

## PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

- Date:** 12 February 2026 at 5:00pm
- Venue:** Westhall, Lansdown Parade
- Present:** Adrian Phillips (Chair), Tess Beck (Secretary), Andrew Booton, , Katharina Hoerath, Sue Jenkins, Andrew Kitching, Robert Maitland, Cathy Presland, Cecil Sanderson, Diggory Seacome, Steve Bryson
- Apologies:**
- Distribution:** Those present + Trustees  
Section 4 only to Planning Comments Box  
[dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk)
- Next Meeting:** 19 March 2026

REF	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<b>Minutes of meeting 15 January 2026 – and updates on schemes previously considered.</b> <b>Matters arising</b>	
1.1	Minutes approved. Matters arising: Judie Hodsdon has stood down. AP to write to thank her for her contribution. AP wrote to Daniel O’Neil to thank for attending in December. Adrian wrote to Tracey Birkinshaw re <b>25/01758/LBC 62</b> Bath Road. Conservation officer echoed our comments more strongly. Tracey has referred the matter to Chris Gomm. Coming up to planning committee next week both applications we have looked at: Hatherley Park desilting and Monkscroft School social housing site.	
2.	<b>Declarations of interest</b>  None.	
3	<b>Applications considered</b>	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
3.1	<p><b>26/00111/FUL</b>   Alterations and extensions to remodel dwelling, including first-floor extension to convert existing bungalow to two-storey dwelling, ground-floor alterations and construction of new external double-garage using existing access.    Outwoods Ashley Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6QJ  <a href="https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T9BG2PELJH600">https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T9BG2PELJH600</a></p> <p>Given the extent of the extensions, this represents an opportunity to significantly retrofit the property to improve its eco-credentials. Disappointingly the sustainability statement is generic. There is no mention of an air source heat pump – or even a ground source heat pump, and extensive hard surfacing will reduce potential biodiversity gain and add to water run off problems.</p>	
3.2	<p><b>26/00089/FUL</b>   Erection of 2 bedroom semi-detached dwelling on land adjacent 25 Atherstone Close    25 Atherstone Close Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 0NX  <a href="https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T97CVGELJFW00">https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T97CVGELJFW00</a></p> <p>No comment submitted</p>	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
-----	------	--------

3.3

**25/01567/FUL** | Creation of new vehicular access to the university car park. Demolition of The Farmery buildings and erection of 2no. dwellings. Change of use of Broadlands Lodge and the Farmery Lodge to residential with associated extensions, access and landscaping.

I Broadlands Lodge 56 The Park Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2RN

Revised plans submitted 29 January.

[https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?](https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=T3E0S1ELIB700)

[activeTab=documents&keyVal=T3E0S1ELIB700](https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=T3E0S1ELIB700)

Comments of the Cheltenham Civic Society in response to the revised plans submitted 29/01/2026 (submitted 13/2/26)

We are surprised that this has not been submitted as a new application.

The revised scheme has responded to some of our earlier concerns and to those of the Heritage and Conservation officer. The buildings have been reduced in height from three to two storeys, which we welcome, and appear to have been moved back a little on to the Farmery site.

However, we still have three concerns:

i)

REF	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>i) The design of the proposed new buildings is still completely out of keeping with their two brick built, Victorian neighbours, and bears no relation to the many fine listed buildings elsewhere in the Park. The materials, shape and volume are all at variance with those of the buildings nearby. The planning authority has a duty under s.72 of the Planning (listed buildings and conservation areas) Act (1990) to preserve and enhance the conservation area. One of the positive qualities of the Park Character Area is that “the form of the buildings and use of quality building materials complement each other. They combine together to give the area a grandeur, elegance and spaciousness”. These proposed new buildings do not do that, and would have a negative impact on the character area. It is perfectly possible to design a couple of buildings on this very sensitive site which respect and complement the character of those around, and which would then be in accordance with national legislation and local planning policies regarding conservation areas.</p> <p>ii) The revised proposals have opened up the view through from the road into the inside of The Park. This is welcomed as “the extensive green space within The Park itself makes the single greatest contribution to (establishing) the spacious character of the area.” However, we object to the way that this greenspace, to which residents previously had <u>de facto</u> public access for many decades, has effectively been privatised and fenced off. Ideally this space should be returned to the University as a connecting green link. Failing that, and as a minimum, there should be a) a right of way created through it for pedestrians to walk between the road and the playing fields, and b) a legally enforceable covenant put in place to ensure that the entire area is kept clear of any obstructions (e.g. play equipment, sheds, parked cars, caravans).</p>	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>iii) We know that it is a principle of planning that each case will be decided on its own merits, but there can be little doubt that if this scheme goes ahead, the University will be tempted to try to sell off other areas, eg the parking space to the west of Fullwood Lodge. And others will point to it as a precedent to justify more new building in The Park and perhaps in other green spaces in Cheltenham.</p>	
3.4	<p><b>26/00138/FUL</b>   Single storey rear extension.    15 Tayberry Grove Up Hatherley Cheltenham  Gloucestershire GL51 3WF  <a href="https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T9KBIQELJIV00">https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T9KBIQELJIV00</a></p> <p>No comment submitted</p>	
3.5	<p>100% affordable housing scheme of 100 dwellings with associated access, landscaping and associated works.    Land At Badgeworth Road Cheltenham  Gloucestershire  <a href="https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T9XB2LELJLO00">https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T9XB2LELJLO00</a></p> <p><i>Comments to follow</i></p>	
4.	<p><b>Planning Policy – revised NPPF consultation</b>  A draft CCS response to proposed NPPF revisions was circulated. AP explained why it was important for the CCS/ PF to comment.  Any comments from other planning forum members need to be sent to AP in the next couple of days.  Steve to do press release when we submit our final comment. AP to complete and submit.</p>	
5.	<p><b>What are civic societies for?</b>  Please review the 3 documents circulated and let AB know your views by next Wednesday 18/2/26 – what you like or don't like, or just requests for clarification.</p>	<p>ALL +  SB</p>

REF	ITEM	ACTION
6.	<p><b>Updates and ongoing matters</b></p> <p>1. Cavendish House SB has written to Ken Ford at Canada Life, who has previously said he was happy to engage with us, but has had no response. AB has drafted a letter to CEO of Canada Life, Max Wilkinson MP and the leader of CBC.</p> <p>2. Colimace AB has discussed with the CBC conservation officer who is supportive of our proposals. SB to convene neighbours of the site and encourage them to engage.</p> <p>3. Local listing review. CBC have come back with a timetable. TB &amp; AB to discuss and respond by end of February</p>	
7.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>1. Carmelo Garcia at the Echo has sent Steve a map showing proposed housing around Cheltenham &amp; Gloucester and would like a comment. Steve to share with PF members. Carmelo wants comments early next week. AP to draft on the basis of any reactions by forum members.</p> <p>2. Carmelo also wants a comment about 131 and the tents.</p> <p>3. There is a revised scheme for Winchcombe Street, the deadline for which is next week. A poor pastiche application but we should comment. Tess to circulate : <a href="https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T7O6SQELJ6W00">https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=T7O6SQELJ6W00</a>. I</p> <p>4. LGR consultation. We should comment. It closes on 26/3/26 so we will discuss our response at our March meeting. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-reorganisation-in-gloucestershire">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-reorganisation-in-gloucestershire</a></p>	
8.	<p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <p>Thursday 19 March 5:00 pm. Westhall, Lansdown Parade. Selector for next meeting: Sue Selection of application to track: Badgeworth</p>	TB