

# Planning Committee

20<sup>th</sup> August 2015

**Present:**

**Members (14)**

Councillors Barnes, Chair (GB); Fletcher, Vice-Chair (JF); Baker (PB); Chard (AC); Fisher (BF); Colin Hay (CH); McCloskey (HM); Savage (LS); Stennett (MS); Sudbury (KS); Thornton (PT); Wheeler (SW).

**Substitutes:** Councillor Rowena Hay (RH)  
Councillor Chris Nelson (CN)

**Present as observers:** Councillors Babbage and Payne.

**Officers**

Martin Chandler, Team Leader, Development Management (MC)  
Craig Hemphill, Senior Planner (CH)  
Chloe Smart, Planning Officer (CS)  
Victoria Harris, Planning Officer (VH)  
Cheryl Lester, Legal Officer (CL)

**1. Apologies**

Councillors McKinlay, Seacome and Lillywhite.

**2. Declarations of interest**

**15/01065/FUL 16 Hewlett Road**

Councillors Barnes, Thornton, Sudbury, Fisher, Rowena Hay, McCloskey –16 Hewlett Road is Cheltenham Liberal Democrat office, and all are members of the Liberal Democrat party.

Councillor Colin Hay –as above, and also once occupied the workshop.

Councillor Baker –is the applicant. Will leave the Chamber.

Councillor Savage –lives in Hewlett Road.

**15/ 00928/ADV & LBC Everyman Theatre**

Councillor Barnes – personal – is an observer on the Everyman Board, but has no voting rights.

**15/ 00899/FUL Sandford Park**

Councillor Sudbury –has publicly supported the scheme and part-funded it from her Gloucestershire County Council 'Active Together' fund. Will leave the Chamber.

### 3. Declarations of independent site visits

**15/00699/FUL 15 Brookway Drive**  
Councillor Fletcher.

Councillor McCloskey – is familiar with all sites *other* than **15/01126/FUL 2 Peter Pennell Close** and **15/00646/FUL Belmont, Hyde Lane, Swindon Village**.

**14/01125/FUL Tim Fry Land Rovers, King Alfred Way** and **15/00899/FUL Sandford Park**  
Councillor Baker.

### 4. Public Questions

There were none.

### 5. Minutes of last meeting

Resolved, that the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2015 be approved and signed as a correct record *without* corrections.

### 6. Planning applications

Application Number:	<b>14/01125/FUL</b>
Location:	<b>Tim Fry Land Rovers, King Alfred Way</b>
Proposal:	<b>Redevelopment of land at King Alfred Way involving the demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 86 dwellings, access, landscaping and other associated works</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Refuse</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Refuse</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>49</b>
Update Report:	<b>Further officer comments and amendments to refusal reasons; additional representations</b>

CH introduced the application as above. The site is situated in the Battledown Industrial Estate, which is surrounded by residential properties, and forms part of the wider industrial estate. The proposal relates to areas to the north and south of King Alfred Way, with access via Hales Road to the west, and Athelney Way to the north.. The original application proposed demolition of the industrial buildings on the site, and replacement with 106 residential units, with 15% affordable housing. The revised scheme proposes 86 units, with 40% affordable provision. The application sets out that the site is outdated, poorly located and unsuitable as a modern work environment ; Tim Fry Land Rovers and some of the other businesses have identified three alternative sites, two in Kingsditch Lane and one in Swindon Road, which would allow the company to grow. The company states that to allow this to happen, residential development of the existing site is essential.

The application was originally due to come to Committee in April, with a recommendation to refuse, but was deferred to allow further information to be considered. The applicant has since provided a unilateral undertaking, which is set out in an earlier report update. The unilateral undertaking sets out that if permission for residential development at King Alfred Way is permitted, this will not be implemented until a suitable new employment site is secured. However, no evidence has been provided to justify the loss of the existing employment land, and the recommendation therefore remains to refuse, on the grounds of the NPPF, Local Plan policy EM2, and Policy SD2 of the

emerging JCS. In addition, Members will note from the blue update that no viability assessment has been submitted to demonstrate that 40% affordable housing can be provided.

