

Planning Committee

Thursday, 14th October, 2021

2.30 - 7.35 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Councillor Garth Barnes (Chair), Councillor Paul Baker (Vice-Chair), Councillor Barbara Clark, Councillor Bernard Fisher, Councillor Paul McCloskey, Councillor Tony Oliver, Councillor John Payne, Councillor Richard Pinegar and Councillor Diggory Seacome
Officers in Attendance:	Gary Spencer (Legal Officer), Andy Robbins (Interim Head of Planning), Michelle Payne (Senior Planning Officer,) Claire Donnelly (Planning Officer), Daniel O'Neill (Planning Officer), Chris Chavasse (Senior Trees Officer) and Michelle Payne (Planning Officer) Ben Warren (Planning Officer), Chris Chavasse (Senior Trees Officer) and Sam Reader (Trees Officer)

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Fifield and Wheeler.

2. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Clark declared an interest in item 5i, being a Trustee of the Cheltenham Trust.

Cllr Clark spoke as a Ward Councillor on item 5g and did not participate in the vote.

3. Declarations of independent site visits

Cllr Baker had visited sites 5a, 5b, 5e, 5f, 5g and 5k.

Cllr Pinegar had visited sites 5a, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, 5g, 5h, 5i and 5k.

Cllr McCloskey had visited sites 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, 5h, 5i and 5k.

Cllr Payne had visited sites 5a, 5b, 5d and 5g.

Cllr Seacome had visited sites 5f and 5h.

Cllrs Oliver and Fisher had visited all sites.

4. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the last meeting held on 16 September 2021 were approved and signed as a true record.

5. Planning/Listed Building/Conservation Area Consent/Advertisement Applications, Applications for Lawful Development Certificate and Tree related applications – see Main Schedule

6. 20/02089/FUL Unit 1, Charlton King Business Park, Cirencester Road, Cheltenham

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application which concerned the erection of a Class E retail store, car parking and servicing areas, access, landscaping and associated works following demolition of existing buildings. The application was at Planning Committee at the request of Councillors Boyes and Councillor Harvey.

The Officer recommendation was to permit subject to conditions and a Section 106 unilateral undertaking.

Speaking against the application, Mr McAlary, owner of Smith and Mann convenience store and CK Post office, explained that this application was the biggest threat that his business had ever faced. He did not believe that there were enough people in the Charlton Kings area to support a discount retailer of this size. He disputed the Lidl and DPDs view that Lidl was a main food shop destination and that his store would retain top up shoppers. The potential loss of local shops and post offices represented a material consideration which falls to be considered separately from the retail impact test under para 22 of the NPPF subsection A. Lidl would be in direct competition with local businesses in an already saturated area and his business could not afford to lose 10% more of trade, if this application was granted planning permission. He urged the committee to take account of the significant number of objections raised by residents, local businesses and the Parish council to this application which would have a devastating impact on local businesses and the community of Charlton Kings.

Glen Stidever, speaking on behalf of Lidl, said the investment in the new store would remediate and regenerate the brownfield site and provide up to 30 jobs. It would be an energy efficient store using the latest sustainable technology and a recent public consultation exercise of 1500 people had attracted 85% support for the proposal. Benefits highlighted by residents included new job opportunities, bringing a derelict site back into economic use, improving the retail offer in Charlton Kings and encouraging residents to shop locally. He believed that the majority of concerns expressed related to supporting and protecting existing local stores. In this respect he referred to the assessment by the council's expert retail adviser who concluded that there was unlikely to be an unacceptable impact on any of these local stores and in fact there was national evidence to suggest that a supermarket would bring a welcome boost to the local economy. He concluded by saying that plans had been adapted to ensure that all relevant policies were satisfied and that the technical consultees had raised no objections to the proposals, subject to the conditions.

