

PLANNING FORUM MEETING : MINUTES

Date: 10 September 2026 at 5:00pm

Venue: Westhall

Present: Adrian Phillips (Chair), Tess Beck (Secretary), Andrew Booton, John Clarke, Sue Jenkins, Andrew Kitching, Robert Maitland, Cecil Sanderson, Diggory Seacome,

Apologies: Katharina Hoerath, Cathy Presland

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

Next Meeting: 8 October 2026

REF	ITEM	ACTION
1.	Minutes of meeting 16 July – and updates on schemes previously considered.	
1.1	Minutes approved. Matters arising None of the applications we discussed at the meeting in July has yet been decided. 20 mph limit – no response from trustees. LGR consultation. LGR is now on pause. Tess to share response to the consultation on parish councils. s.72. AP shared our document with Chris Gomm. There has been an article in Our Town. Andrew invited the conservation officer and colleagues to walk around The Poets. Although there was initial enthusiasm, this has been put on hold. The Poets resident who contacted us about the inappropriate development is to organise a public meeting, which members of the planning forum hope to attend.	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
	No update on the building work that has been taking place in The Daffodil. It is on the market again, this time with Ash (see: https://www.rightmove.co.uk/properties/773402156154289). Cost £1.6m plus £200k for the shop alongside. As well as the approved planning permission for residential, the sales details include this: <i>"A scheme has been prepared comprising 2 town houses, 3 mews houses with communal space, and 2 coach houses to the rear – an application has not been submitted mention an unsubmitted scheme for conversion to mews houses"</i> This is one to keep an eye out for if it is ever submitted for planning https://www.rightmove.co.uk/properties/773402156154289	
2.	Declarations of interest	
	John is a friend of the neighbour of 37 Ryeworth Road (see 3.1).	
3	Applications considered	
3.1	26/01361/FUL Proposed ancillary outbuilding to rear of garden to provide annex accommodation. 37 Ryeworth Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6LG https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TK9IRUEL08300 OBJECT This is a very poor-quality application lacking in detail. For example, there is no topographical survey to show the trees that they plan to remove (as mentioned in the application form) and no information of sanitation drainage. A decision should not be made until all the additional information has been provided.	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
3.2	26/01327/FUL Installation of solar panels on east and west roof slopes. Parish Church Of St Paul St Pauls Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 4EZ https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TJYBHRELLMA00 We acknowledge the damage to the heritage asset necessitated by the installation of the solar panels, but we support the church's attempts to reduce their reliance on fossil fuel and reduce their energy bills. To minimise the visual impact of the panels, it should be a condition that the panels have a matt finish and are on low profile mountings.	
3.3	26/01377/LBC Extensions, alterations and conversion of the existing outbuilding/garage into a single 2 bedroom dwelling. Flat 1 79 Pittville Lawn Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 2BP https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TKEZEBELLPL00 This presents an opportunity to improve on the existing garage building, and we have no objection in principle to the conversion to residential use. This application is an improvement on the previous applications which were overdevelopment of the site. It is difficult to refuse, but it is regrettable that it still intrudes on the setting of the listed building rather than enhancing it, and that the entire front area will remain under tarmac and parking.	

REF	ITEM	ACTION
3.4	26/01344/FUL Proposed 2 bed garden flat at the rear of site at No.64, St Stephens Road. 64 St Stephens Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 3AE https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TK065SELLND00 OBJECT This building, in addition to the flats already approved, would be cumulative overdevelopment of the site. Large gardens are a characteristic of The Park conservation area as identified in the character appraisal and management plan. A good deal of the garden will be lost to the block of flats already approved. Whatever the merits or otherwise of the design, this proposed additional development would result in a loss of outdoor amenity space for future residents of the flats, and further loss of trees. We share the tree officer's concern that the owners of the new building will want reduce the height of, or remove, the neighbour's large tree over-looking the site.	
3.5	26/01372/LBC Proposed rear lower ground floor extension, installation of solar panels, and excavation works to lower part of the existing garden level and create a patio area. 9 Bath Parade Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 7HL https://publicaccess.cheltenham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=TKBG2EEL08300 No objection to the proposed ground floor extension and excavation works. This application presents an opportunity for the planning authority to invoke their inappropriate window policy on the upper storey rear windows.	
4.	Are we for the whole town? Discussion of paper circulated by Adrian 21/08/26 The paper, to which Sue, Tess and Cathy had contributed, was briefly introduced by Adrian. In the discussion, there was a variety of views. Some had concerns about what they saw as mission creep into the area of social policy/community development; and they questioned our legitimacy and capacity to do so.	

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

There was particular concern about taking on new initiatives at this time because CCS's resources are limited. The civic movement generally runs on the active participation of about only 8% of its membership: CCS is no different. With more people actively participating, we could do more. But as it is, CCS is struggling to fulfil its role, and the trustees are at risk of burnout. There is particular frustration over the challenge that Parmoor places on the CCS trustees. The resource implications meant that CCS could not at this time respond fully to the challenge set out in the paper.

The distinctive feature of the civic movement is that it "speaks to the place". While we are rightly focused on heritage assets, our concern is with Cheltenham as a whole. Examples were given where the less salubrious parts of town had been neglected (e.g., in respect of tree planting and litter) but encouraging pride in place should come from the communities themselves. Alstone Avenue was given as an example where this had happened, and CCS had been able to support local initiative. A similar approach might be taken in the Poets CA, with the review of locally listed buildings or maybe in support of the Friends of Sandford Park: these all offer opportunities to reach out beyond our usual "comfort zone".

The forum concluded that:

- We should continue to support communities who approach us (while also suggesting they join the CCS) where we have capacity to do so, in cases such as those referred to above. This should help strengthen our presence in parts of town where we have not been very active,
- We should also celebrate these stories in Our Town and via social media, while ensuring credit is shared, but
- Because of the concerns over unresolved issues of focus or mission creep, and more especially over CCS capacity, we should not submit the paper as drafted to trustees for now.

REF	ITEM	ACTION
5.	Sandford Park Lodge. Some background from the Friends of Sandford Park https://www.sandfordparkfriends.co.uk/chalybeate-spa Adrian has raised concerns about the condition of this council owned building which sits in such a strategic site beside Sandford Park. Lives of Colour are in discussion with CBC about acquiring the building, but these discussions have been going on for some time, and meanwhile the building continues to deteriorate. Its presence is likely to prevent Sandford Park getting Green Heritage accreditation. AB & AP to meet with the Friends of Sandford Park and to talk to Paul Baker. AB to write to CBC re concerns about the state of the building.	
6.	Updates and ongoing matters (a) Problems with the planning portal on the CBC website These are ongoing. We are hopeful that now Chris Gomm has been made aware, that it will be resolved soon. (b) Cavendish House No update (c) Conservation area review AP sent the s.72 comments to Purcell and we hope for CCS publicity and sharing this experience with other civic societies. (d) Local indexing No update	
8.	AOB The cladding is being replaced on Century Court, and also on the block of flats on Great Western Road near the Waitrose car park.	
9.	Next meeting Thursday 8 October 5:00 pm. Westhall, Lansdown Parade. Selector for next meeting: Andrew K Selection of application to track: 64 St Stephens Road. Robert	