

# Planning Committee

**22<sup>nd</sup> October 2015**

**Present:**

**Members (15)**

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

**Substitutes:** Councillor Walklett (JW)  
Councillor Payne (JP)

**Present as an observer:** Councillor Babbage.

**Officers**

Tracey Crews, Head of Planning (TC)  
Martin Chandler, Team Leader, Development Management (MC)  
Ed Baker, Senior Planning Officer (EB)  
Michelle Payne, Senior Planning Officer (MP)  
Cheryl Lester, Legal Officer (CL)

**1. Apologies**

Councillors Lillywhite and Sudbury.

**2. Declarations of interest**

**15/01319/FUL & LBC Compass House, Lypiatt Road**

Councillor Chard – lives in Southwood Lane. Not prejudicial.

Councillor Barnes – knows one of the objectors and serves on a committee with him. Not prejudicial.

**3. Declarations of independent site visits**

- i. Councillor Fletcher: 60 Cleevelands Avenue
- ii. Councillor Chard: Compass House; 282 London Road
- iii. Councillor Fisher: Former Barrington Lodge Nursing Home; 282 London Road; Land adjacent to Gray House, Harp Hill
- iv. Councillor Savage: 282 London Road; Land adjacent to Gray House; (Ladies College Swimming Pool)
- v. Councillor Walklett: 282 London Road; Former Barrington Lodge Nursing Home

**4. Public Questions**

There were none.

**5. Minutes of last meeting**

Resolved, that the minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2015 be approved and signed as a correct record *without* corrections.

## 6. Planning applications

Application Number: **15/01171/FUL**  
 Location: **Ladies College Swimming Pool, Malvern Road**

**DEFERRED**

Application Number: **15/00676/FUL**  
 Location: **60 Cleevelands Avenue, Cheltenham**  
 Proposal: **Construction of new detached dwelling**  
 View: **Yes**  
 Officer Recommendation: **Permit**  
 Committee Decision: **Permit**  
 Letters of Rep: **7** Update Report: **None**

**MJC** introduced this application for a single storey dwelling on land to the rear of 60 Cleevelands Avenue, with access via Tilney Road. It is at Planning Committee because of outstanding reservations on the scheme from the Architects Panel. Officers have worked with the applicant to lift the scheme – it is now unrecognisable compared with the original submission. The application site has been enlarged, and the building now sits comfortably within the site. The recommendation is to permit.

### Public Speaking:

None.

### Member debate:

None.

### Vote on officer recommendation to permit

15 in support – unanimous

**PERMIT**

Application Number: **15/00681/FUL**  
 Location: **Land adjacent to 205 Leckhampton Road**

**DEFERRED**

Application Number:	<b>15/00958/FUL</b>
Location:	<b>Former Barrington Lodge Nursing Home, 138 Cirencester Road, Charlton Kings</b>
Proposal:	<b>Erection of four detached dwellings with garages (revised scheme)</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>9</b>
Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**EB** introduced the proposal as above, for four dwellings . The original application was permitted in January 2015, with a revised scheme approved in May. Houses 2, 3 and 4 are largely complete; this application is for four units, with Plot 1 enlarged. The changes are detailed in the report. The officer recommendation is to permit.

#### **Public Speaking:**

##### **Mr Richard Basnett, planning agent on behalf of neighbours, in objection**

Is speaking on behalf of the residents of 46 Bafford Lane, situated to the north-west corner of the site. Has followed the planning application from its conception; it has been complex. The four houses are now near completion, and the scheme has been significantly amended in the current application. The siting and proximity of Plot 2 adjacent to the boundary with No. 46 Bafford Lane will be overbearing. The owners of No. 46 welcomed and supported the original application, subject to the correct levels being used for the drawings, but the permission was granted with misstated levels, to the detriment of No. 46. Plot 2 has been constructed with a large basement, contrary to the plans, as is the originally approved Plot 1 which is 56% larger than originally approved and thus more harmful to No. 46. The cumulative effect of all the adjustments are detrimental to No. 46. If the height of the approved scheme could be reduced, this would be welcomed as it would be less overbearing. Similarly, a condition relating to no additional windows and doors would also be welcome and the proposed condition for a wall along the boundary. Currently there is a very large fence in place, urges this condition is enforced and not changed to a fence.