In response to Member questions, the following responses were given:

- No explicit additional speed mitigation features were deemed necessary by the highways authority on the Cirencester Road given the relatively short distance and that traffic approached relatively slowly. Speed surveys were not always used as a measure- officers had visited and observed the site and there was a good level of visibility, particularly given the existing uses.
- Existing pedestrian facilities would be relied upon and there existed an opportunity to cross the road before reaching the store
- The delivery management plan contained appropriate levels of control-it was for the operator to ensure the site was protected.
- There were no proposed changes to bus frequency, however work was underway to bring the bus stop back into the public highway which would be of benefit for the development, if supported.
- There were no proposals to install an island for turning in to the site when approaching from the town centre given the size of the site.
- Given this was a modest sized unit with only 2 main deliveries in 24 hours (which may be supplied by smaller vehicles) there was no justification for a condition to limit these. If deliveries were limited to daytime only, there would be a potential conflict of users of the car park.
- With regard to the travel plan, all HGVs exit and enter in forward gear. The plan details the extent of reversing necessary. Given the small number of vehicles and the small distance this was fairly insignificant in the wider scheme
- A detailed external lighting scheme was proposed and had been reviewed by environmental protection team who were now satisfied that there would be no significant harm to neighbouring residential properties. This was a modern lighting solution which did not lead to levels of pollution.

- Sequential development –Lidl had vacated the Grosvenor terrace site and moved into Swindon Road site and the sequential test had been considered carefully at the time. This application was for an additional store.
- In assessing traffic generation, reference was made to the existing lawful use of premises which was light industry. These could be businesses generating quite a lot of local traffic
- Advertising was secured under a different part of the Planning Act so a separate consent would be required for illuminated lighting if the application was successful.
- Planning appeal decisions acknowledged the degree of impact on local businesses and local shopping centres from new retail developments-a small impact was however not sufficient to withhold consent
- The Lead Local Flood Authority had stated that the proposed development on the brownfield site would provide a betterment to the flood risk to the area and the surrounding area.

The Chair moved to the debate and Members made the following comments:

- Receiving 900 representations on an application was unprecedented
- Regretted potential loss in employment land by site use for retail, rather than industrial uses, particular given low level of employment space in the borough
- Recognised small net gain in employment
- Welcomed positive application in terms of sustainability
- Regretted potential 15 % loss in trade for existing local businesses on top of losses already incurred because of Sainsburys
- Unhappy with Highways response and that a pedestrian crossing can be demanded on a small shop but not a larger one, but can't go to appeal on Highways grounds if Highways not in support.
- Referred to policy EM2 on loss of employment land and retail impact
- Previous application on this site was for sheltered accommodation. There were also bidders for industrial units, but retailers would always outbid others financially.
- Retail consultant and Spirax Sarco commented that it would have a detrimental impact on existing local stores
- Need to balance another shopping opportunity against loss of good community businesses
- Agreed no demand for dilapidated units but site could be cleared and new industrial units put on.
- Did not think this site was properly marketed
- Application did have good points, for example, bio diversity, but another retail store was not needed and EM2 was not met.
- Sequential development assessment did not suit as already moved out
- Previous Lidl site in Grosvenor Terrace did not meet Lidl brand of being outside the town centre. Had ample parking but not free and store wasn't visible from High Street. Lidl did not support town centre rule 89 of the NPPF.
- Regarding EM2 – why do we have classes of land if not going to protect them? Why change to retail as were outbid?
- Cheltenham short of employment space and needs industrial places; rather see this remain as a business site than retail.
- In a market economy the highest bidder normally wins – cannot control market forces. Housing will always outbid industrial or retail.
- We can control some things such as the change in the class of the use of land, ie, from Class B to E, but change of use of land was a global problem and guided by NPPF and other considerations.

- Charlton Kings always had a strong sense of community and binding this were the local stores and would not want to see this destroyed.
- A difficult decision as to whether to permit a supermarket on a site which should be industrial land. Decision complicated by unhelpful support from Highways and the retail consultant. No clear direction.
- This would be the second supermarket in this area and it would have a cumulative effect on the local store.
- The local bus from the town centre was an hourly service, so no sustainable public transport for people who needed it most. Should consider the alternative use as employment land.

