

PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

Date: 16 July 2026 at 5:00pm

Venue: Westhall

Present: Adrian Phillips (Chair), Tess Beck (Secretary), Andrew Booton, John Clarke, Katharina Hoerath, Sue Jenkins, Cathy Presland, Cecil Sanderson, Diggory Seacome, Casey (planning student) observing

Apologies: Andrew Kitching,

Distribution: Those present + Trustees
Section 4 only to Planning Comments Box
dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk

Next Meeting: 10 September 2026

REF	ITEM	ACTION
1.	Minutes of meeting 11 June – and updates on schemes previously considered.	
1.1	Minutes approved.	
2.	Declarations of interest	
I	None Matters arising.	
3.	Matters arising	
	Note comments submitted between forum meetings. JC raised concerns about missing applications because of the timings of meetings and deadlines. If anyone spots any significant applications in between meetings, please send to AP and TB to potentially circulate. What effect do our comments have? (RM) Do they change outcomes? Chris Gomm has said he appreciates our comments. DS: from experience, while planning officers take notice, the planning committee don't appear to take notice of comments. There are lot of tree applications to filter through, decisions are made very quickly and little or no opportunity for consultation.	

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

AP suggests SJ produces a short note for tree officers to copy to Chris Gomm.

4 Applications considered

- 4.1 26/00466/OUT Outline application for the erection of up to 165 residential units, including provision of vehicular and pedestrian access, green infrastructure and associated works. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are matters reserved for future consideration.
Home Farm Quat Goose Lane Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 9RP
<https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TCCBWVELK3T00>

OBJECT

Local Green Space

Much of this site was shown within the JCS as the Swindon Village Green Buffer. In the 2020 Cheltenham Local Plan, part of it is shown as Local Green Space (LGS). LGS is a statutory protection which gives equivalent protection to green belt status.

However:

- The JCS Swindon Village Green Buffer is not referred to in the plans
- The LGS was not listed in the constraints on the Planning Portal
- The boundary of LGS does not appear to be clearly shown on the plans submitted.

From the illustrative plans, it appears that the LGS area contained in this submission is to be treated as part of the development site. That seems to conflict with approved planning policies designed to keep the northern edge of Swindon Village free of development.

Should development be approved, then the limits of the LGS need to be clearly marked with a physical boundary, and the LGS needs to remain accessible for the enjoyment of the community during the development, and its environment and wildlife protected from the development process.

REF	ITEM	ACTION
	While paths and an orchard may be positive contributions to the LGS, this should be achievable while maintaining public access, and with minimum disruption to the wildlife in the area. <u>Infrastructure</u> As Highways have indicated in their objection to the previous application for the site, and as neighbours and their council representatives are stating in their objections, there is not yet the infrastructure in place to support this development. Quat Goose Lane is not adequate to support construction traffic or the traffic that would be generated by the completed development. Development should not start until there is alternative road access in place for construction traffic, and it should not be occupied until the M5 all ways junction 10 work is complete. By this stage, hopefully, the other community infrastructure promised for the Elms Park development (school, doctors' surgery etc.) will also be in place.	
4.2	26/01048/SCOPE EIA SCOPING OPINION REQUEST for around 750 homes on land between Hyde Lane and Swindon Lane, Cheltenham. Land North Of Swindon Lane Cheltenham Gloucestershire https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=THFSGQEL08300 Noted. No comment submitted.	
4.3	26/01004/FUL Demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of a self-build dwelling. 200 Hatherley Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 6ET https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TH2ZYJELL2G00 We regret the loss of yet another bungalow. Especially as this was one of an attractive pair, being very much of its period. We have concerns about the second-floor bedrooms which only have rooflights. These do not appear to offer adequate daylight or ventilation and provide no means of emergency egress. Extending the building onto the boundary with 198a Hatherley Road is unneighbourly and is likely to make future maintenance difficult.	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
4.4	26/00970/FUL Construction of building to accommodate 3no. 1 bed apartments and associated works. Land Rear Beaufort Arms London Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TGRVY0ELL0900 OBJECT This is overdevelopment of the site, in combination with the apartments that have already been granted permission. There is no through ventilation for the apartments, and no windows or ventilation in the bedrooms. With the only windows being south facing, this is likely to make conditions inside the apartments intolerable in the hot summers we now experience regularly. There is no mention of how these apartments will be heated or cooled, or of insulation standards. These are very small apartments. 41m² is only sufficient for one person. (and given the space taken up by the staircase, we are not certain the first floor flat even complies with that). How will it be ensured that each flat is only occupied by one person? The frontage, which is the only outside space will be dominated by bins. No provision has been made for parking. We have concerns about the impact on 23 Coltham Road, due to the loss of sunlight to their outdoor amenity space and solar panels.	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
4.5	26/00962/FUL Erection of a self-build dwelling. The Yard Exmouth Court 1 Exmouth Street Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 7NR https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TGPNF3ELKZT00 OBJECT While we have no objection to development of this site in principle, this proposal would be overdevelopment. It is too big and will impact negatively on its neighbours. Since the original buildings are to be demolished and replaced by a residential building, there is no need to take inspiration from the light industrial forms of the original structure. Instead, the design of a replacement building would do better to take inspiration from the neighbouring houses in the conservation area. Highways comments regarding emergency access are unhelpful. They would seem to preclude any development, which would be a waste of a site, and ignore the fact that the lane already services a number of premises.	
4.6	26/00906/LBC Conversion of 14 Cambray Place from 7 flats to a single dwelling, including internal and external alterations and associated works. 14 Cambray Place Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1JS https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TG1YNMELKVS00 SUPPORT We support this proposal to reconfigure the property to its original use as a single house. While the loss of affordable housing in the town centre is regrettable, the quality of the accommodation provided in the bedsits was not good, and there are many other opportunities to create flats in the area e.g. above commercial properties.	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
	We support the replacement the of sash windows. If it is possible, removal of the paint on the façade to reveal the original ashlar would further improve the building. Re-unification of the property to a single home presents the opportunity to improve the parking area at the front. This needs to be properly designed, with planting and permeable surfaces, to improve the setting of this listed building. Permission should be withheld till satisfactory plans for the front have been drawn up.	
7	4) Section 72 duty. Paper to go to CBC, written by Andrew B, revised by Adrian. The latest version was distributed on 9/6/26, for comments. The forum congratulated Andrew B on the research he had undertaken in preparing this paper, which was endorsed subject to final editing. e.g. check whether that the 4 steps process and 5 stages are consistent with each other. This is a useful document that we hope the planning officers will find helpful. It was agreed that the paper would be forwarded to Chris Gomm as a follow-up to the Forum's meeting with him in June, and that CCS would consider giving it wider publicity.	