##### **Mr Robert Deacon, applicant, in support**

Plot 2 has been amended to lift the kitchen floor to allow disabled access, not to create a basement – although a basement has been created in the process as Barrington Lodge already had a basement. **This** should have been at design stage, was rectified on site and amended plans approved. Of the seven properties affected by the development, 46 Bafford Lane is the least affected; measurements from the first floor are as follows: 15m to Brizen Cottage; 20m to 4 Bafford Lane; 22m to 6 Bafford Lane; 17.5m to 8 Bafford Lane; 15m to 4 Lawson Glade to the nearest corner; 21m to 46 Bafford Lane. The windows on the back of Plot 1 look across the garden of No. 46 but not into it; the windows face the rear garden of No. 4 Lawson Glade but officers do not consider this to be unacceptable . To confirm, No. 46 is the property least affected by development.

#### **Member debate:**

**PB:** this application has been discussed a few times before, and has been concerned about the number of changes submitted. It is really difficult for local residents and lay people to understand what is going on with the proposal. On Planning View, realised he would be very hard-pressed not to support the officer recommendation. Takes the neighbour's concerns on board, but does not consider these significant enough to refuse the proposal. Would question the officer on the comment regarding the boundary wall – it was more effective and aesthetically pleasing, and should be retained. It is a good scheme; likes the contemporary style and design, and appreciates that the developer could have

built more houses on the site. Agrees that there have been too many changes along the way, but will support the scheme as it now is.

**HM:** finds the report difficult to follow, as a number of statutory consultees talk about five dwellings – the original application – with no comments about the four-dwelling scheme. From highways point of view, this makes no difference, but would like officer assurances that the Civic Society, Architects Panel and parish council have all looked at the enlarged Plot 1 – would like to know what their comments are.

**MS:** on Planning View, saw the changes being proposed, and questioned if the site was built exactly as planned and this proposal came in as a subsequent amendment, would we vote for it? Concluded that we would, and cannot see that the change will significantly alter Plot 2.

**EB, in response:**

- to PB, Condition 8 requires details of a 2m high wall as officers felt appropriate as well– as discussed with the agent – to be submitted prior to occupation, so there is no breach at the moment;
- to HM, regarding reconsultation on the four-dwelling scheme, actually received very few responses from consultees. The parish council came back, maintaining its original concerns.

**BF:** the officer referred to Condition 8 requiring the design details of the wall prior to occupation; shouldn't this be the completion of the wall?

**AC:** agrees. What if the applicant doesn't build it?

**EB, in response:**

- the condition requires details for approval and the wall to be built in accordance with the details before occupation.

**GB:** enforcement action will be taken if it isn't.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

12 in support

1 in objection

2 abstentions

**PERMIT**

Application Number:	<b>15/01165/FUL</b>
Location:	<b>Land adjacent to Gray House, Harp Hill</b>
Proposal:	<b>Erection of two dwellings and associate works</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Delegated Permit, subject to resolution of the issue of site size and the application of policy HS4</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Delegated Permit, subject to resolution of the issue of site size and the application of policy HS4</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>7</b>
Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**EB** introduced the application as above, with officer recommendation in the report to permit. One late issue concerns the size of the application site and whether an affordable housing contribution is required. According to the application, the site measures 0.44h, and Policy HS4 in the Local Plan

requires affordable housing contribution for schemes of more than 15 dwellings or sites larger than 0.5ha. Officers have noted a small parcel of land to the rear of the site, and it is not clear whether or not this is owned by the applicant, or to be included as part of the garden. This needs to be explored. If it is to be included in the site, the size of the plot will be more than 0.5ha, triggering Policy HS4, which requires a 40% contribution. If Policy HS4 is implemented, the council should explore whether to seek a commuted sum from the applicant. A revised recommendation, therefore, is to permit, with the final decision delegated back to officers, subject to resolution of the issue. If the site is over 0.5ha, action will be taken on HS4.

