



# CHELTENHAM CIVIC SOCIETY

---

## **PLANNING FORUM**

**Note of meeting held at 6.00pm on Friday 4 May 2018 at Parmoor House**

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

**Observer:** Tess Beck

### **49 Clarence Square, Cheltenham**

**Internal alterations & erection of two storey mews garage**

**Planning ref: 18/00810/LBC**

The Planning Forum considered that the architectural treatment did not reflect the traditional character of adjacent mews dwellings/garages as claimed by the applicant; if a traditional design is proposed it should be executed correctly. The proposed building is too deep, at 7m, to reflect traditional massing and accommodate a traditional pitched slate roof. The treatment of openings on Wellington Lane is also not in the traditional manner. There are several examples, in Wellington Lane, of modern mews houses, which might offer a better solution.

The Forum did not feel that the mews garage building needed to be set back from the neighbouring building line. By returning to the line of the other properties on this side of the lane, the garden encroachment would be kept to a minimum and the integrity of the lane maintained.

### **Seven Arches, Lansdown Parade, Cheltenham**

**Internal alterations & single storey rear extension to form two dwellings**

**Planning ref: 18/00714/LBC**

The Planning Forum welcomes the application in that this building is in need of restoration. We advise that the design for the windows needs to be more sympathetic given the nature of the main building and the area.

### **The Hawthorns, 33 Christ Church Road, Cheltenham**

**Demolition of rear annex, internal alterations & erection of three storey rear extension to provide 10 no. flats**

**Planning ref: 18/00786/FUL**

This is a missed opportunity for an imaginative design. The Forum considered that the proposal is mediocre with its dull repetitive treatment of the elevations, which do not reflect its residential use; the design lacks architectural coherence. We support the neighbours' concerns about the size and capacity of the parking area. The Planning Forum were concerned that the car parking area is too small and the configuration of the bay's will make manoeuvring difficult, and the limited site area may well exacerbate the problems with roadside parking in the vicinity. We note the concern expressed that the waste collection area is too small and would be blocked by the two bays of the allocated parking.

---