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

6.	Cheltenham Civic Society response to the Cheltenham Speed and Road Safety Consultation (proposed 20 mph speed limits)	
----	--	--

CCS published its response to this consultation on 19 June (the day the consultation closed) <https://cheltcivicsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CCS-response-to-20mph-consultation-19Jun26.pdf> . Does this position reflect the views of its advisory groups such as the Planning Forum? See Adrian's note distributed 10/7/26

The CCS position had been formulated with the advice of SSG but not that of the Forum.

The Forum debated the issue. AP disagreed strongly with CCS position on the grounds that it completely ignored the evidence from outside Cheltenham of the benefits of 20 mph limits for road safety, noise, pollution and the general quality of the urban environment. He felt that the position taken by the CCS was inappropriate for a body that campaigns for a better urban environment, and was also concerned that the views of the Planning Forum had not been sought before the position statement was issued in the name of CCS.

AB referred to the issue of the Boots Corner traffic management scheme: he thought that the county's proposals suffered from the same lack of evidence. He said that CCS were not against a 20 mph limit in residential areas – though this has not been picked up in the reporting.

In the debate that followed, a variety of views were expressed about the CCS position and how it was arrived at.

At the conclusion, AP said he proposed to prepare a letter to the trustees setting out the concerns expressed during the meeting. Recognising that there some conflicting views, he would circulate this letter to all PF members, and invite those who wished to sign it to do so.

There was discussion about whether this matter should have a public expression, for example through an article or articles in Our Town. This was left for further consideration.

REF	ITEM	ACTION
6	Community Governance Review stage 3. This consultation on boundary options for town and parish councils is out for consultation. https://cheltenham.gov.uk/communities-and-leisure/community-governance-reviews/background-to-the-community-governance-review-2025-to-2026/ What are the implications for the Planning Forum, if any? And should we comment? Tess to distribute a briefing note. Should this response be from CCS or the PF? AP and TB to draft a response with help from RM. Concern about Cheltenham losing its voice, but also the future sustainability of small parish councils.	
7.	Updates and ongoing matters (a) Cavendish House. CCS had a Teams meeting with Canada Life facilitated by Max W. Since then, Steve has built a relationship with one of the team and they have asked for more details. (Need to thank Max for his help with this). There still no proper conversation with CBC. Since the discussion with Canada Life has started, the idea of the CCS itself seeking pre-app advice is off the table. AP reminded the Forum of the importance of keeping Cynthia involved. (b) Conservation area review. No further news. AP to send the finalised s72 paper (see above) to Dan and Purcell, the CA review consultants. (c) Local indexing. Still delayed (d) Civic awards deferred	
8.	AOB a) HODs launch 30 July. TB to circulate invitation b) Daniel who is leading on the homeless pods in Cheltenham would like to talk to the CCS. AB suggests also inviting Solace and other related groups to present to CCS as a whole. c) TB to distribute link to town centre consultation. d) RM has noticed a lot of construction activity in the Daffodil. AB suggests he chats to the builders and sees if he can find out more.	
9.	Next meeting Thursday 11 September 5:00 pm. Westhall, Lansdown Parade. Selector for next meeting: Cecil Selection of application to track: Exmouth Court - Adrian	