

PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

Date: 18 January 2022 at 5:00 pm

Venue: via Zoom

Present: Andrew Booton, Sue Jenkins, Andrew Kitching, Adrian Philips, Rob Rimell, Peter Sayers (Chair), Tess Beck (Secretary),

Apologies: Judie Hodsdon, Dawn Williams

Mike Sheppard has retired from the Planning Forum. The Forum thanks him for his contributions, and will miss his extensive knowledge and experience. We welcome Rob Rimell back to the Planning Forum

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

Next Meeting: 24 February 2022

Ref	Item	Action
1	Declarations of interest	
1.1	Rob Rimell is member of Friends of the Wilson	
2	Applications considered	
2.1	21/02720/LBC Replacement garage, railings and gate to front elevation and exterior redecoration Mulberry House 7 Queens Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2LR	
	https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R3SC1IELIY800	

SUPPORT

The Civic Society Planning Forum strongly supports the reinstatement of the railings. We have some reservations about the garage design. Hung garage doors would be more appropriate, and a colour other than dark grey. Perhaps the applicant could echo the design of the house by dressing the front of the garage in Cotswold stone and adding coping.

- 2.2 21/02693/FUL I Single storey, two bedroom, self-build retirement dwelling
I Land Adjacent Lillybrook Golf Club Cirencester Road Charlton Kings
Cheltenham Gloucestershire

[https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/
applicationDetails.do?keyVal=R3JGK1ELIW700&activeTab=summary](https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=R3JGK1ELIW700&activeTab=summary)

OBJECT

The Civic Society Planning Forum strongly objects to this development in the AONB. We support the objections made by the Cotswold Conservation Board and the Architects' Panel.

- 2.3 21/02650/LBC I Internal alterations (upper ground floor reception area and corridor) I Municipal Offices Cheltenham Borough Council
Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 9SA

[https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/
applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R3DIOKELIU600](https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R3DIOKELIU600)

No comment submitted

- 2.4 21/02723/FUL I Erection of 5 storey block of flats in the existing car park comprising 11 one-bedroom flats over 4 floors with refuse store, bicycle store and 5 secure car parking spaces on the ground floor I Land Adjacent 8 St Georges Place Cheltenham Gloucestershire

<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R3SC78ELIYE00>

OBJECT

The proposed massing and orientation seriously restricts future development of the adjacent car park and the Proud Lion comic shop site.

The Minster Quarter is now a key town centre development area, thanks in part to the Minster Exchange, and it is a shame there is no overall vision for the area. In the absence of a masterplan for this area adjacent to the Minster Quarter, perhaps the planners at Cheltenham Borough Council could convene all interested parties, including the owners of neighbouring properties and car parks, and agree some planning and development principles.

Given that the applicants for 258-264 High Street have reduced the height of their proposed development to four storeys, perhaps the height of this application should be similarly reduced.

We strongly object to the plans for a green wall. Green walls are rarely sustainable due to ongoing maintenance demands, and end up failing and looking dreadful. A street tree planting programme would be a better way to add planting to the area.

The car park layout appears to be unworkable. There is not enough room for vehicles to manoeuvre within the car park, and the entrance from St George's Place is very tight.

The pedestrian and cycle path between the High Street and St George's Place is a key link route. It should be a condition of any planning permission granted that this route should be safeguarded and not be obstructed either during the construction phase or once construction is complete.

- 2.5 20/00759/FUL I Erection of new residential development (Use Class C3), new vehicular and pedestrian access off Manor Road, attenuation basin and ancillary infrastructure I Elms Park Tewkesbury Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QA9EQKEL0HI00>

OBJECT

Our original objections still stand. The sustainability issues we raised have not been addressed. The pylons still determine the layout of the development, to the detriment of the overall design, and particularly to the detriment of the amenity space.

Given Cheltenham's limited supply of employment land, we are concerned that the layout of housing abutting the boundary of employment land could potentially kill off the use of that area for employment in the future.

As the first bit of the North West Cheltenham JCS urban extension to come to planning, this scheme should be the standard for the rest of this development.

