



# Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Committee Minutes

**Meeting date:** 16 November 2023

**Meeting time:** 6.00 pm - 6.40 pm

---

**In attendance:**

**Councillors:**

Paul Baker (Chair), Garth Barnes (Vice-Chair), Glenn Andrews, Adrian Bamford, Bernard Fisher, Paul McCloskey, Emma Nelson, Tony Oliver, Diggory Seacome and Simon Wheeler

**Also in attendance:**

Michael Ronan, Tracey Birkinshaw (Director of Community & Economic Development), Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance) and Lucy White (Principal Planning Officer)

---

## **1 Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllr Clark.

## **2 Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

## **3 Declarations of independent site visits**

There were none.

## **4 Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes that had been published as a supplement were approved.

## **5 Public Questions**

There were none.

## 6 Planning Applications

### 7 23/01597/FUL, 129-133 Promenade

The Planning Officer introduced the report as published.

The agent on behalf of the applicant spoke and made the following points:

- There is a contradiction in the report regarding the covers.
- This application is not dissimilar to that of the Pittville Pump Room, which the planning committee agreed.
- This application is for less marques that will be of a lower height.
- The hospitality industry is continuing to suffer with pubs closing.
- The application is only for 12 months, the reduced harm is outweighed by the benefit to the public.

The response to a Member question was as follows:

- The marquees were originally put up during covid and as part of the covid legislation. The report addressed that issue, members were informed that they had to consider the application in front of them rather than anything that has gone before.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were raised:

- There needs to be a balance between the harm to the asset and the benefit to the town.
- Buildings are expensive to maintain and you do need a successful business to maintain the building.
- The marquees create a vibrant and lively atmosphere.
- They are only requesting a 12 month extension and the applicant has tried to mitigate the harm of the marquees.
- The proposal for the lower marquees will show more frontage of the building but not the front gardens, without the marquees there would be a nice frontage that could be used.
- The Members understood that the marquees do allow for more customers but that is not a planning consideration.
- The application for the Pittville Pump Rooms is different as the structures is to the side of the building and not directly in front.
- Planning shouldn't consider the viability of the business as a planning matter – this premises was a viable business before the marquees.
- Parasols were suggested as an alternative as you do not need planning permission for them.
- There was an understanding that an enforcement notice will be served on the existing marquees.
- The Pump rooms are in a different situation to this property. The marquees are unsightly and this was a thriving business before covid.
- There will still be marquees in the front of the building regardless of height.

## Page 3

- Nobody comes to Cheltenham to just visit 131.
- Covid caused a lot of businesses to put up marquees – everyone else in the town has removed theirs this is the only property that still has them.
- The business has already had ample time to plan for the future.
- There are heaters in the marquees that are not eco friendly.
- There had been the hope that the scaled down marquees could be supported, but having seen photographs of the property before and after the marquees do show their impact.
- The applicant still has 3 months to use the marquees under permitted development rights.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to refuse:

For: 9

Against: 1

Refused.

### **8 23/01314/FUL, Car Park, Synagogue Lane**

The Planning Officer introduced the report as published.

There were no Member questions and the matter went to Member debate where the following points were made:

- Disappointment that there is to be a 3 year extension as the site would be good for quality housing and would make difference to the Councils 5 year supply.
- Car parks are needed on that side of town, the 3 year extension should be granted.

The matter then went to the vote on the office recommendation to permit:

Unanimous – permitted.

### **9 23/00808/TREEPO, 87 - 99 Beeches Road - WITHDRAWN**

### **10 Appeals Update**

These were noted for information.

### **11 Any other items the Chairman determines urgent and requires a decision**

