

APPLICATION NO: 21/01696/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Lucy White
DATE REGISTERED: 4th August 2021		DATE OF EXPIRY : 29th September 2021
WARD: Pittville		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Uliving@Gloucestershire Ltd	
LOCATION:	Pittville Student Village Albert Road Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Temporary dual use of up to 205 bedrooms for either student accommodation (C1) or serviced apartment accommodation (Class C1) for an 18 month period commencing June 2023.	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	17
Number of objections	17
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

15 Albert Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JH

Comments: 11th August 2021

When the Pittville Campus was expanded only a few years ago, no parking space was provided for the students, and students were prevented from bringing cars to the site. Should the application by the University be granted for up to 205 apartments to be let to non students, this is likely to give rise to a major parking problem in the area. It is inevitable that many, or all, will have at least one car and need to park these somewhere. There will be no parking spaces available on the Campus site. So where will they go other than littering local roads? This is an attractive part of Cheltenham and should not be allowed to become an eyesore.

If the Campus is unable to provide this necessary parking space, the application should be refused.

10 Albert Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JH

Comments: 27th April 2023

I stand by previous objection which you have on record. Thank you.

Comments: 18th August 2021

I feel this application is not appropriate and should be rejected on the following basis:

1. The government is encouraging the economy to return to normal and looking for institutions like Universities to support young students who have suffered during Covid through returning to normal teaching and normal education facilities and services. In line with the government direction, Gloucestershire University should use their energy and creativity to developing student numbers and the student experience back to pre COVID levels. They should not dilute their efforts by looking for short term rental profit opportunities that are outside the planning conditions they have already agreed to and the purpose of the institution.
2. The accommodation is clearly unsuitable to non student use. For example there is minimal parking available which makes it unsuitable for non student letting.
3. There is a safety, security and wellbeing risk if short term rental tenants are introduced on short term letting conditions into the student community. Parents and students chose the campus environment as a safe space to help young people transition to independent living. This "safe environment" would be undermined if the campus becomes a hub for short term adult lettings.
4. The application does not provide any firm commitments as to who will, and will, not be allowed access if this proposal would be approved. The proposal is a vague list of some potential customers with no restrictions to ensure student safety, nor additional vetting to ensure the short term tenants are computable with the existing student community and the feel / culture that a campus represents.

Five Oaks
81A New Barn Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3LF

Comments: 23rd August 2021

We hereby register our objection to this planning application:

This decision is currently under officer delegated powers, to be decided undemocratically by planning officers without due debate by the planning committee.

The council website shows that there are only 39 consultees which appears to us that wider scrutiny is being avoided.

A delegated decision is wrong, immoral and legally questionable, especially as the original planning for the student village was so controversial. It also demonstrates that the council appear to be attempting to avoid wider scrutiny.

This proposal should be at the very least subject to proper debate and decided by the very persons democratically elected to represent the local community in a council planning committee meeting.

The existing operation has proved incapable of fully controlling noise and disturbances from the site. As nearby residents, we look forward to the undisturbed nights during the summer, when the site is unoccupied. Any temporary change of planning to dual use of up to 25% of the available rooms will have increased noise/disturbance/parking issue implications which local residents should not have to suffer from as well.

The application fails to demonstrate a local requirement for the proposal, only a need based on lack of investment return by U-living. The main reason for this change put forward are the Corona virus pandemic restrictions which is a situation that we no longer have.

Loss of income due to the Pandemic has been global!

Local well established smaller accommodation providers also have all suffered from the impact of the pandemic and may be already struggling. This proposal will have a detrimental impact on the existing local businesses.

The question needs to be asked and answers be made public to what occupancy rates have there been historically? As this might give significant evidence of the true, underlying reason behind this planning application.

The student village was planned and built solely for students, with NO parking facilities!

This proposal will benefit greatly a large national business to the detriment of the established local businesses of Cheltenham.

The clearly insufficient onsite parking availability for this proposal should be reason enough for it's refusal! It is difficult to believe that up to 205 "non-student" guests will be expected to comply to not bringing their car. It is ridiculous to expect anybody to believe that this proposal will work.

We see no reason why this change should be allowed as it fails to demonstrate a local need for increased serviced accommodation AND it will NOT help students nor the local community.

This proposal will benefit greatly a large national business to the detriment of the established local businesses of Cheltenham.

U-living have the power to increase student occupancy by being more flexible with rental costs and other means!

A reason for not full occupancy of the 792 rooms available for students must be linked with the high cost of rent per week for University students (minimum £141 to £202 per week); surely more students could be attracted by lowering rates of rent, considering the accommodation is detached by considerable distance from the main University buildings.

