



# CHELTENHAM CIVIC SOCIETY

## PLANNING FORUM

Note of meeting held at 6.00pm on Tuesday 25 February 2020 at Parmoor House

**Those present:** Rob Rimell (Chair), Peter Sayers, Andrew Booton, Adrian Phillips, Tess Beck (Minutes), Andrew Kitching, Mike Sheppard & Mike Richardson.

**Apologies:** Mike Duckering

### **8 Montpellier Villas, Cheltenham**

Removal of fireplace and installation of wood-burning stove

Planning ref: 20/00074/LBC

Following lengthy discussion, it was agreed to submit no comment.

### **Cath Kidston, Britannia House, 21 Promenade, Cheltenham**

Refurbishment of existing retail unit into new Salon, works include redecoration and glazing works to existing shopfront and new signage

Planning ref: 20/00082/LBC

SUPPORT. The Civic Society Planning Forum appreciates the light touch approach to the exterior. The quality of the public space and street scene would need to be improved (which is not within the control of the applicant) if the outdoor setting is to benefit.

### **Chapel Spa, North Place, Cheltenham**

Change of use of existing spa (Class D1) to hotel (Class C1) with associated internal and external alterations

Planning ref: 20/00119/LBC

SUPPORT. Based on the heritage statement, the Civic Society Planning Forum supports the proposed fenestration design. We do not accept the proposed removal of 2 ground floor windows (drawn as "blind" on the proposed elevations). With careful detailing & appropriate materials, these could be retained. We have some concerns about waste storage and disabled access: are there any plans for a call button or intercom at the bottom of the steps for disabled visitors? Otherwise this is a good proposal for a difficult site. We hope this development will kickstart the long-stalled development of the North Place car park. The Planning Forum commends the heritage statement.

### **Oakfield House Stables, Oakfield House, Greenway Lane, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham**

Erection of a single self-build dwelling following the demolition of existing stables (revised scheme)

Planning ref: 20/00154/FUL

OBJECT. The Civic Society Planning Forum objects strongly to this proposed development within the AONB, which would adversely affect the AONB and would be contrary to the AONB Management Plan, the NPFF, JCS and Local Plan. The Forum endorses the comments by CPRE and the Cotswold Conservation Board.

Our reasons for objection are exactly the same as those given by the Council for rejecting the previous scheme on this site. The forum is concerned that the previous application enjoyed the support of local authority officers, despite the AONB location and contrary to the local authority's own planning policies regarding the AONB.

Therefore, we ask that the decision on this application be made by the council's planning committee.

### **303 Cirencester Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham**

Proposed new dwelling in the rear garden of 303 Cirencester Road

Planning ref: 20/00213/FUL

OBJECT. The Civic Society Planning Forum object to this application on the grounds of over development: the planned dwelling is too big for the plot allocated. The plans are inadequate as they fail to show the new road access from Cirencester Road to the existing dwelling, which this development would necessitate.

### **Four Telephone Kiosks Outside 43 Promenade, Cheltenham**

Temporary re-painting of telephone kiosks - four in white, and six in one of six rainbow colours - 10 Listed

Telephone Boxes in the Promenade

Planning ref: 20/00229/LBC

OBJECT. The red colour is a significant feature of the listed boxes, and that as a tourist attraction, visitors expect to see red telephone boxes (and red pillar boxes). Comparisons were drawn with the poor execution of the gold pillar boxes in 2012.

The Forum believes that other locations and/or venues would be better suited and be more effective for the promotion of the LGBTQ+ message. The Forum hopes the interior displays will materialise, as the current use of some of the boxes for storage detracts from their appearance and that of the Promenade.

The application documentation is inadequate. An application of this nature must surely be in colour. The Forum regrets that local architects were not employed to draw up the plans, as they may have paid greater attention to detail in both the location of the defibrillator and the spelling in the document. The Forum notes that there is an undertaking to reinstate the original colour at the end of a year. If the Borough is minded to permit, this should be enforced and a condition imposed requiring the use of an anti-graffiti finish.

### **55A Alstone Avenue, Cheltenham**

Erection of detached bungalow

Planning ref: 20/00246/FUL

OBJECT. The Civic Society Planning Forum endorses the objections made by neighbours at 55 & 49 Alstone Avenue. The proposed building is overbearing and of poor architectural quality.