



## PLANNING FORUM

Notes of online meeting held at 5.00 pm on Tuesday 25 November 2020

**Those present:** Peter Sayers (Chair), Andrew Booton, Adrian Phillips, Andrew Kitching, Sue Jenkins, Mike Richardson & Tess Beck (Secretary)

**Apologies:** None

### **Land at Shurdington Road, Cheltenham**

Full planning application for residential development comprising 350 dwellings, open space, cycleways, footpaths, landscaping, access roads and other associated infrastructure  
Planning ref: 20/01788/FUL

The Civic Society supports the principle of developing this plot, but this scheme has been designed for the benefit of the developers rather than the people who will be living here for years to come. It needs more attention to detail to make it somewhere people will want to move to, and to stay.

### **Traffic**

We share the concerns expressed by many commenters about the traffic issues that will be generated by this development, as well as by the planned secondary school and other neighbouring new residential developments. The roundabout at the western end of the development is a positive development. However, the north-eastern access is likely to be used by more than half of the traffic from the new houses, a minimum of 400-500 vehicle movements a day, a significant proportion of which will be making a right turn towards Cheltenham. There needs to be more thought given to this junction.

There are no shops or services on site or within easy walking distance. The nearest shops in Woodlands Road are nearly a mile away. Morrisons and the nearest pharmacy are twice that distance away. The adjacent Redrow development is also entirely housing. This will create the need for many more car journeys.

The service entrance to the Cheltenham Secondary School designated for "Staff, Deliveries/Coach Vehicular Entrance" will also feed onto Kidnappers Lane to the west of the entrance to the Millers site. Kidnapper's Lane currently has no pavements along its full length from Farm Lane to Church Road. The 'school side' of Kidnapper's Lane consists of a wide tree and vegetation filled verge which could be widened as part of the current construction work. The lack of at least one pavement on this part of the road alongside the Millers development would be a considerable risk to the increased pedestrian and cycling traffic. This matter was raised during public comments on the school's proposals but needs to be made again

The pedestrian crossing points improve access to the bus stops on Shurdington Road.

### **Space Standards**

This is a very high density development: the result of trying to fit 350 units onto the site. This has resulted in some very small units, more appropriate to a city centre development than this semi-rural location. If you compare the size of plots and properties surrounding this site, the proposed density is immediately visible.

If these proposed houses are to provide a sustainable lifetime home for residents they need more space. This could be just by increased plot area to allow space for future extension and privacy. The pandemic lockdown has highlighted the need to be able to work from home, children requiring space in their bedrooms for home schooling, worries about food supply encouraging people to grow some of their food, and difficulties of crowded households and relationships. There needs to be space for securely storing bikes, recycling boxes and wheelie bins, gardening equipment, possibly a greenhouse or conservatory, and desk space for adults and children to work.

The lack of capacity for residents to adapt their homes to their changing needs will lead to a high turnover of occupants, which is detrimental to sustaining a community.

### **Community spaces**

We welcome the innovative plans for a community orchard and allotment space. We would like more detail on how they will be managed, and for this to be pinned down in the planning permission.

Given this innovative green infrastructure, perhaps Miller Homes should consider working towards the Building with Nature accreditation scheme. This could give it a wider, national profile and could be a selling point when marketing houses - and would encourage the developers to do even better.

The play areas are limited and there is no space for informal games, eg football within the development. Has there been any discussion with the new secondary school as to whether leisure facilities can be made available?

Other than the green infrastructure, this development is all houses. There are no community or commercial buildings. The lack of a centre will make it hard to create a community. Residents will have to travel the best part of a mile away to access goods and services. The distance to local services means this is likely to be a very car dependent community as mentioned earlier.

### **Carbon emissions**

This development makes no contribution to Cheltenham's Carbon neutral goal: indeed, it is likely to be a net producer of carbon emissions.

Given it is a very car-dependent development, could EV charging points be built into every home?

There is a lot of emphasis on the high standard of insulation, but not on the sources of the energy. Despite the government commitment to no new gas boilers being installed after 2025, Miller Homes' Energy & Sustainability Statement assumes that all dwellings will be provided with gas fired heating systems. Instead the estate should be built with its own Combined Heat and Power (CHP) system or ground source heat pumps, and solar panels wherever possible. These measures would make a positive contribution to carbon neutrality and could be a selling point for potential buyers.

### **Hunter Page Planning, Thornbury House, 18 High Street, Cheltenham**

Change of use of building from office to residential

Planning ref: 20/01777/LBC

#### **SUPPORT**

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports this application for change of use to residential use. Though we will lose the mixed use end of the High Street, it is a predominantly residential area. Thornbury House was originally built for residential use, and as a listed building it does not adapt easily to modern office requirements.

This presents an opportunity to address some of the shortcomings at the rear of the building (windows etc.). Further applications will benefit from engaging an architect used to working with listed buildings.

### **Spa Pharmacy, 12 Rotunda Terrace, Montpellier Terrace, Cheltenham**

1. Alter existing internal lobby and door, 2. Install Consultation Pod, 3. Install new frame and door to cellar entrance, 4. Install an air-conditioning compressor on the rear wall of the pharmacy, 5. Create a secure stock room in the basement (stud walls only)

Planning ref: 20/01681/FUL

#### **SUPPORT**

The Civic Society Planning Forum supports these changes which will enable Spa Pharmacy to continue to operate successfully as a chemist. We welcome that there is still a useful and necessary shop in this location

The listed frontage is unchanged. Could the air conditioning unit at the rear be screened from view?

#### **Glenfall Gardens Cottages, Mill Lane, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham**

Change of use of Gardens Cottages from hotel accommodation (C1) to 3 no. dwellings (C3)

Planning ref: 20/01918/FUL

#### **NEUTRAL**

The Civic Society Planning Forum finds the design underwhelming. It could be so much better. We would support this application if the details were better, in the fenestration for instance. There is a lot of inspiration in the neighbouring area, including Glenfall House itself.

#### **4 Hartley Close, Cheltenham**

Extensions, alterations and remodelling works to form two storey flat roof dwelling

Planning ref: 20/01907/FUL

#### **OBJECT**

The Civic Society Planning Forum objects to these proposals, which are out of keeping with the rest of the estate, both in style and in scale. The unimaginative grey cladding does not sit comfortably with its 1970s brick neighbours, and is not a good design.

#### **Top Floor Flat, 101 Montpellier Terrace, Cheltenham**

Window repairs and replacement glazing to 1 no. window

Planning ref: 20/01884/LBC

#### **SUPPORT**

#### **2 - 4 Promenade, Cheltenham**

Removal of existing alarm box and installation of 2 no. CCTV cameras overlooking ATM positions

Planning ref: 20/01930/LBC

#### **SUPPORT**

#### **21 Southcourt Drive, Cheltenham**

Two storey rear extension, single storey side and rear extension and hip to gable roof conversion and rear dormer to facilitate loft conversion

Planning ref: 20/01964/FUL

#### **OBJECT**

The Civic Society Planning Forum objects to this monstrous overdevelopment of the site. This is massively out of scale in relation to the existing building and its neighbour, and it has a serious negative impact on its neighbour at 23 Southcourt Drive.

This is a good example of why two storey extensions should not come within permitted development rights.

#### **1 Sandford Park Villa, 81 - 83 Bath Road, Cheltenham**

Replace the existing timber and glass door with timber window

Planning ref: 20/01862/FUL

#### **SUPPORT**

This is an improvement on the existing door and solves the problem of flooding.

---