**Public Speaking:**

**Mr Guy Wakefield, of Hunter Page Planning, in support**

Realises that this is a difficult application due to the loss of employment land, but the process started 5-6 years ago, as a result of the landowner's need to relocate to better, more modern business premises, with the understanding that other businesses on the site would follow. The site has been assessed by commercial surveyors who identified various problems with it, and it has been marketed without success. A similar application for residential development on employment land was permitted at the bottom of Leckhampton Road, and in this case, the applicant needs to sell the land for residential development in order to proceed, having talked to banks to realise that other funding is not possible. The three alternative sites suggested are genuine, and the applicant has proposed that any approval will be subject to a legal agreement stating that this would not be implemented until suitable alternative employment sites have been found. An appeal decision at Stroud Rugby Club supports this approach, and the loss of recreational land would not be considered less significant than the loss of employment land. Officers have said that there is no certainty of an alternative site being found, but the appeal inspector in the Stroud case only found that an alternative recreation site *might* exist; in fact, none was found, and the permission lapsed. It is reasonable to think that an inspector would come to the same conclusion regarding King Alfred Way and alternative employment land. Overall, the proposal would represent a net enhancement of the borough, as the land has been marketed for employment without success, and there are sufficient material considerations for it to be permitted. There is considerable local support, with ten benefits identified.

**Councillor Babbage, ward councillor**

This isn't a straightforward application. Cheltenham needs housing, especially affordable housing, but there is also a shortage of employment land and small business units. This site hasn't been used to its full potential, doesn't support many jobs, and is not particularly attractive to businesses. In general, people are supportive of brownfield site development over greenfield, but there are concerns with this plan. Parking in the area is a major issue, both on King Alfred Way and neighbouring streets, as is the volume of traffic and road safety concerns arising from speeding cars. Although the applicant has reduced the number of proposed units from the original submission, this is still a high-density proposal and causes several issues of concern, including the taller buildings towards Hales Road. The officer recommendation is to refuse due to loss of employment land, but if Members are minded to permit, would suggest that some of the S106 contribution is used to address traffic issues. These might include the introduction of traffic-calming measures at the King Alfred Way junction, to counter limited visibility and excessive speed, and pedestrian crossings at the junction of London Road with Hales Road, and Cirencester Road with Haywards Road.

**Member debate:**

**JF:** knows the area well, having lived much of her life there. Supports the officers regarding the loss of employment land. This is in short supply in the town – Cheltenham is not as short of housing as it is of employment land. The appeal decision at Alma Road supports this view; officers recommended it for approval, JF proposed refusal, and this was upheld by the Inspector, due to the loss of employment land – even though it only involved a small number of jobs. We need to hang on to every little bit we've got. Concurs with officer advice; this application should be refused on policy EM2 and the NPPF.

**PB:** we have to show consistency here, and are fortunate to have the recent Alma Road decision to guide us. That scheme would only have resulted in the loss of a few jobs; this application would mean hundreds of jobs would be lost. Cannot help wondering whether lack of investment in the buildings was a deliberate move, making them no longer fit for purpose and residential development the only alternative. The lack of investment is disappointing; this is a good location, fit for purpose, and ideal for start-up businesses. It could be very successful. As JF has said, we need to protect employment

land at all costs. It's true that the borough needs to build more houses, but if there are no jobs for the people who live in them, it will be a waste of time. Strongly supports the officer recommendation, and would make the additional comment that the applicant's assurance of 40% affordable housing on the site should be taken with a very big pinch of salt. It is a desperate attempt to buy votes and won't happen. When 106 houses were originally proposed, the developer suggested 20% affordable would be viable; when this number was reduced to 86 dwellings, 40% affordable was proposed. This doesn't add up and needs to be looked at very carefully.

