

APPLICATION NO: 22/01373/FUL	OFFICER: Mrs Lucy White
DATE REGISTERED: 30th August 2022	DATE OF EXPIRY : 25th October 2022
WARD: Lansdown	PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Lucky Onion Group
LOCATION:	129 - 133 Promenade Cheltenham Gloucestershire
PROPOSAL:	Retention of existing temporary marquees at 125, 127, 129, 131 and 133 Promenade, Cheltenham for a further two year period

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	10
Number of objections	10
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

Flat 3 Burston House Pittville
Circus
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2PU

Comments: 31st August 2022

I walked past these buildings last week for the first time in six months, with visitors from Oxford. Like me, they were not impressed that such beautifully restored and repurposed houses could be obscured and disfigured by so many and such ugly tents. I appreciate that retaining them will bring in more money but at lunch time last week there were very few people actually dining - or even drinking. Talking about protecting their heritage by keeping these beyond the pandemic is disingenuous. Maybe a compromise should be made - a covered area at the side of 129 where there is more space. We already have to deal with large and unsympathetic so-called temporary structures at Pittville Pump Room and the Town Hall which compromise their surroundings. If these are approved, and this application as well, why bother having heritage listings at all?

Flat 4
40 Evesham Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2AH

Comments: 31st August 2022

The Promenade is arguably the Regency face of Cheltenham. Currently, 129-133 give it the appearance of a Bedouin camp site, spoiling the entire ambience of this iconic Regency parade. By removing the overall character I believe that the town in general suffers. It was absolutely fair that these TEMPORARY structures had their place during the difficult period but they are no longer warranted. We are heading towards winter during a time when large amounts of energy will be used to heat these highly inefficient structures. A 2 year extension will just become a lifetime extension which is no doubt the plan, get us used to it? It certainly is not in the interest of Cheltenham as a whole.

32 Imperial Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1QZ

Comments: 5th September 2022

I object very strongly to this planning application. Imperial Square is a beautiful regency square which is totally ruined by the plastic marquees outside 131. This is supposed to be a conservation and heritage area, and whilst understanding the problems caused to businesses during Covid, this is no longer causing the necessity to eat outside as opposed to in the hotel. Once the trees lose their leaves in autumn the marquees will again stick out like a sore thumb. Please do not grant them permission to keep their "temporary" extensions

17 The Pavilions
Sandford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7AR

Comments: 3rd October 2022

The temporary structures around these Grade 2 listed buildings may well have been necessary during the Covid epidemic, however it is surely time to return to some degree of normality.

These Grade 2 listed buildings form an elegant and attractive frontage to the promenade and it would be a mistake to continue to allow them to be concealed in canvas. The existing planning permission has expired and they should be ordered to take them down without further delay.

Worcester House
Pittville Circus Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2QA

Comments: 18th September 2022

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area, As stated in the proposers application. The tented village look to the fronts and side of the development are to the detriment of the core of the Montpelier conservation zone. They obscure the frontages or 3 grade 2star listed buildings, especially from the pavement on that side of the promenade, where they obscure the view of the entire terrace of listed townhouses further down the promenade. They are opposite imperial gardens, where the railings are being replaced to enhance the heritage of the area as a core part of heritage of the town. From here, the sides of the tents, with wooden fire doors - all removed for the proposers photographs, usually totally obscure the lower levels of the listed buildings, and the sides to the tents obscure or detract from the railing detail specifically mentioned in the listing.

Section 16 of the NPPF focuses on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Conservation (for heritage policy is defined in the Glossary (Annex 2) as: "The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance." - this refers not to its economic significance, but to its significance within the built environment, and this development can only diminish this, and in no way enhances it.

With regard to the comments by the proposer that the tents have allowed the business to continue at a lower level than pre civil 19 is clearly fatuous. The outside area has added almost 400 covers, far more than the original indoor dining area and bar, and are clearly more full than these areas would be, even at capacity. The addition of these tents have allowed the original indoor restaurant to be reimaged as a totally separate Japanese restaurant, with separate theme and menu, as has the rum bar to the original gin bar - both therefore represent an extension of the business into the outside space, not a necessary alternative. The argument that the tents are needed to shade customers from the sun in the summer is untrue - the venue managed perfectly well previously with outside tables shaded by much more appropriate parasols.

We're this proposal to be approved, it should be for this winter only, in its current form as per the photographs without sides, and should be removed in the summer, when the venue can revert to the tables shaded by parasols that it used in all the years prior to covid restrictions

36D The Broad Walk
Imperial Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1QG

Comments: 31st August 2022

I object to the Lucky Onion Group's application for the following reasons.

This proposal fails to comply with any of the current planning policies and legislation specifically designed to protect Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. These marquees only exist because of Covid 19 first and second wave lockdowns. They are no longer required.

Historic England's publication 'Temporary Structures in Historic Places' points out that "Very short term, genuinely temporary and wholly reversible changes are unlikely to have an unacceptable impact on setting. Longer term or recurrent changes, even if notionally temporary, may have a more serious impact."

The key piece of heritage legislation is the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 which requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and their setting. It also requires special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. These 13 marquees completely mask the frontages of three Grade II* listed Regency villas and do absolutely nothing to preserve or enhance the Montpellier Character Area, quite the opposite, they create significant harm.

This application ignores, or has no knowledge of, the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. It does not consider or acknowledge the owners responsibility for these Heritage assets or their setting and only recognises their commercial value.

This is not a temporary shelter outside a pub or half a dozen tables outside a brasserie, this is a long row of 13 Marquees obscuring three Grade II* listed Regency villas creating almost 500 square metres of additional floor space. I believe this is a blatant attempt to permanently expand their operation off the back of the Covid 19 special measures and is therefore exploitive and opportunistic. This is inappropriate and damaging to the Heritage and Conservation of the area.

6 Imperial House
Lypiatt Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2QJ

Comments: 5th September 2022

I am objecting to this application as they are beautiful Georgian buildings and these eyesores are ruining the look of the buildings also you can see them from a distance. They are far too big and look like a circus.

1 Promenade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1LN

Comments: 5th September 2022

We object to this planning application. The need for this business to have marquees outside of their premises has now passed. Whilst it was necessary to have some outdoor eating spaces during the Covid-19 pandemic this is not the case anymore. It looks as though the owners of this business have experienced an increase in income because of the increase in the number of people they can serve and now they want to maintain this level of income. Unfortunately it comes at a cost to the natural beauty of the area. The marquees cover up the Regency style buildings which is such a shame.

I may support a smaller area of marquees but just not as they have proposed in their application. It is just not acceptable for all these buildings to be covered up.

1 Claremont Lodge
Montpellier Spa Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1UG

Comments: 13th September 2022

The existing temporary marquees on Cheltenham's signature thoroughfare are an eyesore and spoil the vista of the three listed buildings in a conservation area. One questions the whole point of listing a building if it can't be seen. In addition, the existing marquees provide almost 500 square metres of hospitality space increasing greatly the noise and general disturbance in that part of town. The Promenade and Montpellier are already well served by restaurants, bars and cafes and there is no need to provide more through the erection of what are temporary structures.

32 Imperial Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1QZ

Comments: 5th September 2022

I object to the Application.

The existing temporary marquees were allowed because of the Covid pandemic. Even then they were only permitted on a 'temporary' basis.

The marquees obscure Grade 2 listed Regency buildings which face Imperial Gardens and The Promenade. There is no point of paying lip-service to protecting this high profile conservation area if the 'temporary' marquees are allowed to remain.

No extension should be allowed.