The Chair was concerned about the lack of valid reasons to put forward for not permitting, as the case would likely go to appeal if not approved.

A member cited EM2 and NPPF 92d as reasons for refusal, but welcomed the opinion of Officers.

The Interim Head of Planning noted that members would like to see something else on this site, with a different new use and to protect existing businesses, but informed members they must determine the application on its merit. He did not think there was sufficient evidence to refuse on retail impact or highways matters. Other matters had been assessed over a long period of time by the Planning Team and he believed the requirement of the policy was met. Clear evidence would be needed that employment opportunities were being harmed if members wished to follow policy of keeping and protecting jobs.

The Senior Planning Officer referred to notes relating to EM2 that 'in the vicinity' related to adjacent businesses and land, or business, land or property in the same estate, and each had to be considered on its own merit and that it did not extend to the wider village. She also stated that the site had been vacant and she had not been aware of other interest and was satisfied that this was a job generating proposal. She did not feel it would have such an impact on other businesses as supported by the retail consultant.

A member quoted that EM2 stated about protecting existing employment land, albeit the site was derelict, and argued that this application was indeed in the same neighbourhood as Smith & Mann and other local shops. He reiterated that the Retail Consultant had stated there would be a detrimental impact to local shops. NPPF 92d was also quoted again as promoting healthy and safer communities and it was pointed out how important this had been over the last year and how much the existing local shops had done towards this. He felt there were reasons to be cautious regarding the impact on the community.

The Chair pointed out to members that the committee had to demonstrate substantive and sufficient reasons to justify refusal if that were to be the case, otherwise it would be very difficult if the application went to appeal. He agreed it was a sensitive issue and that people felt strongly about historical businesses, but he was not convinced he had heard substantial reasons to be able to defend the application and urged members to make the right decision otherwise it could be a costly mistake.

A member concurred that he didn't think they would stand a chance at appeal as the applicant had gone about it in the right way and knew the way the system worked.

The Interim Head of Planning advised members that although EM2 had been put forward as a reason for refusal, they would need to provide evidence of harm and the bar for that at appeal was very high. He didn't feel the degree of harm was high enough versus the benefits of the scheme or that there was sufficient evidence that was quantifiable to win an appeal. If the appeal was lost there could be costs awarded to the Council in going against the recommendation of the Retail Consultant.

In reply to a further question about increased bus frequency and whether this was a material consideration, the Head of Planning suggested this scheme was not of a significant scale to request increased efficiency in public transport.

Regarding grounds for refusal, a member, whilst accepting the content of the Retail report, repeated that policy EM2 talked about the detrimental impact on the continuing operation of existing businesses in the vicinity. He stated the retail study said it would have a detrimental impact, but not the degree of that impact and argued that the impact was subjective as no one knew what degree of impact this would have over the coming years. He continued that reason NPPF 92d was pretty clear.

The Head of Planning further informed members that relying on EM2 alone was dangerous territory and that the Planning Inspector could say it was out of date and non-compliant with NPPF. He explained that the NPPF had been up-dated in July and that the Council's local plan was adopted in 2020 making it now out of date and if this was relied upon it could incur the Council costs.

A member also queried that the Council only got costs awarded against them if the refusal reasons were frivolous. The Legal Officer explained that it was not if they were frivolous but more if the refusal was unreasonable and there had to be evidence on which to base a refusal reason otherwise it was likely to be unreasonable.

A member stated he wanted to support the local retailers and would not be supporting the application but would not be putting forward a refusal reason as he did not want to incur costs to the Council.

The Chair summed up telling members to consider carefully the advice of Highways, the Legal and Planning Officers and the Retail Consultant. He admitted it was a delicate and difficult situation and that often planning decisions were on balance and he felt this was one such case, whereby whatever decision was taken there was a higher authority to take into consideration.

