



CHELTENHAM CIVIC SOCIETY

PLANNING FORUM

Notes of online meeting held at 6.00 pm on Tuesday 28 April 2020

Those present: Rob Rimell (Chair), Andrew Booton, Peter Sayers, Adrian Phillips, Andrew Kitching, Mike Richardson, Tess Beck (Minutes), Mike Duckering & David Oakhill (invited guest)

Apologies: Mike Sheppard

Holy Trinity Church, Portland Street, Cheltenham

Provision of PV panels to eastern elevation of roof. Provision of new access dormer to eastern elevation of roof. Removal of 2 no. redundant, non-original, air vents.

Planning ref: 20/00494/FUL

SUPPORT. The Civic Society Planning Forum supports this application as the PV panels will not be visible and they will make a useful environmental contribution. We would like more information on where the associated equipment will be located, as this has not been included in the application.

Dolder House, 102 Painswick Road, Cheltenham

Erection of single storey dwelling with soft and hard landscaping and other associated works.

Planning ref: 20/00583/FUL

SUPPORT. Although the site is somewhat overdeveloped, and the exterior uninspired, the proposed design is not visible from the road. Tree retention is an issue as indicated by the Tree Officer's comment, and a comprehensive tree plan should be a condition of granting permission. In addition, the Forum urges the applicant to extend the existing garden wall to replace the existing timber panels.

Car Park, Chester Walk, Cheltenham

Proposed mixed use Innovation Hub for the town centre (revised scheme following grant of planning permission ref: 19/00204/FUL).

Planning ref: 20/00552/FUL

SUPPORT. While the Civic Society Planning Forum still approve of the principle of a mixed-use Innovation Hub on this site, this design lacks the excitement of the original proposal. The elevation facing the Minster churchyard is unresolved. The submitted design is too fussy with too many balconies, which would perhaps be more appropriate to a residential development. The bottom halves of the full-length windows are likely to be filled with office detritus which will further detract from this frontage onto a significant heritage site. The large letters on top of the building on the church yard elevation are inappropriate. There needs to be a landscaping plan for the Minster churchyard, with possible provision of a path to the Hub's main entrance. The Forum is concerned about the apparent difference in representation of cladding materials between the artist's impression and elevations.

13 Leckhampton Road, Cheltenham

Formation of off-street parking to front and new dropped kerb.

Planning ref: 20/00553/FUL

OBJECT. These plans will further erode the character of Leckhampton Road and are contraindicated by the conservation area management plans for the area. The applicant could create easily accessible increased parking provision at the rear of the back garden without detracting from the area's character.

12 The Oaks, Up Hatherley, Cheltenham

Change of use of land to rear of existing garden of 12 The Oaks to residential and erection of 1 metre high fence.

Planning ref: 20/00567/FUL

OBJECT. The Civic Society Planning Forum objects to this imposition on the green swathe of highway landscaping (and potentially to road safety). There is a distinct lack of information in this application.

Beaufort Arms, 184 London Road, Cheltenham

Construction of two storey building comprising 2 no. one bedroom apartments and 2 no. studio apartments following demolition of former skittle alley and storage building.

Planning ref: 20/00611/FUL

OBJECT. The design is undistinguished and the design and materials are not in keeping with the local area and will look dated very quickly. The application is missing a design access statement. We are concerned by the lack of parking provision.

3 Regency House, Humphries Place, Cheltenham

Erection of 3 no. car protection canopies over 7 car parking spaces within the grounds of Regency House for 3, 4, 6 & 13 Regency House.

Planning ref: 20/00561/FUL

After a brief discussion, when it was agreed that these canopies did not appear to make a serious detrimental impact although the existing battle-ship grey may not be an appropriate colour, it was agreed to submit no comment to CBC.