**CHay:** supports the officer recommendation. The applicant has suggested a condition that no development of the site should commence until another employment site has been secured, but would this be a net gain? If the businesses relocate to other sites already identified as employment land, this would in fact be a net loss of employment land. Cannot accept this as a reasonable solution. Notes that the application was advertised and sent to all the usual statutory consultees, but would make a plea that when applications involving employment land are submitted in future, officers should write to the Local Enterprise Partnership and Cheltenham Chamber of Commerce to ask for their opinion. Notes that the applicant has offered to provide 40% affordable housing in order to win approval and that the development would be Secured by Design, but that this would be setting out in little enclaves within the site. Has objected to this situation for many years; if the people in the enclave are nice, it will be great; if they have any anti-social behaviour tendencies, and particularly if the enclave is situated close to the entrance to the development, this could cause all sorts of problems. Secured by Design schemes are written by middle-class people for middle-class people, and it doesn't always work that way. CBH is good at looking after its tenants, but not all landlords are the same. Is worried about the design, which could result in people being trapped in their own homes. We need to be very mindful of this.

**AC:** this application is one of the most difficult that Members have considered for a long time, and if just reading the officer report, would agree 100% with the recommendation. However, having visited the site on Planning View, realises that the site is a scrapyards, a complete mess offering no employment potential. It has been compared tonight with Alma Road, but that was a local facility, a working garage, proving MOT and other services for local people, which is one of the reasons why the Inspector refused the appeal. King Alfred Way is not a local facility. There has also been suggestion that the site hasn't been properly marketed – maybe six months' intensive marketing could be conditioned? Supports the application - the proposal would represent an improvement of the site - but agrees with CHay that the offer of 40% affordable housing is pie in the sky. All in all, is edging towards the view that what is proposed is better than what is there now.

**BF:** a lot of what AC has said is right. To the rear of Tim Fry Land Rovers, adjacent to Athelney Way, there are a number of large units which have been empty for two years, demonstrating that there are clearly problems with letting there. The applicants and CBC need to do more more work on this application; it is not ready for a decision to be made. If there's an offer of 40% affordable housing, we should be ready to accept it. There are developments on employment land with no affordable housing at all – at Kier Moss, Leckhampton Hill, Bouncers Lane. It has been said that there would be no employment gain if the businesses relocates, but permission was granted for BMW showroom on the greenbelt in Hatherley which provided no extra jobs at all. Regarding available sites, there are a lot of possibilities around the town, and Tim Fry Land Rovers needs a more attractive site for people to take their vehicles to – it is what Land Rover-owners will expect. The buildings at King Alfred Way are in very poor order and the best option is to knock them down and start again; to say the site could be redeveloped for employment is a bit of a red herring.

Regarding traffic, highways officers say there will be less traffic in and out of the site if it is used for housing.

The scheme shouldn't be dismissed out of hand. Can't ask for another deferral, but it should have been run past the District Valuation Service – 40% affordable housing is always the aspiration, but the school site at Arle Road didn't achieve this, and that could have been classed as an employment site.

Doesn't know which way to go with this application. If not permitted, the site could end up derelict like Bonella Switches, which has now been levelled, while the development of the builders' yard on Gloucester Road will provide very little affordable housing. The argument for consistency goes both ways, and is not convinced by it.

**HM:** supports the officer recommendation. This is a dilapidated site, but should be kept as employment land - it needs redevelopment to provide start-ups with supporting services, as there is very little of this available in Cheltenham and this site is ideal. In addition, the urban design team have concerns about this site as a suitable place to live, which we should take into account. Regarding traffic, the junction of Haywards, Cirencester and London Roads backs up at any time of day. The Haywards Road junction has minimal access at the lights, which makes drivers more likely to use Ewens Road, turning it into a rat run; residential development of the site will make this situation even worse.

**CN:** has listened with interest to comments from fellow Members and agrees with a lot of what has been said. Was conflicted when first looking at this application. Cheltenham is a town with a lot of planning activity currently taking place – the JCS proposing 9,100 new homes for Cheltenham, pressure to provide strategic sites, Local Green Space applications, and the draft Cheltenham Plan. It is hard to find sufficient land for all 9,100 homes, and it appears that this site could help deliver that number, but the Examination in Public has also highlighted a shortage of employment land in Cheltenham, which is a problem. Preparation for the Cheltenham Plan is also showing that there isn't enough employment land in the town. Agrees with Members who have said that now is not the time for an application like this. The Cheltenham Plan will determine policy for the next 15 years, and to remove employment land today would be premature and wrong; the Cheltenham Plan may well safeguard this area and improve it as an employment site.

