



# CHELTENHAM CIVIC SOCIETY

---

## PLANNING FORUM

Note of meeting held at 5.45pm on Monday 15 April 2019 at Parmoor House

**Those present:** Rob Rimmel (Chair), Peter Sayers, Douglas Ogle, Mike Sheppard, Mike Duckering, Andrew Booton, Bruce Buchanan (Minutes), Adrian Phillips, & Mike Richardson.

**Apologies:** Tess Beck

### **The George Hotel, 41-49 St George's Road, Cheltenham**

Internal and external works to facilitate refurbishment of existing hotel.

Planning ref: 19/00460/LBC

The Forum welcomes refurbishment of the hotel and that the bathrooms will not impinge on internal cornice details.

Ground-floor windows - consider that glazing bars should be restored to sash windows.

Blocked off external doors: details not shown.

Details of main entrance not shown.

Details of landscape treatment for front and rear courtyards not shown, and would prefer to see no cars parked at front of hotel.

### **Little Vatch Farm Lane, Leckhampton, Cheltenham**

Erection of two self-build dwellings and associated works.

Planning ref: 19/00471/FUL

The site has been allocated as green space, as part of Leckhampton Open Space in the Local Plan and should not be developed. Design of proposed houses mediocre and not well presented.

### **RBS, 45 Promenade, Cheltenham**

9 no. non-illuminated fascia signs split across the two elevations, 2no. non-illuminated hanging signs, 1 no. non-illuminated ATM tablet and 1no. set of non-illuminated letters to entrance area.

Ref. No: 19/00577/ADV

No objection in principal but is this extent of corporate advertising really necessary?

### **29 Unwin Road, Cheltenham**

Proposed detached bungalow and associated parking.

Planning ref: 19/00597/FUL

There is no objection to the principal of development, but the proposed bungalow design is unimaginative and mediocre. No streetscape context shown, which should be mandatory.

### **122 & 124 Ryeworth Road, Cheltenham**

Erection of three storey detached dwelling on land between 122 & 124 Ryeworth Road.

Planning ref: 19/00626/FUL

There is no objection in principal to infill development. The design would work better as a complete contrast to the adjacent mediocre suburban dwellings. The roof pitch is discordant and doesn't reflect that of the adjacent houses. A flat roof would work better and have less impact on the adjacent dwellings. The massing could be more coherent because the rear extensions look like an afterthought.

**Glenfall Farm Stables, Ham Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham**

Conversion of stable buildings to form three dwellings plus demolition of existing farmhouse and erection of new dwelling (revised scheme ref: 18/02547/FUL).

Planning ref: 19/00611/FUL

The Forum welcomes the submission of a palette of materials – helpful information.

Plot 4 massing is acceptable, but the architectural treatment is inconsistent, incoherent and too suburban for a rural location. Conversion of the Dutch barn was considered the correct approach.

**21 Montpellier Terrace, Cheltenham**

Alterations and additions.

Planning ref: 19/00668/LBC

The Forum objects to the loss of the bay window. It may not be original but it now makes an attractive addition to the rear elevation. The plans do not show the proposed balcony. The balustrade treatment is inappropriate for a listed building. Access to the utility room from a reception room compromises the space and doesn't appear necessary.

---