### **Public Speaking:**

#### **Mr James Griffin, Hunter Page Planning, in support**

Is grateful for officers' work on this site, and commends the report and conclusion that the development is suitable for the site. The scheme is a high-quality development in Cheltenham's urban area, which has been revised to address concerns of officers and neighbours, which concerned planting, plot detail for Plot 1, and screening for Plot 2. A neighbour objection has been withdrawn in light of these revisions. The scheme is supported by the Architects Panel, which considers it well designed and interesting, and the Civic Society, which echoes these comments, liking the modern design and good use of topography. The Parish Council, Battledown Trustees, and Gloucestershire Highways have not raised any objection. Regarding the ownership of the land mentioned by the officer, only the land within the red boundary is in the applicant's control; anything beyond is not. This proposal meets the high standards required by the Local Plan. Hopes therefore that Members can permit, in line with the officer recommendation.

### **Member debate:**

**MS:** looking at the block plan, notes that the red line embraces the road/track that serves The Bredons and the property at the back. Is that correct? If so the owners of the two new properties will own the access road, and the use of the track by the other houses of the track could become compromised?

**PB:** the scheme will not contribute much to Cheltenham's affordable housing situation, but the views are magnificent and the applicant should be congratulated on an imaginative and contemporary scheme. Would very much like to see it when finished, as part of a future Completed Schemes tour. Is happy to support the revised recommendation, it would be good if officers can negotiate a contribution to affordable housing.

**JP:** agrees with PB. – the site is spectacular and the view splendid. We are increasingly seeing more and more innovative designs, which bodes well for Cheltenham. Supports the scheme; the architect should be congratulated.

**LS:** also echoes PB's comments, but with a small degree of anxiety. Although the site is technically in the urban area as defined by the Cheltenham Local Plan, there is a rural feel to Harp Hill and residents are concerned that the contemporary design won't sit well on the edge of the AONB.

### **EB, in response:**

- access will be via a shared access track, serving Kings' Welcome, The Bredons, and the two new dwellings.

**DS:** is the road therefore owned by the four properties? This may lead to ownership disputes in the future.

**EB, in response:**

- planning only deals with land use, not rights of way and ownership. The four parties will have to come to an agreement regarding the access track.

**HM:** confirms that; if existing residents can demonstrate that track has been used as their access for a certain number of years, there will be no problem – it is a civil matter.

**Vote on officer recommendation for a delegated permit, subject to the resolution of the issue of site size and the application of policy HS4**

15 in support – unanimous

**DELEGATED PERMIT**

Application Number:	<b>15/01319/FUL &amp; LBC</b>
Location:	<b>Compass House, Lypiatt Road</b>
Proposal:	<b>Extension to Compass House creating two storeys of additional office space at ground and first floor with car parking at lower ground floor, and replacement windows to existing modern rear extension (excluding penthouse) – revised scheme following withdrawal of application refs 15/00518/FUL &amp; LBC)</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Permit/Grant</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Permit/Grant</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>6</b>
Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**MP** introduced the application as above – a contemporary extension to a Grade II listed building, providing an additional 430 square metres of office space, with parking on the lower ground floor. It is at Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Harman, in view of concerns from local residents. The recommendation is to permit/grant.

**Public Speaking:**

**Mr Ian Brothwood, applicant, in support**

Is partner of the international law firm Charles Russell Speechlys, which is based at Compass House but requires additional space to accommodate existing staff and future growth. The firm has been based in Cheltenham for 30 years, and provides advice to major corporate companies, privately-owned businesses and individuals. The Cheltenham office provides an important centre for specialist advice on key focus areas, and for serving the local market between Birmingham, Bristol and Oxford. Since moving to Compass House in 2001, staff numbers have increased by 34%, now having just under 90 members of staff, and the firm is looking to expand and grow with Compass House now at capacity, while remaining in Cheltenham. Additional space from the proposed extension will provide space for a further 30 staff. The firm has been looking for alternative accommodation in Cheltenham for two years, but there is nothing suitable. Staff and clients are committed to the central location of Compass House, and the decision to seek permission to extend was unanimous among staff and welcomed by clients. 75% of the staff live in or close to Cheltenham and 50% of clients in Gloucestershire, creating clear economic benefits for Cheltenham. In addition, a conservative estimate of the firm's business contribution to the local economy is £3million. Through discussions with CBC planning and conservation officers, have tried to reach a balance, bearing in mind neighbouring amenity, design, and heritage and planning concerns, with the original proposal withdrawn and revised, and the proposal now comes well within the daylight standards in respect of neighbouring properties, as required by the council. An open evening for neighbours was also held.