It's true there are empty units on the site, and much of it is dilapidated and looks like a scrapyard, so Members need to send a strong message to the planners working on the Cheltenham Plan. If the area can be safeguarded, traffic issues will need to be addressed and business rates reviewed, making the area more attractive. These are concrete ways to help the owners maximise employment opportunities in the town. The Cheltenham Plan needs teeth to develop what we want; the Committee's job will be a lot more difficult if it doesn't have any. Agrees with CHay that applications on employment sites should be shared with the LEP and Cheltenham Chamber of Commerce to ensure we have a thorough understanding of employment land in the town.

Agrees with the officer recommendation and most Members' views expressed tonight, and urges all Members to vote against this application. This will give a strong message to the owner that we want to keep employment land, and a strong message to planners to look at the issue in the Cheltenham Plan.

**LS:** has listened to officers' and Members' well-founded concerns about the loss of employment land, and understands that Cheltenham has a shortage of land both for housing and employment. With the greenbelt in Leckhampton and AONB in Glenfall Way threatened with housing development, we have to think whether we are using available land efficiently and effectively. This brownfield site is clearly an eyesore, and not providing much in the way of employment and economic activity; 86 new homes, including 40% affordable, is a significant number in view of the chronic shortage of housing, both locally and nationally. This is not an easy decision to make, and agrees with many of the points made, but we have to consider the merits of this number of houses for the town. Traffic concerns can be mitigated. Will support the proposal.

**CH, in response:**

- it has been an interesting debate, with many issues covered;
- to CN's comments about the site itself, today's updates included comments from planning policy officers, based on the economic strategy produced in support of the Local Plan. This looked at King Alfred Way, identified a shortfall of employment land, and concluded that this land is needed to support employment provision in the town going forward;
- the appeal decision at Alma Road is very timely, stating at Paragraph 14 that although there is some debate as to whether or not Cheltenham can demonstrate a five-year housing supply in advance of adoption of the JCS, there is no dispute about the shortage of employment land in the borough and any reduction in that would not weigh in favour of granting planning permission;
- in making a decision, we have to be mindful of the employment potential at King Alfred Way; the planning policy team has been involved with consideration of this application and given guidance;
- regarding highways issues, there are concerns about current access to the site and the impact on surrounding roads, . Highways officers have not raised any objections to the application.

**CL, in response:**

- the applicant has submitted a draft 106 agreement, which states as follows: prior to commencement of development to use reasonable endeavours to find alternative accommodation within Cheltenham Borough to re-locate the owner's existing business (currently located at the owner's property), subject always to suitable property being available of similar quality, suitable to the owner's business and available to rent or purchase at reasonable affordable commercial rates;
- therefore, it does not actually prevent the planning permission from being implemented if no suitable alternative employment site can be found.

**PT:** is bothered about the promise of 40% affordable housing. Members shouldn't forget the cases when builders start work and then say that this figure is not viable. On Planning View, Officers promised to provide information on the number of people who would lose their jobs if the site is used for housing.

**BF:** to CN, would say there is a danger in being blinkered by strategy and not taking note of real problems – the JCS is set to run to 2031 and a lot can change during that time. If Tim Fry Land Rovers can't stay viable at this site, it could go out of business, losing all the current jobs. The government has stated that we need to build houses. Is not 100% in support of this application, but it needs to be looked at again.

**MS:** has listened intently to the debate and heard a lot of interesting comments. CBC has spent a lot of money on its economic strategy, and the officer recommendation is in front of us. If we start losing employment land, the town will be in trouble, and there will be no point in building houses – it would become a dormitory town. Is 100% behind the officer recommendation. There is a lot of rubbish on the site, but this isn't a consideration for Members. This land is extremely valuable, and could be put to good employment use, maybe by an electronics company or something similar. Is only concerned that, in six months' time, the applicants could come back saying they have tried to market it and there is no interest. We must be aware of how the marketing is taking place, as it would be easy to make it unmarketable.