Instead of trying to change the planning permission, wouldn't it make more sense to attract more university students by other means? Especially as the University is on track for a larger intake of students for the coming year 2021/2022!

If the Council accepts a change of planning in favour of U-living, the local accommodation economy will suffer! It will reduce the income of local smaller established accommodation businesses with the potential impact of many having to stop trading. . A precedent should NOT be set by allowing this planning request. The original acceptance of building the student village was under the condition that it be for "SOLE" use of student accommodation. There should be NO flexibility from it's original purpose, especially by trying to diversify the use whilst NOT having the infrastructure needed for it!

Now that Covid restrictions have been lifted, there is no reason to relax planning constrictions!

We object outright to this planning proposal and at the very least, we would expect this proposal to be debated at planning Committee, given the due regard it deserves for the sake of the people and businesses of Cheltenham, please

Comments: 25th August 2021

Further to our initial objection we wish to add the following comments

The applicant appears to be taking the stated local plan policy out of context. Policy HM1 clearly refers to STUDENT ACCOMMODATION and not NON-STUDENT ACCOMMODATION or mixed use.

The object of providing student accommodation is just that, for use by students!

Ref. HM1, Uliving were fully aware at every stage, of the fact that the accommodation would not be utilised during the summer holidays when they proposed, designed, and built the Student Accommodation.

HM1 is a document which relates to future Student accommodation developments only, it has been written at a time after the student village was constructed and section C relates to long term sustainability and adaptability, NOT change of use after just 4 years of sole student rentals!

Considering the huge number of objections before the original application was granted to refurbish 214 rooms and build 577 new student bedrooms, the restriction (condition 29 of 14/01928/FUL) was put in for good reason, namely that the council could control of its use, presumably in order to protect the amenity of neighbours and of the surrounding area for the future. And to ensure that the accommodations were solely available for students.

87 New Barn Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3LF

Comments: 27th August 2021

Letter attached.

85 New Barn Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3LF

Comments: 27th August 2021

Letter attached.

73 New Barn Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3LB

Comments: 28th April 2023

I'm generally not supportive of the application for the same reasons as have been stated by others here and previously. I would add, however, that, in the (surely unlikely?) event that the planning committee is minded now to allow this change of use, there does seem to be a clear need for a healthy dose of quid pro quo - see below.

When the student "village" was opened a few years back, the assumption made by the applicants had been that the site would attract close to 800 occupants. Now we are told that they have not been getting anywhere near that; either the developers/operators appear to have got their sums wrong or they didn't give proper weight to all the possible threats to their assumptions. They now expect the Borough and local residents to support a change of use to allow them to restore their revenue stream and to ignore the additional stresses on local infrastructure once more. This proposal is, therefore, simply asking the community to put up with more in order to bail out the developers/operators who are again offering nothing in return. This seems plain wrong.

In the few years since it opened (after the student accommodation opened), the Starvehall Farm development, on the South side of New Barn Lane, has brought a large increase in volumes of pedestrians and traffic using New Barn Lane. The proposed development of the Pitville School playing field will add still more. The student accommodation up for "change of use" is also on the South side of New Barn Lane and there is talk of even more residents' cars being allowed to park on the student site at times, although "discouraged", whatever that means. The nearest local shop, Park Stores, is well used but is on the North side. Thus, all the increased numbers of pedestrians using the shop, will come from the opposite side of the now much busier road and have to re-cross it to return. Despite there being a 30MPH speed limit in New Barn Lane, this is regularly ignored by the increased number of drivers on the road,

especially those heading East, accelerating from the Albert Road junction, between 15.30 and 18.30 weekdays, a favourite time for users of the shop! Crossing the road has become an increasingly and unacceptably hazardous occupation for new and existing (often elderly) residents and, importantly, should be addressed as part of this proposal.

If the community (Borough and local residents) are to derive any comfort at all, should this application be unfortunately approved, it would seem reasonable to require the developers - who wish to add yet more pedestrians and cars to the area - to contribute to the costs of installing a proper pedestrian crossing near the shop or, at the very least, the installation of one or two illuminating radar speed displays where 30MPH shows in green and higher speeds in amber or red to remind drivers of the speed limit.

Notwithstanding the surprising comments by the GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer back in October 2021s, I would ask that the planners review with some urgency and independence the road safety speeding and pedestrian crossing hazards, extant and future, opposite Park Stores on New Barn Lane. I particularly request that, as part of this proposal, the planners, should they choose to ignore local resident' views again and allow this change, impose a reserved Section 106 agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to require the developers to pay back to the community instead of simply taking and asking for more. The applicants should be required, at the very least, to fund suitable measures as outlined above should they be indicated after said road safety review.