As no formal recommendation for refusal had been put forward, the Chair went to vote on the substantive motion for approval.

FOR : 3

AGAINST : 3

ABSTAIN : 3

After a brief adjournment to take legal advice, it was confirmed that the Chair had the right to and was obliged to use his casting vote.

The Chair retained his vote **FOR**.

APPROVED

7. 21/01270/FUL Oakfield House Stables, Oakfield House, Greenway Lane, Cheltenham

The Planning Officer introduced the report relating to the erection of a new stable block and riding manege on land associated with Oakfield House where two single storey stable buildings were recently demolished. The application was before Committee due to the sites sensitive location within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Previous applications for a residential dwelling had twice been before Committee, refused, and dismissed at appeal.

There were no speakers.

A member queried Highways' recommendation that the entrance right of way should be tarmacked and questioned this as it was a private road and within AONB which does not lend itself to tarmacking. The Officer replied that it related just to the section up to the gates, that the amount of tarmacking had been reduced considerably and that tarmacking was needed due to the type of vehicle that would be using it and for easier maintenance and cleaning due its usage within a horse stable environment.

In reply to questions on the colour of various facilities, the Officers replied that:

- The roof would be black, with an alternative of dark green.
- The nature of the surface of the manege was a dark black colour
- The tarmac area of the car park would be the normal black grey tarmac, but there was willingness to accept a buff colour.

The Chair moved to debate and the following comments were made:

- Think title of house wrong as there are no stables there
- As it is located within an AONB, a new development has to enhance the area and members did not think this did
- It altered the contour of the land
- Query over size of proposed stable - to be large enough for horse welfare
- Inappropriate development in area of AONB
- Proposal to refuse on grounds of SD7
- If a commercial undertaking, what provisions were in place for the disposal of manure
- Would generate more traffic
- Allowing permitted development in an area of AONB which would not enhance it.
- Applicants enhanced area by removing the dilapidated outbuildings; would be wrong now to allow this proposal that does not enhance it further
- All that is going to be seen are buildings and a black manege, together with the stable block, will look like a blot on the landscape; cannot support
- Queries as to whether this could be subject to a change of use later. This could be the case but it would need another application.

There being no further comments the Chair moved to vote on the Officer's recommendation to permit.

FOR : 0
AGAINST : 8
ABSTAIN : 1

REFUSED

The Chair moved to vote on the proposal to refuse on grounds of SD7 and NPPF 172

The Officer suggested that the same refusal reason as before as set out in the report at paragraph 6.14 could be used and he read this out. He asked for members' consideration on the public right of way which was agreed. Members were happy to use this as the reason for refusal.

Upon a vote to refuse, it was:

FOR : 9
AGAINST : 0
ABSTAIN : 0

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY for refusal.

8. 21/01464/LBC Hampton House, Shurdington Road, Cheltenham, GL53 0NH

This item was deferred with agreement of the Applicant due to Officer absence.

9. 21/01475/FUL 2 Morlands Drive, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham GL53 8LP

The Planning Officer introduced the report relating to extensions, alterations and remodelling works to form a new two storey dwelling to a detached bungalow on Morlands Drive. The matter was before committee due to the level of concern from local residents. Revised plans had been submitted following recommendations from the Officer.

There were no speakers and no Member questions to the Officer.

A member praised the work of the Officer in negotiating revised proposals from the first plan consisting of a flat roof, to what was now before committee. He continued that although the application would have come to committee as the Parish Council had objected, that he had called it in due to vagaries in possible timings.

Another member noted that it would be colour through rendered and commented that although rendering was better for insulation, colour was coming through the rendering in some buildings in the town and was unsightly and although he could not object remarked that everything was being rendered currently.

There being no further comments, the Chair moved to vote on the Officer's recommendation to permit.