Hopes that Members agree a balance has been achieved and can support the proposal, in keeping with NPPF guidance to encourage and support economic growth, the need to reverse the decline in Cheltenham's office space, and CBC's objective to attract and retain high-value employment.

### **Councillor Harman, in objection**

Thanked Planning Committee for allowing him to speak – this is the first time he has done so, which indicates the strength of feeling among residents of Southwood Lane, several of whom are in the public gallery tonight. Could put forward a range of issues which might be very persuasive for Members, but realises he must focus on planning reasons, and believes there are grounds for refusal, if Members choose to do so. The Heritage and Conservation Officer has acknowledged that the height, mass and positioning of the proposed extension will have an 'overbearing and intimidating presence', and that the loss of glimpses of Southwood Lane from Lypiatt Road will be unfortunate. It will have considerable impact on the residents of 15,17 and 19 Southwood Lane and Carrick House. In conclusion, the Heritage and Conservation Officer states that some aspects of the scheme are supported but not the overbearing presence on Southwood Lane of the North East elevation, and that a revised scheme to address this concern with additional landscaping on the Lypiatt Road elevation may be supported. As ward councillor, met with residents on their doorsteps and at two meetings, when the decision to permit was finely balanced. It's clear that this is a special area, and the building is one of Cheltenham's architectural gems. As such, heritage and conservation advice is particularly relevant, and Members have every reason to refuse the proposal if they wish to do so. A walk down Southwood Lane confirms its open perspective, and the canyon-like effect of this proposal, if constructed, may technically be within limits but will change the aspect for residents completely, as well result in a degree of overlooking. There are other issues which could be raised but will stop there.

### **Member debate:**

**PB:** we talk a lot at Council about the need to protect employment land and business and to encourage economic growth; there is currently huge emphasis on this from government and the local authority. Cheltenham is already losing business, because the town can't accommodate growing requirements. This application is made by an important local employer, long-established in the town and looking to grow. Its contribution to the local economy is astronomical, but the firm will have to move from the town if it can't grow – it will have no option. Therefore strongly supports the officer recommendation. It is important that as a planning authority, we support local business. The applicant withdrew the first scheme after consultation with officers. The current proposal is a mix of contemporary and traditional – it is important that an important building such as this works well. Supports the scheme from a design perspective, and from an economic point of view not against it. Realises it will have some impact on Southwood Lane, but this is a wide lane, and there will be no significant loss of light – officers have taken this concern on board when assessing the proposal. Urges Members, if they are concerned about economic growth in the town, to support the application.

**JF:** agrees with PB – it is very important that we keep employment land. The Heritage and Conservation officer has talked about a balancing act – that is what this is – but growth of business, economic growth, and increased employment are all very important to the town.

**JP:** agrees with the previous two speakers, and considers the applicant courageous in wanting to develop this site. It is an important site, but the proposed development sits comfortably and the exterior is pleasing. Has some concerns about the proposed green wall, but PB is right that we need to support companies' proposals such as this, and granting permission tonight will encourage other companies to seek similar permissions.

**MS:** agrees with all that has been said, and welcomes the undercroft parking in particular.

**HM:** on Planning View, a number of Members were concerned about the adjacent brick-built building which will be close to the proposed extension and could suffer from loss of light. Officers have said these are secondary windows and have been no objections from the occupants of the building. Planning Committee should look at all things irrespective of objections or support, and consider planning policies. The original proposal to move the edge of the extension further back from adjacent buildings would result in an increase in height which would be more overbearing for residents. Therefore, reluctantly supports the application.

