a conservation area.

3 Planning Forum review

3.1 Carried over to meeting on 8/12/21

4 Civic Awards update

4.1 Carried over

5 AOB

5.1 Tess to feed back to Martin Horwood (copy in Peter) re transparency of Planning Portal - what do dates mean - what is the closing time for comments?. Suggest Forest of Dean as an example (Sue)

5.2 125 Hales Road. Request by Ben Warren to comment on the revised application 125 Hales Road 21/01962/FUL and 21/01962/LBC
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QYQS9ZELHR200>

“Our objections still stand. Notwithstanding the applicant's declared intention to retain the cornices, removing the walls and door to the playroom/ study would fundamentally alter the layout of the listed building. As would removing the basement staircase

“The proposed gates are an improvement on the previous application, but while the wrought iron is a more appropriate material, the style of the gates is not in keeping with existing iron work.

“Where is the application for subdivision of the building to create a separate basement flat?”

Peter to email this directly to Ben Warren.

PS

Cambray Court.

CCS trustees have authorised the Planning Forum to make the planning application and have agreed to cover the cost of application. Adrian suggests setting up a task and finish group with Sue and Judy. Adrian will draw up the terms of reference. And ideally would also have someone with an engineering background. Need a topographical survey.

5.3 Temporary structure. Cut off for comments is 1 January 2022. No guidance has been put out by CBC. A letter has been drafted with co-signatories from local groups including Friends of Pittville, FOMBAG, to propose a compromise but the final text has not yet been agreed with the co-signatories. Application coming in from the Cheltenham Trust for the Orangeries at the Pump Room and the Town Hall. Check deadline dates and consider at December's meeting if necessary
Action: finalise letter asap.

AB

Minster gardens application has come back to us. Peter to circulate

PS

6 Next Meeting

Zoom meeting 4:30 pm 8 December to look at items not covered tonight.
Selector for next meeting in January. Andrew K