FOR : 9

AGAINST : 0

ABSTAIN : 0

PERMITTED unanimously

10. 21/01591/FUL 52 Fairfield Parade, Cheltenham GL53 7PJ

The Planning Officer introduced the report relating to single storey and first floor rear extensions and a rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion to a two storey semi detached dwelling in Fairfield Parade. The plans had been revised throughout the course of the application and the application was before committee at the request of the ward councillor.

Mr Jonathon Bardgett spoke in objection to the application.

The Chair informed members that Cllr Maughfling was due to attend committee to speak in support of the objection posed by Mr Bardgett, but was unable to due to a positive Covid test. Cllr Maughfling had though issued a statement, which the Chair hoped all members had read. Members confirmed they had.

In reply to a member question, the speaker confirmed he lived at No.50 Fairfield Parade.

A member raised the question of when site visits would return as he felt this would have been most helpful in this application. The Chair confirmed that this was in discussion and hoped it would be soon. He agreed it was difficult to see some of these sites from a street view and that proper view from back gardens was beneficial.

A member questioned whether site visits would be reinstated soon enough to justify deferring the item until such a visit could take place. The Head of Planning confirmed that the resumption of site visits was being looked at in consultation with Council's Health and Safety Officer, but was unable to say exactly when they would restart and urged members to make a decision if possible.

Members queried if the light test was passed or not and requested another look at the photo of the neighbours looking in and clarification on the 45 degree light test. Is it guidance not necessarily mandatory and if it fails then no.

In reply to Member questions on the light test, the Officer explained the light test procedure and that if more than 50% light was cut off from plan and elevation then this would be considered as an unacceptable loss of light and would be used as a refusal reason. She continued that the light test was done on the initial scheme and had failed, so the applicant revised the plans and reduced the height and that subsequently passed the light test.

A member requested guidance on semi-detached houses and the maintenance of symmetry. The Officer explained that the extension was to the rear so would not detrimentally impact on the street scene and public realm.

The Chair moved to debate. One member had visited the site and had accessed the rear of the property with the neighbour's consent and agreed that it was very difficult to assess without seeing properly. He felt that if the application would not be out of time that it be deferred to the next meeting to allow other members to visit the site and if site visits were not reinstated before the next meeting that the neighbour would be happy to let members see the site from his rear garden.

The Head of Planning stated that the period for determination had already expired on this application and an extension of time had already been sought to take to this Committee, so another extension of time would be needed if it was deferred to the next Committee. He explained that there could be an appeal against non-determination, but if members felt they needed to see the site then it was justified in deferring it but was a risk against non-determination. The speaker confirmed he was happy to accommodate members to visit his house and this would be organised via the Democratic Services team and the speaker.

Members were happy to travel independently to site visits.

The Chair moved to vote on the proposal to defer to the next meeting to be able to facility a site visit.

FOR : 8

AGAINST : 1

ABSTAIN : 0

APPROVED for deferral

11. 21/01776/FUL British Telecom, Oriel Road, Cheltenham GL50 1BA

The Planning Officer introduced the report relating to metal railings being installed at the site topping the existing brick wall.

Mr Radcliffe spoke in objection to the application and stated that although the application was not for railings on Wollsey Terrace he believed that the permission did not meet the NP12 and NPPF requirements and that a CLPUT had been submitted for this. He stated that the railings made the building into a prison like structure. There has been no anti-social behaviour reported in the last 5 years at the site and this raised a question as to whether it was a serious problem as the BT employees only accessed the site during the working day. He stated that he believed that the proposal was contrary to the heritage policy in the Cheltenham Borough Council Local Plan.

Cllr McCloskey made a point of order and asked the Planning Officer if the other application that the applicant had put in would be brought to Committee again and was told that it was not the case, however that appeared to have now changed. The Planning Officer explained that the application had to meet certain requirements of the GPDO and the new application might not cover that. The Interim Head of Planning explained that applicants' agents often

made an application to see if a certificate would be granted rather than go to full committee. Members were reminded that they could only vote on the application in front of them, not one that may or may not come before the committee.