**KS:** came to the meeting with an open mind about this application, as there are arguments on both sides, but feels she must support the officers – where the use of an area needs to be considered, this should be done through the planning process rather than on an ad hoc basis to help one business cushion the costs of its own development. Is not altogether averse to housing on the site - although traffic-wise, it isn't the easiest to access - and there would be space at Pittville School for incoming children. Planners need to look at this site and others nearby, as there is potential for conflict between

residential and business uses. If, through the planning process, another site is available which could replace this, it could be redeveloped, but in isolation, it is not the right thing to do.

**RH:** regarding traffic, and references to the traffic generated by the industrial site, was the knock-on from GCHQ and Starvehall Farm taken into account, and the considerable increase in traffic that these developments will cause?

**CH, in response:**

- these developments would have been factored into the traffic modelling;
- regarding the number of jobs currently on site, the best figure officers can provide is 34 jobs within the red line – so not the most efficient use of the land.

**Vote on officer recommendation to refuse**

11 in support

3 in objection

**REFUSE**

Application Number:	<b>15/00646/FUL</b>		
Location:	<b>Belmont, Hyde Lane, Swindon Village</b>		
Proposal:	<b>Erection of dwelling (revised scheme following approval of planning permission ref. 13/00854/FUL)</b>		
View:	<b>Yes</b>		
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit</b>		
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit</b>		
Letters of Rep:	<b>0</b>	Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**MJC** introduced this application for a revised detached dwelling. Work has commenced on the permitted scheme, which has resulted in the applicant's request for a further 450mm on the first floor height, a further 5.1m in first floor width, and an extension to the first floor landing. The site is in the green belt. The application is at Committee at the request of Councillor Fisher. The officer recommendation is to permit.

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

**BF:** the key concern here is that this site is in the green belt. The original dwelling was a very small bungalow with a cast-iron roof and one bedroom. This grew a lot with the first application and just keeps growing, with a further 5m now requested, apparently for no good reason. It is now like a film-star's house, with a massive pool. With the first design, the only thing showing was a small area at the top; was staggered on Planning View to see how big it has become. The outbuildings were breeze block dog kennels and a chicken run, not part of the residential dwelling, and this proposal and hedge will make a difference to the green belt – it will stick out like a sore thumb. The developer proceeded at his own risk; he could have built lower, but this would have cost him more. The original application was only permitted by a narrow majority, due to the greenbelt location, and now the applicant is asking for an even more massive pad, on a site surrounded by cornfields. If we could overlay the size of the original proposal with what is now proposed, Members would see that it is a very large increase indeed.

**SW:** recalls a similar application to this, at which he voted with other Members but for a very different reason. There is already planning permission on this land, and if it is to be considered as building land, wants to see it built on properly, with more than one dwelling. If it isn't, and is still classed as green belt, does not want to see any further development on it. Will vote in objection.

**CHay:** considers the design to be fine; the principle is accepted, and this proposal is just a bit bigger. Is there any height restriction on the green roof? If the plants are maintained at 0.5m high, it will make no difference. Recalls a similar application for a house on Cleeve Hill which was very controversial but went on to win a civic award, as an example of an attractive, modern, good-quality building which enhances the site. This is just one house in the greenbelt, not rows and rows of housing; it looks good and is acceptable.

**MS:** agrees with CHay. The design is alright, and the original application has approval; to say an extra couple of feet will make any difference is wrong – it will go unnoticed. We would stand no chance of winning an appeal. The scheme is panning out well, and is likely to bring money to the area. Will go with the officer recommendation.

**BF:** Members shouldn't forget that this was done at the applicant's own risk. Previously, the only visible part was a small part of the top of the building; this is now extended by 5m. What's the square meterage of the proposed dwelling now? What if the applicant wants to extend it further, or sink the pool deeper? There is also the question of the removal and replacement of the soil; the house seems to be a lot more visible when it was originally approved.

**AC:** Members sometimes have to consider very boring architecture, but this is absolutely brilliant. It isn't materially different to what was originally approved, there's just a bit more of it. It is an excellent scheme. Will vote in support.