26 Elm Court
Hillcourt Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JU

Comments: 2nd May 2023

This proposal was not in the original plans. The building was proposed and should always be used as intended and that is for student accommodation. There will be a safety concern for students and neighbours alike. Doing this will drive away more students as they will have to mix with non students on site which isn't part of university living. Parking spaces between 6pm and 8am only, for 205 serviced apartments is ridiculous. People will be parking on neighbouring roads outside of these times

17 Elm Court
Hillcourt Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JU

Comments: 25th April 2023

I'm not happy with the way the previous objections were all dismissed.

PARKING: I'm sorry but 75 parking spaces between 6pm and 8am only, for 205 serviced apartments is ridiculous. Of course that's going to spill over into the neighbouring roads - IT ALREADY DOES with the students currently living there.

NOISE: so there is no objection on the grounds of noise as Environmental Health have had only one complaint. Come on - do your due diligence! I think you'll find the the Security on site have had hundreds of complaints about noise! To be fair to them, they have always handled them very well, but who complains to Environmental Health??? We go straight to site Security.

DRUG-DEALING: we have noticed regular drug-dealing going on in around these side-streets since the students started living here. Nothing that we're been able to report to the police though, as they keep irregular times, and are gone quickly, but we all see it happening.

WHO WILL LIVE THERE: the planning permission is deliberately vague on this subject, saying it's "student-related" but then saying contractors, "young-professionals" and so on. So basically, anyone they want to! Will there be any control over this, once permission is granted? I doubt it. Who next? Gold-cup race-goers? Stag-night parties? I would need assurance that only certain groups of people could live there, e.g, academic staff, visiting students, and so on. As it is, it is open to anybody and everybody, I presume whoever is willing to pay?

TEMPORARY USE: well, we all know this will end up getting extended. Particularly if you base your noise-nuisance data on how many complaints get to Environmental Health!! This seems like a classic case of getting in there with one type of planning approval, and then gradually changing it over the years until it becomes something else entirely, that would never have got approval at the start.

It seems to me that the rooms are too expensive for students, and there are many reports of mould in the rooms, hot water not working, and never getting fixed. Maybe there are reasons for the low uptake of students? No doubt U-Living can make more money out of non-students, but that was NOT what they were given planning permission to build.

5 Elm Court
Hillcourt Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JU

Comments: 26th August 2021

We wish to object this application on the following grounds:

- 1.The government is encouraging the economy to return to normal, institutions like Gloucester University should be encouraging the students to return to the village.
- 2.To turn 205 rooms to short term rental will have a negative impact to the residents of the area as the application does not provide any firm commitments as to who will and will not be allowed access. It will be turning a Students Village into a 205 rooms airbnb.
- 3.There is a safety, security and wellbeing at risk for the students and for the local residents alike.

10 Elm Court
Hillcourt Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JU

Comments: 2nd May 2023

May 1st. 2023

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds.

Traffic.

The GCC Highway Authority and Environmental Health consultee submissions are dated October 2021.

Since the completion of residential developments in New Barn Lane and the estates around Bishops Cleeve, Gotherington, and beyond, traffic around the application site has increased considerably, particularly at daily peak times and the attendance of students at Pittville School.

It is presently obvious to those who live around the application site, and those using the surrounding routes, that traffic is now more intense than it used to be.

Occupancies.

At 6.10 in the officer report, the anticipated occupancies include conference delegates, young professionals, and other short-term contractors. Race goers are not mentioned but it would be wrong not to expect them to want to use the facility as well.

At 6.11 the officer report proposes to discourage any attendees bringing cars to Cheltenham. While this might be possible with HE employees, it is futile to think that other attendees would NOT bring cars here, if they're racing, or shopping, but especially

if they are coming to work for even a minimal period or for the proposed maximum 90 day stay.

Public transport.

At 6.12 in the officer report there is reference of a Deed of Variation being drafted to the original S106 Agreement.

The original S106 included the provision of a shuttle bus, but this has not been provided for the past two years or so when Stagecoach revised their service to run between Prestbury and the Park Campus and return.

The only shuttle bus being provided is for students only through the night.

Does the DoV remove the obligation on GCC and CBC to provide a shuttle bus at any time?

This is important as the campus is presently not at full capacity.

The Prestbury N service often arrives at Pittville full of passengers leaving little space for students and with anticipated increased occupancy, the service would become more strained.

Flat 21
Pittville Court
Albert Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JA

Comments: 11th September 2021

169 objections to the original application to increase the size of the Student Village from 214 rooms to nearly 800, and did the council listen? NO? Why did ULiving demand so many rooms - Greed. There were plenty of suggestions limiting to number to 400/600, but NO, ULiving demanded nearly 800!! And they got their way.

