



Notice of a meeting of Planning Committee

**Tuesday, 28 May 2019
6.00 pm**

Membership	
Councillors:	Garth Barnes (Chair), Paul Baker (Vice-Chair), Stephen Cooke, Diggory Seacome, Victoria Atherstone, Bernard Fisher, Dilys Barrell, Mike Collins, Alex Hegenbarth, Karl Hobley, Paul McCloskey, Tony Oliver, Simon Wheeler, John Payne and Rowena Hay

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting

Agenda

7. **18/02053/FUL - 48 SWINDON ROAD, CHELTENHAM -** (Pages 5 - 6)
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS
[Planning Application Documents](#)

Contact Officer: Judith Baker, Planning Committee Co-ordinator,
Email: builtenvironment@cheltenham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Additional supporting information for objection to Proposed Development at 48 Swindon Road (Affecting Normal Terrace)

28.05.2019

1. In the last meeting almost all councillors stated they were concerned about visibility and Highway Safety
 - o Glos Highways have reiterated their lack of concerns.
 - o The **Highway Code article 210** forbids reversing from minor to major (theory test question).
2. New development may sit slightly further back than current building **but it extends several meters further east** at entrance to Normal Terrace
 - o More difficult for vehicles reversing from Normal Terrace to take evasive action.
 - o Pedestrians on Swindon Road have reduced chance of seeing vehicles.
3. The Highways Agency say it is not the job of the developer to fix problems in Normal Terrace; and we agree.
 - o **We just don't expect them to make them worse – and that is what this development will do.**
4. The statement that adding 16 residents to our tiny street will have no effect on “the existing transport infrastructure” is not true.
 - o That is why half the street comes out to oppose the plans.
 - o The situation is such that a charge of **Wednesbury Unreasonableness** might be brought – it is obvious that any reasonable person would feel that the decision by Glos Highways is nonsensical, and that a Judicial Review may be needed.
5. Last meeting the Committee discussed “loss of amenity” as grounds for refusing the application.
 - o They were directed by Mr Seymour their grounds on terms of loss of amenity were not sufficient; this despite the fact that **community cohesion, a protected characteristic.**
 - o **Community cohesion is certainly put at risk** by the development's effect on existing residents. Mr Seymour assures us this is not so; he clearly has not listened to what the residents say.
6. At the last meeting, Miss Brown speaking for the developer, assured the committee that this was “a well-designed scheme that the conservation officer had not objected to.” This may have created a **misleading impression**; if the committee would like to turn to the **Conservation Officer's report they will find that he spends an entire page objecting to the scheme!**
 - o To quote:
“It is the opinion of the conservation officer that alternative, more sensitive scheme for the site that retains the existing building have not been properly explored and the benefit of a limited number of additional residential units that could be located elsewhere without a harmful impact, does not outweigh the great weight that needs to be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Approval of the loss of positive building within the conservation area is resulting in the slow erosion of its heritage significance and approval of such schemes should be exceptional. If this application is approved concern is raised this unwelcome approach will be further reinforced resulting in resisting such proposals in future becoming increasingly difficult.”
7. The Lower High Street Character Area Appraisal and Management Plan has **identified the building as of a Positive Character as recently as 2008.**
 - o **NPPF article 193 requires exceptional reasons to demolish a positive building**, and it not for the planning officer to re-grade it as neutral or harmful, especially given there is currently a review of the Conservation Area in progress.

This page is intentionally left blank