**MJC, in response:**

- to BF, the applicant isn't building at his own risk; he is building in accordance with the planning permission, and hasn't yet started on the first floor, with which the current application is concerned;
- the details of the square meterage are set out in the officer report; the original first floor was 88.5 square metres, the revised first floor is 120 square metres;
- the pool is part of the original approval;
- regarding levels, the drawings show them as they will be reinstated. This is also approved. The solid green line on the ground floor level indicates the level to which the land will be reinstated. A lot of earth moved during the construction period will be reinstated – this is conditioned;
- regarding the height increase, this is purely to do with the structure needed to retain the sedum roof. Soil and sedum are heavy, and the roof has to be stronger.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

12 in support

2 in objection

**PERMIT**

Application Number:	<b>15/00699/FUL</b>
Location:	<b>15 Brookway Drive, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham</b>
Proposal:	<b>Single and two storey extensions to side and rear of existing dwelling</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>7</b>
Update Report:	<b>None</b>



**VH** introduced the application as above, which is at Committee at the request of Councillor Reid who considers it would dominate the adjacent property as it is over development and not subservient.

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

**RH:** notes at paragraph 6.18 that the officer does not consider the neighbouring property would lose daylight to an unacceptable degree, but what is an unacceptable degree and how close to being unacceptable is this proposal?

**VH, in response:**

- it is a simple pass or fail of the 45° light test; this application passes the test.

**JF:** is worried about the scheme. There will undoubtedly be loss of daylight for the neighbours; it is overbearing. Cannot go along with the officer recommendation.

**RH:** doesn't understand the light test and how it relates to what is in the report. Will the neighbour lose 40% daylight, 44% or what?

**MJC, in response:**

- to clarify the light test, as VH has said, schemes essentially pass or fail it. It is carried out by projecting 45° from different parts of the extension; if the centre point of the windows is on the extension side, there will be loss of light. It is a crude system, but national best practice and routinely carried out;
- planning guidance talks about loss of more than 20% of daylight being noticeable and therefore any loss below 20% is taken as acceptable;
- this is quite technical and difficult to explain without pencil and paper, but it is basically about projecting various lines from the highest and deepest points. Can demonstrate if Members would like.

**AC:** it's interesting that there is a very similar extension next door, and the proposal is no better or worse than that. The objector on the other side cannot build a similar extension, as the driveway of that property has been sold off. If he owned this house and had a family, would want to do exactly what the applicant wants to do. Considers it perfectly okay.

**MS:** to anyone worried about loss of light, it will be noticeable to the neighbours but their sunlight is already compromised by the house next door but one. Cannot see any problem with this application.

**PT:** was going to say something similar. The large extension on the house beyond definitely affects the light to the house of the neighbour who has objected, and there's nothing to be done about that. This proposal won't make any fundamental difference. Many of the houses in this area have extensions, not all as big but all on the same track of increasing the size of living accommodation. Has no problem with this at all.

**HM:** is concerned about on-street parking. The house will be substantial, and may add as many as four cars. On-street parking is already difficult, and at the bottom of the close, where the application site is situated, there is a turning circle which needs to be clear at all times. This proposal will mean loss of amenity to neighbours in Brookway Drive, making it more difficult to park and turn round.

**VH, in response:**

- there is one off-street parking space at the moment, and no additional spaces are proposed. There was felt to be sufficient on- and off-street parking available in the area to ensure that highway safety will not be endangered.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

10 in support

2 in objection

2 abstentions

**PERMIT**

Application Number:	<b>15/00899/FUL</b>
Location:	<b>Sandford Park, College Road, Cheltenham</b>
Proposal:	<b>Construction of three self-binding gravel petanque courts, new tarmac path, picnic table areas, planting and the removal of an existing tarmac path</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>0</b>
Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**Councillor Sudbury left the Chamber for the duration of this item.**

**VC** introduced the application as above, which is at Committee because the Park is owned by Cheltenham Borough Council, and comes with a recommendation to permit

**Public Speaking:**

**None.**

**Member debate:**

**PB:** is fortunate to represent this area and live close to the Park. The Friends of Sandford Park have been engaged in this scheme, and Councillor Sudbury has put forward an application for funding to the County Council, to encourage the community to engage more fully. It is a superb scheme, will provide fantastic local amenity and enhance the area.