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

12 in support

2 in objection

1 abstention

**PERMIT/GRANT**

Application Number:	<b>15/01450/FUL</b>
Location:	<b>282 London Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham</b>
Proposal:	<b>Demolition of existing vacant dwelling house. Landscaping works to remove existing trees/hedges, plant new trees and erect new retaining wall. Erection of 2 no. 5 bedroom detached dwelling houses and separate garage block with parking courtyard and private rear gardens.</b>
View:	<b>Yes</b>
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Refuse</b>
Committee Decision:	<b>Refuse, with loss of the hedge added to the reason for refusal</b>
Letters of Rep:	<b>5</b>
Update Report:	<b>Letter from applicant</b>

**EB** told Members that this application relates to 282 London Road, in a prominent location at Six Ways, and proposes demolition of the existing house and the erection of two 3-storey detached dwellings. The recommendation is to refuse, for reasons set out in detail in the report: the proposed dwellings are too tall in relation to the two dwellings next door; the large rooves are inappropriate, and with artificial slate the proposed material; and the size and position of the garage, with gable end to the road, is not considered acceptable.

**Public Speaking:**

**Mr Ian Allerston, Daniel Hurd Associates, agent in support**

Number 282 London Road is currently a run-down house surrounded by large trees. Two previous proposals on this site have been permitted at appeal, where the Inspector stated that the vegetation to the front of 282 London Road makes a positive contribution to the conservation area and screens the site from view, making it less prominent. These new proposals are more traditional than previous ones, with room in the roof for accommodation and a landscape buffer between the street and the houses. The eaves height matches the existing building; the roof height is slightly higher, but okay in context. The trees on the site are approximately 16m high, the proposed dwellings approximately 9.5m - so they will not be visible from the highway. The proposed materials – brick, locally-sourced stone etc – are inspired by Sixways Hall, and can be seen elsewhere in Charlton Kings and throughout the borough; they are robust and familiar, appropriate to the context, and will stand the test of time. Regarding impact, these proposals will make little difference to the area, confirmed by the Trees Officer and the neighbours, who prefer the more traditional approach to what has previously been submitted. Charlton Kings Parish Council has praised the proposal. To sum up, this proposal has more architectural sympathy to the site and context, and no greater impact than those schemes already approved. Urges Members to support it.



**Member debate:**

**MS:** agrees with what the speaker has said. Likes the traditional style. Heritage and Conservation comments are noted, but if the hedges are retained, especially along Ryeworth Road, the proposal will sit quite comfortably in the site. The neighbours are happy with it. Will support the application.

**LS:** agrees with MS. This is a derelict brownfield site, and we should be encouraging sustainable development. The location is shielded from both London and Ryeworth Roads by existing vegetation. There are letters from four neighbours, all in support - is aware that derelict land can sometimes cause problems for local communities.

**SW:** remembers Members being horrified by the original application at this site – and this proposal is not a million miles away from it. Actually quite likes the design overall, although it has problems – doesn't approve of the roofing material but it doesn't make that much difference; doesn't like the end gable of the garage but no-one will be able to see it because of the hedge. Would like to see the hedge on Ryeworth Road retained rather than replaced, but is quite happy otherwise.

**HM:** looked at the appeal decisions on the previous two applications. It has been said that this proposal is a similar height to the previous, but it is in fact greater, and in proximity to No. 284, it will be overbearing and incongruous. It's true that there are other 3-storey houses along London Road, but much further along. The Inspector talked about the high quality of the previous design, but officers do not consider the current proposal to be high quality, and the materials are not what they would expect. The Inspector also asked for the hedges to be retained, but the applicant is proposing removal and replacement with a 'ready hedge'. If the hedge is to be replaced, it should be with semi-mature landscaping of similar species. The hedge on the Ryeworth Road side is loved by local residents, the first piece of real greenery going away from town, and enjoyed by people at Six Ways. Regarding design, cannot understand why the proposal should emulate Six Ways Hall – it wasn't residential when first built, and the two properties cannot be seen at the same time. Will vote against the scheme.

**AM:** if looking at this proposal in isolation, there's a good possibility that he would agree with the officers. But an application has already been approved here; the appeal Inspector didn't agree with the officers or Members. The question now is, do we prefer what we turned down previously but the Inspector liked, or turn down this? With that choice, would have to vote for the current proposal. It's a crude basis on which to consider the scheme, but will support the proposal accordingly.

**PB:** a case of the lesser of two evils? The design is okay, though supports the officers' comments regarding scale and height. This is a very prominent location - possibly the busiest junction in Cheltenham. A major concern is the fantastic hedge on the Ryeworth Road side – it is very impressive, mixed, and habitat to a variety of wildlife. Whatever happens, we must ensure the amenity value of this hedge is protected.

