



## PLANNING FORUM

Note of meeting held at 6.00pm on Wednesday 7 March 2018 at Parmoor House

**Those present:** Bruce Buchanan, Mike Sheppard, Penny Hall, Robert Rimell, Peter Sayers, Douglas Ogle & Mike Duckering

### **The Quadrangle, Imperial Square, Cheltenham**

Alterations & extensions to the existing building

Planning ref: 18/00277/FUL

The members of the Forum have mixed opinions regarding the architectural merits of this building. However, it occupies a key location in the centre of Cheltenham adjacent to the Town Hall and Imperial Square. Members were disappointed that the Civic Society was not included in pre-application discussions with the applicant. We are concerned that the proposed alterations to the fifth floor will increase the impact of the building on the Town Hall and adjacent buildings in Imperial Square. At present, this floor is set back from the main façade and any alterations should also retain that setback. If this floor is to be altered then we suggest a simpler, minimalist treatment to reduce its impact. We do not object to the addition of the rooftop restaurant because it will remove some of the existing mechanical clutter from the roof. However, we suggest that it should also be glazed in a simple minimalist manner. The restaurant will be clearly visible at night adding to the visual impact of the building on the adjacent Imperial Square.

In principle, the alterations to the fenestration will be an improvement to the proportions of the existing building; however, we do not support the proposed louvered element to the altered fenestration. The proposed bronze-clad bays will compromise the architectural integrity of the existing building and should be omitted. We appreciate that the architect is trying to articulate the façade but what is proposed is visually confusing. We do not consider that bronze cladding is a suitable material in the Central Conservation area. The alterations to the ground floor façade should retain the transparency of the existing façade at this level.

We welcome the use of solar panels on the roof. On a point of detail, we consider that there is an insufficient number of WCs allocated to the restaurant.

### **College Lawn, Cheltenham**

Penfold Post Box

Planning ref: 18/00333/LBC

We welcome the trouble taken to replicate this important example of Penfold design pillar-boxes.

### **Grange Stables Cottage, Parabola Road, Cheltenham**

Change of use, alterations & extensions

Planning ref: 18/00370/FUL

The stables are not clearly visible from the street. However, we object to the use of timber boarding and we think its use should be proscribed in the conservation area. Unless timber cladding is correctly detailed and maintained it tends to look shabby within a few years. We suggest the use of render instead of boarding. We have no objection to the internal alterations proposed.

**Tythe Barn, Home Farm, Mill Street, Cheltenham**

Conversion of barn to annex, glazed link & internal alterations

Planning ref: 18/00383/LBC

We have no comments to make regarding the internal alterations because we do not have access to the interior. The proposed link will look clumsy and inelegant as illustrated. A glazed link of this type should have minimal impact on the traditional buildings that it is linking to, and have a light transparent appearance. We suggest that a much lighter minimal structure with seamless glazing would be more appropriate. The junction of the link with the entrance doors has not been properly resolved.

**6 Royal Parade, Bayshill Road, Cheltenham**

Alterations to existing rear extension

Planning ref: 18/00286/LBC

We do not have access to the interior of this building but we would raise a question mark over the removal/alteration of an internal staircase. We do not object, in principle, to a modernist approach to the external alterations to the existing extension, which was previously altered at some time in the twentieth century. However, we think the proposed large double height opening could be more elegantly proportioned and should be setback within the external wall thickness. We are concerned that the proposed balcony will overlook adjacent gardens.

---