**CHay:** this is a great scheme, and the timing is particularly brilliant with the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Cheltenham's twinning with Annecy coming up. Hopefully the two towns can challenge each other to a game on the new pitches

**BF:** this is an excellent scheme, and as the Plough at Prestbury also has petanque courts, could see the start of a petanque league!

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

13 in support - unanimous

**PERMIT**

Application Number:	<b>15/00928/ADV &amp; 15/00928/LBC</b>
Location:	<b>Everyman Theatre, 7 - 10 Regent Street, Cheltenham</b>
Proposal:	<b>Erection of two internally illuminated matrix display signs – two 'messagemaker' display units to ends of canopy at front of theatre</b>

View:	<b>Yes</b>		
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Grant</b>		
Committee Decision:	<b>Grant</b>		
Letters of Rep:	<b>0</b>	Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**CS** introduced this application, at the Grade II-listed Everyman Theatre. Listed building consent and advertising consent are sought for illuminated message units which will display information relating to the theatre only. The Conservation Officer and Highways Officers do not have any objection to the scheme. It is at Committee because Cheltenham Borough Council owns the site and the officer recommendation is to permit.

**Public Speaking:**

**Mr Geoffrey Rowe, Chief Executive of the Everyman Theatre, in support**

There are two reasons for this application: the first is commercial, like any exterior signs, to sell seats and advertise the catering facilities at the theatre. The second is to counter the appearance that the theatre isn't open - it is a Victorian building, and can often appear closed. The Everyman relies on ticket sales and catering, with 90% of its income coming from sales, and during the day in particular, it tends to look dark and closed, situated as it is among lit-up shops and restaurants. The display signs will show that the theatre is open for business and encourage sales. When it was built in 1891, the Victorians preferred to keep their pleasures private, so the windows are small and the audience not visible from outside. Modern theatres, on the other hand, like to show their wares. The elitist image still lingers, but illuminated signs will counter the impression that the theatre is only for those in the know. The signs won't affect the listed exterior of the building as they will be fastened to the canopy and can easily be removed. They will soon be accepted as part of the exterior and something people expect from a place of entertainment.

**Member debate:**

**AC:** this is a no-brainer – a wonderful proposal. Is a big supporter of the Everyman, and this will achieve exactly what it wants to achieve. It's true that it can look closed during the day. Fully supports the proposal.

**LS:** this is an excellent proposal, very eloquently described by Mr Rowe.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit/grant**

14 in support – unanimous

**PERMIT/GRANT**

Application Number:	<b>15/01065/FUL</b>		
Location:	<b>16 Hewlett Road, Cheltenham</b>		
Proposal:	<b>Refurbishment and Alteration to workshop at the rear of 16 Hewlett Road</b>		
View:	<b>Yes</b>		
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit</b>		
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit</b>		
Letters of Rep:	<b>0</b>	Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**Councillor Baker left the Chamber for the duration of this item.**

**CS** explained that this application seeks to make amendments to the existing single storey extension to the rear of this property, inserting a window to the side and replacing the existing garage door with a

window. There is no change of use, and all alterations are external. It is at Planning Committee because the property is owned by Councillor Baker.

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

None.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

13in support – unanimous

**PERMIT**

Application Number:	<b>15/01126/FUL</b>		
Location:	<b>2 Peter Pennell Close, Cheltenham</b>		
Proposal:	<b>Single storey front/side extension</b>		
View:	<b>Yes</b>		
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit</b>		
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit</b>		
Letters of Rep:	<b>0</b>	Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**MJC** introduced the application as above, which is at Planning Committee because the site is owned by Cheltenham Borough Homes.

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

**HM:** fully supports this application, which is much needed. The new extension will be a bedroom. The existing second bedroom is small and will be converted to an en suite bathroom with disabled access to Bedroom 1. With the ageing population, there are likely to be more and more applications of this type. It is an excellent proposal and should be supported.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

14 in support – unanimous

**PERMIT**

*The meeting ended at 7.40pm.*