**BF:** this isn't a great design, and as is situated in the conservation area, it should be of the highest architectural standard. The applicant already has two approved schemes, preferable to this. Does this scheme comply with policy thinking? No – it is bland, to put it kindly. Some of the designs considered tonight have been really good, but not this – it isn't suitably high quality, and neither are the materials. Regarding the retention of the hedge, is it part of the approval itself or a condition? There is a difference. Hedges can be cut down or die or be altered. The applicant has an approved scheme, and this new proposal is being submitted purely for commercial gain. Will not vote for this appalling design.

**GB:** agrees with what PB and HM have said – is very concerned about the hedge. It's possible to tell how old a hedge is by the number of plant varieties it contains. This hedge sustains a lot of wildlife, and it would be an abomination if it were to be removed. Agrees with officers regarding the height and the roofing materials – these are not appropriate to the site.

**EB, in response:**

- a note on the landscaping drawing shows the hedge on Ryeworth Road replaced by a 1.8m hedge, and also states that the existing hedge is in poor condition, with no long-term future. There is, however, no evidence to justify this comment;
- it is possible to condition the retention of the existing hedge;
- the height is officers' biggest criticism of the design and the relationship of the proposed dwellings with the houses next door. The difference is substantial: 2m higher at ridge height, with eaves 0.4m higher;
- of the three previous applications, two were approved at appeal, one at committee. They represent three very different architectural approaches: the first bold and most contemporary, but of a relevant height; the second of similar scale and also contemporary, but higher on the far side; the third a safer option, with hipped roofs. All three are of scale and height very similar to the neighbouring properties.

**JP:** has real problems with this. Has looked at the three previous schemes: does not like the first two, but considers the third one better than the scheme being considered today. On the face of it, and in isolation, it seems an interesting design, but what we're getting isn't what we're seeing. The materials are not good quality; the finish is not good quality. It seems the applicant's ambition is just to squeeze as many rooms into the smallest space, compromising the design in the process, the front is actually completely flat. The height is overpowering; the wood cladding at the back of the proposed dwellings is not in keeping with this type of house. If the proposal wasn't in this location, might be able to support it, but in this location, cannot support it.

**HM:** the NPPF tells us to look for solutions not problems; there are already three approved schemes on this site.

**PB:** is annoyed that the hedge has been referred to by the applicant as having no future and no value. It is clear that it has huge significance. Would appreciate officer help with refusal reasons regarding this - so it is clear that the refusal includes concerns over the hedge.

**AC:** thanks to the officers for showing the previous three schemes on the screen. Is also concerned about the hedge, would prefer either of the two previous designs – at least they were different – and considers the garages unspeakable.

**AM:** having now been reminded of the previously approved schemes, considers the current scheme a greater not a lesser evil.

**PT:** the hedge needs a little TLC and gentle work to help it thicken up and make it a more friendly habitat for local wildlife. Is concerned should this application be approved that there is a condition to ensure that the existing hedge is retained.. Is there a similar condition attached to the previous three approvals, depending on which one may end up being used? It would be a great shame if there isn't, and the applicant gets rid of the hedge.

**CH:** tried to resist making any comments about the design, but considers that at least the two previous applications look like two separate properties. These detached dwellings look like two big semi-detached properties split in two. Dislikes this, often done because of the kudos of detached properties, even when they are right up against each other, like these. If the same design was used

for semi-detached houses, at least the proportions would be better. These don't look like detached properties. The previous designs did.

**EB, in response:**

- the approved schemes do not include any reference to the hedge being retained. If Members are minded to refuse the application tonight, the unjustified loss of the hedge could be added as an extra refusal reason.

**PB:** not just the unjustified loss of the hedge, but also the loss of the amenity value of the hedge. Would like to add this if appropriate.

**CL, in response:**

- understood that the officer is suggesting that, if Members want to, they can add an amendment regarding the hedge, but that officers themselves are not proposing to amend the recommendation to include this.