- 2.6 21/02596/FUL I Change of use of part of the ground floor for use as an extension to the existing café and associated alterations I The Wilson Cheltenham Art Gallery And Museum Clarence Street Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 3JT
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=R2V0CAELIQG00>

OBJECT

There is no reference to the redevelopment of the Minster Churchyard and the regeneration of the Minster Quarter in this design. There is no indication of how it contributes to the street scene at either the front or rear elevation.

The focus of this application seems to be on a coffee shop as a means of income generation. We recognise that the Cheltenham Trust needs to generate income, but this should not be at the expense of everything else. The Trust is a custodian of Cheltenham's culture, which is more than just cafés.

The application does not give details of the glass screen on the mezzanine, and there is a lack of information on what the first floor will look like.

We have concerns about how the artists' studios will work in practice. For example, the lack of provision of running water to the studios, and what will the access provisions be (given the value of the museum's collection)? Have any artists been consulted?

There has been no consultation or even a formal announcement on the removal of the Tourist Information Centre from The Wilson. Are there plans for it to be relocated elsewhere?

- 2.7 21/02738/LBC | Retrospective application for the painting of shopfronts facing Montpellier Street and Montpellier Walk (regularisation) | 22 Montpellier Walk Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1SD
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=R3U6YNELIZA00>

OBJECT

Cheltenham Civic Society has received four complaints from members of the public concerned about the recent changes to the façade, and we would also draw the planning officers' attention to the public comments submitted on the planning portal. We note this is a retrospective planning application.

The use of the vinyls on the windows has increased the impact of the green colour and has killed the street scene. The vinyls should be removed and we ask that Cheltenham Borough Council considers a policy on the use of vinyls on shopfronts.

There is some debate on the heritage basis of the colour choice. Perhaps the tone could be specified as part of the conservation management. It would contribute more to the street scene if it were more subdued.

If the applicant wants the prestige of a Montpellier address, they should be cognisant of the responsibilities that come with the custodianship of a listed building.

The applicant appears to have incorporated an additional caryatid into his frontage. The left-hand caryatid used to share a paint scheme with the neighbouring building, All Bar One. This creates a jarring incursion of the green colour scheme into part of the frieze above the change in height, which is not a natural break.

It should be investigated whether the decorative frieze which is a feature of the rest of this terrace is still present under the box.

- 2.8 21/02364/FUL I Demolition of mid-20th Century Wing and Erection of a Replacement Extension to the Office Building I Charlton House
Cirencester Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 8ER
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=R1F2KIELICW00>

OBJECT

Why, when the number of employees is decreasing (as referred to in the traffic report), is the size of the building being increased to this extent? This seems to be a concern for many of the site's neighbours, judging by the public comments.

In many respects, this is a thoughtful piece of design, but it is too big. It is too dominant and too high. Some of the artist impression drawings obscure the height. Ideally a street scene visualisation should have been submitted, which could have shown more clearly how it would fit in with the gradient of the site. As an extension to a listed building, it should be subservient to that building. The join between the building and its extension appears awkward, especially where the canopy meets the older building.

This could be an improvement on the existing extension, which has little or no architectural merit. But only if it is reduced in its size, perhaps stepping down in height to echo the slope.

3 Planning Forum Review

- 3.1 Tess to consolidate agreed edits to criteria for selection, so this can be added to our Terms of Reference and to the CCS

TB, PS

4 Cambray Court

- 4.1 Adrian has circulated plans. Next stage is taking the plans to the Environment Agency for their endorsement. The outcome of this will determine what happens next, e.g. whether CCS puts in a planning application.
Andrew K still of opinion that CCS should not be the applicant, concerns about liability.
Ideally the EA would take on the project.

5 AOB

- 5.1 Rob and Andrew B to draft letter to Cheltenham Trust
- 5.2 Historic England have declined to list the terrace at the rear of Cavendish House
- 5.3 Government policy on temporary structures published 20 December 2021, and is now incorporated in a Statutory Instrument. No restrictions on temporary structures unless they are in the curtilage of a listed building.
- 5.4 Andrew B has met with SPJARA about policy for converting front gardens into driveways. Tracey Crews has agreed to draft policy.

RR, AB

6 Next Meeting

Selector for next meeting. Tess Beck

TB

Thursday 24 February at 5pm. Location to be decided.