In response to Member questions the Planning Officer stated that BT had been made aware that the application was going to committee on that day and that he understood that they hadn't made any communication with the residents and although the railings were not completely traditional they were in keeping.

The Chair took the opportunity to speak and stated that BT had showed no community spirit or consideration and had no inclination to do so. Whereas there was no requirement to do this it was a big issue and big establishments had responsibility to neighbours and communication would be appreciated by both the neighbours and the committee.

During the debate Members questioned the need for the railings at all and questioned the access onto Wollsey Terrace, which was in the curtilage of the building. Other Members believed that the railings would not detract from the area.

The Chair moved to vote on the Officer's recommendation to permit:

For: 6

Against: 3

Abstain: 0

GRANTED

12. 21/01815/FUL Lidl Foodstore, Grosvenor Terrace, Cheltenham GL52 2SA

The Planning Officer who wrote the report was unable to attend the meeting and the report was presented by another Planning Officer on their behalf.

There were 2 speakers on the application.

Tay Attwell who spoke in objection stated that the proposed opening hours for the site were for 12-14 hour a day, 7 days a week and 365 days a year and that would have a negative effect on the amenity for local residents. There was also concern that there would be an increase of traffic in the town centre and in a conservation area and there would be a 40 foot shipping container on the site which would be visible from the surrounding properties and that should not be permitted in a conservation area. There was also a concern that once the property was granted as a B8 class, the site could become a distribution centre and that would be detrimental to the vitality of the area. She stated that the proposed opening hours were vastly different to other places providing the same service which were mostly 9-5 or 8-6 Monday to Saturday and either closed on a Sunday or open 10-4.

Councillor Clark also spoke in objection as the Ward Councillor. There was reiteration that no other storage facility in the area was open for such long hours. There was concern raised that due to the proximity to the High Street small shops would use the facility as a stock room and therefore the facility would be in constant use. The application stated that the facility would be used by up to 60% by local residents. There had been an approach by a developer to pull the site down and build apartments which she believed would be more in keeping with the area. There was concern that she had been told that there were no objections to the opening hours when Lidl applied for an extension knowing that they were moving, this was not the case. Councillor Clark then left the Chamber as she could not take part in the debate or the vote.

In response to Member questions the Interim Head of Planning confirmed that it was possible to restrict within B8 but wording would be key. The units could be divided as that was classed as internal works. There was no knowledge on how big each unit would be. There could be different opening hours as a restriction but consideration would have to be

given to the previous use of the site. There could be a condition to stop the proposed office looking like a shipping container but it would be better to have amended plans from the applicant.

During the debate there were Members who expressed the opinion that it would be better to go for deferral and some Members who wanted to go for refusal and cited there was not enough parking for such a facility. There was also the belief that something better could be done with the site.

There was the proposal to defer for reasons of a separate office and different opening hours with the suggestion of 8-6 Monday- Saturday and 10-4 on Sundays.

The Chair moved to vote for deferral:

FOR: 6

AGAINST: 2

ABSTAIN : 0

DEFERRED

13. 21/01856/FUL Imperial Gardens, Promenade, Cheltenham

The Planning Officer who wrote the report was unable to attend the meeting and the report was presented by another Planning Officer on their behalf.

The Planning Officer presented the report relating to the erection of temporary structures including an ice rink in the south west quadrant of Imperial Gardens for a maximum of 75 days, including rig and de-rig, between November 2021 and January 2022. The application was before Committee as the Council own Imperial Gardens.

Belinda Hunt, representing the BID, spoke in support of the application stating that an ice rink, together with the Christmas market and the enhanced Christmas lights, would be an additional attraction to aid the town's post Covid recovery. A good Christmas offering would put Cheltenham on a par with larger nearby cities and would be better than some more local towns. She stated the location in Imperial Gardens linked the various areas of the town together, was accessible to all without drawing people away from the main retail zones and was close to the coach central drop off in Royal Well. It would attract more local people and visitors, thus increasing the footfall to Cheltenham and benefiting the local economy. The Queens Hotel and other nearby businesses were fully supportive of the ice rink.