**PB:** formally moves to amend the refusal recommendation to include this

**BF:** seconded.

**JW:** has no issue with the height or design of the proposal, but does have reservations about the hedge. In view of the strong feelings expressed, would vote for permission on the basis that the hedge is retained.

**MS:** Agrees if the proposal is permitted, a condition should be added to ensure that the hedge is retained.

**CL, in response:**

- the officer recommendation is to refuse, with no reference to the hedge. PB has moved to add reference to the loss of the hedge to the refusal reason. Members now need to vote to see if they wish to add this to the refusal reason. If so, loss of the hedge will become part of the substantive refusal reason upon which a vote will then be taken. If that is then lost we will then look for an alternative motion.

**BF:** would remind Members that all conditions are appealable. If the applicant wants the hedge gone, they will appeal to remove the condition.

**Vote on PB's motion to add the loss of the hedge to the substantive refusal reason**

14 in support

0 in objection

1 abstention

**Motion carried**

**Vote on officer recommendation to refuse, with added refusal reason regarding loss of hedge**

11 in support

4 in objection

**REFUSE**

**MJC** introduced the next four application in one presentation – they are basically the same application for four different sites. The proposed work is endorsed by Cheltenham Borough Homes, and the applications are at Planning Committee because Cheltenham Borough Council is the applicant.

**PT:** in view of the parlous state of local government finances, it seems rather expensive to change doors for the sake of it if there is no real need. It's nice to have heritage doors, but if they weren't there originally, why are they needed now?

**GB:** that isn't a planning issue.

**CH:** most of the time, CBH looks to improve buildings in the area. This proposal is nice to see.

**BF:** endorses CH's comments – these doors will look so much better, and CBH try hard to make the town look good – as long as the letter boxes aren't rat-traps!

**GB:** votes on the four applications will be taken one at a time.

Application Number:	<b>15/01377/LBC</b>		
Location:	<b>Flat 1, 38 London Road, Cheltenham</b>		
Proposal:	<b>Replacement of existing internal flat entrance doors (38,40,42, &amp; 46 London Road - Flats 1-3)</b>		
View:	<b>No</b>		
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Grant</b>		
Committee Decision:	<b>Grant</b>		
Letters of Rep:	<b>1</b>	Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

None.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

14 in support

1 abstention

**GRANT**

Application Number:	<b>15/01659/LBC</b>		
Location:	<b>2 Montpellier Spa Road, Cheltenham</b>		
Proposal:	<b>Replacement of existing internal flat entrance doors (2 Montpellier Spa Road Flats 1,2,3 and 4 Montpellier Spa Road Flats 1,2,3)</b>		
View:	<b>No</b>		
Officer Recommendation:	<b>Grant</b>		
Committee Decision:	<b>Grant</b>		
Letters of Rep:	<b>0</b>	Update Report:	<b>None</b>

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

None.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

14 in support

1 abstention

**GRANT**

Application Number: <b>15/01660/LBC</b> Location: <b>Tyndale, Clarence Square, Cheltenham</b> Proposal: <b>Replacement of existing internal flat entrance doors (Flats 2,3,4)</b> View: <b>No</b> Officer Recommendation: <b>Grant</b> Committee Decision: <b>Grant</b> Letters of Rep: <b>0</b> Update Report: <b>None</b>
---

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

None.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

14 in support

1 abstention

**GRANT**

Application Number: <b>15/01662/LBC</b> Location: <b>105 Winchcombe Street, Cheltenham</b> Proposal: <b>Replacement of existing internal flat entrance doors (105 Winchcombe Street Flats B,C,D and 107 Winchcombe Street Flats B,C,D)</b> View: <b>No</b> Officer Recommendation: <b>Grant</b> Committee Decision: <b>Grant</b> Letters of Rep: <b>0</b> Update Report: <b>None</b>
--

**Public Speaking:**

None.

**Member debate:**

None.

**Vote on officer recommendation to permit**

14 in support

1 abstention

**GRANT**

**GB:** as this is EB's last Planning Committee, would like to thank him for his excellent work and dedication to Cheltenham's street scene. He has been an excellent planning officer, always easy to speak to, and Members have benefited from his planning expertise. On behalf of Planning Committee, wishes him good luck.

*The meeting ended at 7.30pm.*