



# CHELTENHAM CIVIC SOCIETY

---

## PLANNING FORUM

Note of meeting held at 6.30 pm on Tuesday 5 September 2017 at Parmoor House

**Those present:** Bruce Buchanan, Penny Hall, Douglas Ogle, Mike Duckering, Mike Sheppard and Robert Rimell  
**Apologies:** Caroline Dunn

### 99-101 London Road.

Proposed Flats and Shops, erection of 4-storey building to replace a 2-storey tyre depot. Planning ref: 17/01609

We welcome this proposal, in principle, as it will fill an unsatisfactory 'gap' in the street frontage. We consider that initial fenestration treatment proposed i.e. traditional sash windows with glazing bars was more in keeping than the current proposal, which will present a bland elevation to the street frontage. We question the viability of retail in the location.

### 8 Imperial Square.

Change of use from offices to flats. Planning ref: 17/01551/LBC

We welcome the change of use from office to residential. However, we consider that the division of the historic building into flats will compromise the spatial quality of the interior. We would prefer a change of use from offices to a single dwelling.

### Gallagher Retail Park, Tewkesbury Road.

Erection of Class A retail building. Planning ref: 17/01459

Our opinion regarding this application was divided; some considered that development was within a pattern of development already established in this area. Others considered that more 'out of town' retail would only undermine Cheltenham town centre even further. The building is the usual 'nowhere realm' architecture.

### 24 Carlton Street.

Erection of 6 Dwellings and 2 Offices following demolition of existing building on site.

Renewal of 12/01014/FUL & CAC. Planning ref: 17/01258

We are not against modern infill in this location, but we consider that there is an opportunity to review the design and 'would prefer a simple palette of materials; we do not think timber cladding or zinc are appropriate materials in a conservation area. We appreciate that the architects have tried to pick up the rhythm of the existing street elevation, but perhaps a less assertive treatment would be more appropriate in this setting. We understand that, unfortunately, the existing building is beyond economic repair.

### Land at North Road West and Grovefield Way.

Hybrid Application seeking detailed consent for planning permission for 5,034 Sq m B1. 502 Sq m Day Nursery D 1, 1742 Sq m Supermarket 204Sq m Drive through coffee shop and Parking. Outline planning permission sought for 8034 Sq m commercial office space with associated car parking and landscaping. Planning Ref: 16/02208/FUL

We are against development in the Green Belt when there are still several vacant sites and offices in the town centre; this type of development cannot be considered 'sustainable'. We question the impact on the local road network and query if there is sufficient parking. The development lacks any clear urban form and is relying on the landscaping to conceal an architecturally dull collection of buildings; the new BMW building presents a more refined example. This proposal is the type of development you would expect to see in North America not adjacent to the 'gateway' to a Regency town.

### **Land Adjacent to Oakhurst Rise**

Outline application for residential development for up to 100 Dwellings with access with all other matters reserved for future application. Planning ref: 17/ 00710 /OUT

This is a significant site remaining within the urban area. We accept the principle of residential development in this location. The site slopes to the south and is visible from the adjacent area. The proposed indicative layout does little to acknowledge the unique topographic nature of the site or its orientation. The indicative 'house-types' are dull and suburban, and indicate no local distinctiveness. This site presents, by reason of its size and location, an opportunity to build distinctive, modern and sustainable housing, which should take advantage of the sloping southerly aspect of the site.

Note: Planning Forum Member Penny Hall, as Vice-Chair of Charlton Kings Planning Committee, was not present during the discussion of this application.

---