Councillor Horwood was invited to speak on behalf of Cllr Atherstone who wished to speak as Cabinet Member for Culture, Wellbeing and Business. Cllr Horwood stated that this was the third attempt to get an ice rink to Cheltenham and that the Committee had approved the last two applications. The location was slightly different as previously it was proposed to be where the now newly erected Orangery was sited. He reiterated the significant economic benefit it would bring to the town alongside the Christmas Market and lights. Ice rinks were very popular, especially with children and families would come into town increasing the footfall. He stated that out of 122 letters sent out only 5 objections had been received with concern about noise from generators needed to keep the ice frozen and noise from music. He stated there would be careful monitoring of these noise levels and echo barriers to absorb noise. He said the risks were manageable and the ice rink had the support of the Cheltenham Trust, the BID, local hospitality and the Civic Society Forum and would bring added joy to Cheltenham at Christmas.

A member asked about that state of the gardens afterwards – would there be boarding to help protect the grass? He also enquired about provision of changing rooms and lockers, additional portaloos and the cost of a skate. In reply the Officer stated that the event was subject to a land use agreement in which a condition was to leave the area as was. The

Green Space team would also have responsibility for overseeing the area. The Officer was unable to answer the other questions, but it was not felt these were pertinent to the decision.

During the debate a member expressed his delight that Cheltenham would rival big cities such as Cardiff and Birmingham and was supportive of the application.

A member raised further concerns about noise and cited recent complaints received from residents when the big screen was in Imperial Gardens. He also felt diesel fumes from the generators did not go towards a carbon neutral environment. Although the idea was good and he supported the increase in footfall it would bring, he felt it was in the wrong location and that residents in Imperial and Montpellier Gardens constantly had to put up with noise and rubbish. On a positive point, it was noted that a telephone number would be handed out to residents to ring if affected by the noise.

The Chair, although he understood the concerns of the ward councillor, felt that there were sufficient measures in place to mitigate against some of the problems.

The Chair moved to vote on the Officer's recommendation to permit.

FOR : 8
AGAINST : 0
ABSTAIN : 0

GRANTED unanimously

14. 21/01874 Pittville Pump Rooms, East Approach Drive, Cheltenham GL52 3JE

The Planning Officer introduced the report relating to the removal of defective insulation and roof covering on the balcony, timber repairs, repointing of stone steps and addition of rodding point to downpipe on the Grade II listed building of Pittville Pump Room in Pittville Gardens. The matter was at Committee as it is a Council owned building.

There being no questions or comments from Members, the Chair moved to vote on the Officer recommendation to grant.

FOR : 8
AGAINST : 0
ABSTAIN : 0

GRANTED unanimously

15. 21/01940/LBC Belmont Lodge, Belmont Road, Cheltenham, GL52 2NJ

The Planning Officer introduced the report relating to the replacement of single glazed aluminium window to the front elevation of Belmont Lodge in Belmont Road. The matter was before Committee as the property is owned by Cheltenham Borough Council.

There being no questions or comments from Members, the Chair moved to vote on the Officer recommendation to grant.

FOR : 8
AGAINST : 0
ABSTAIN : 0

GRANTED unanimously

16. 21/02201/CONF 16 Thompson Drive, Cheltenham GL53 0PL

The Trees Officer presented the report relating to confirmation of TPO 781 on a copper beech tree at 16 Thompson Drive. An objection had been received from the adjacent neighbour at 14 Thompson Drive due to the stress caused as a result of the nuisance caused to the property. However it was considered that all visual and ecological benefits associated with this old tree outweighed the nuisance caused to the objector.

There being no questions or comments from Members, the Chair moved to vote on the Officer recommendation to confirm TPO 781.

FOR : 8
AGAINST : 0
ABSTAIN : 0

CONFIRMED unanimously

17. Appeal Updates

Noted

18. Any other items the Chairman determines urgent and requires a decision

None

Chairman