Other objectors have already raised the issue of parking with this new application - How on earth would ULiving stop visitors from driving to their Serviced apartment accommodation. It is one thing for young students not to bring a car to the area but a totally different proposition to stop the general population bringing their cars when they stay.

Let's be totally honest - they are asking for a "temporary extension" but we all know that it would set a precedent and ULiving could well be back in 18 months' time asking for the change of use to be made permanent. This is a Student Village and must stay that way. The local residents put up with enough already.

What would happen to all the small businesses that at present offer Serviced Apartments in Cheltenham if ULiving flood the market with an additional 205 rooms? - (I assume ULiving would be undercutting the price of existing businesses as they would have economies of scale). Does the council want to see the local businesses suffer at the expense of this national company?

Strangely in today's Times (11th September 2021), there is an article titled "Shortage of digs is leaving students in a hole". Why is it that Pittville Student Village has apparently

got exactly the opposite problem? Maybe it's simply because ULiving built too many rooms and has discovered that it can't fill them??

I hope the Planning Department stand up to big business this time but I won't hold my breath.

77 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DT

Comments: 21st April 2023

Use of the premises for non students was never in the original plan for this campus. The building should be used for students as this is what it was intended for in this area.

11 Albert Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JH

Comments: 11th August 2021

While I realise the Covid situation has placed a strain on University finances, this proposal is very likely to create a serious parking in the area. At present students are required to sign an undertaking not to bring cars on site. Non student renters will be under no such constraints. All of Albert Drive and parts of other roads in direct proximity have restricted parking. There is no onsite parking. Inevitably renters are going to have to put their cars somewhere. Where?

Perhaps this development was always too large for demand, as local residents suggested at the time.

9 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
GL50 4jn

Comments: 30th December 2021

Student accommodation should remain for
Students and surely we should be encouraging 2nd and 3rd year or mature students to use the facilities rather than staying in private accommodation. Perhaps reducing prices may be a way of encouraging demand? Other businesses have to do this so not sure why the UOG thinks it can be different.

18 Walnut Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3AG

Comments: 19th August 2021

The application to convert 205 student flats to student/non-student accommodation is understandable and, as expressed in the applicant's covering letter, quite acceptable. However, I wish to register an OBJECTION to the scheme on the following grounds:

The application is for a time limit of 18 months, to be reviewed thereafter. Having established a precedent during those 18 months what is to stop a repeat application but with extended terms of reference - more flats, more than 90 days' occupation, more than another 18 months?

Parking: While the university and Uliving may be able to restrict students' bringing cars with them, they will not have the same control over non-students, especially (as listed in the application) these will be visiting tradesmen, contractors and consultants, and staff from other universities on temporary assignment. With no parking on-site these occupants would have no alternative but to clog up the surrounding residential streets. We have already had students parking locally at the start of term, and they have been known to use the Pump Rooms car park for extended periods.

While the applicant says that in terms of operation and management of the village "nothing will change", this is undermined immediately by the statement that only a "request/active discouragement that a car is not brought" is possible; as already stated, contractors and consultants will of necessity have their own vehicles with them.

It may be argued that the nearby racecourse car park is available to them, but no mention is made in the application that the Jockey Club has even been approached, let alone agreed to such an arrangement.

The reason given for change of use, that of under-occupation due to the pandemic, is somewhat disingenuous - even before Covid it was obvious that the blocks were under-occupied, suggesting that this application is an attempt to correct misplaced commercial enthusiasm for the original project.

While the general thrust of the present application as described is not unacceptable, I believe it presents the proverbial thin end of the wedge, and if it goes ahead I would fully expect it to be repeated and expanded in 18 months time to the detriment of the surrounding residential area.

Flat 21
Pittville Court
Albert Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JA

Comments: 2nd November 2021

I note the letter dated 25th October on behalf of ULiving which has more holes in it than a garden sieve.

Originally, ULiving were stating that it was only a temporary request, however they are now hinting that they would like to make it permanent "it is unlikely that things will ever return to the way they were". They are well aware that it would set a precedent. If this application were to be granted, where would it end? - a request in another couple of years to increase serviced accommodation by another 200 rooms??

The applicant is now saying that 75 car parking spaces could be used by visitors between 6pm & 8am, although I thought that they were asking visitors to use public transport? What if visitors want to arrive before 6pm or depart after 8am? Where exactly do they park then?

Why would they ask people to use mini buses? - do they need to move their cars out of the staff parking spaces first?

Please would the members of the Planning Committee consider where these 205 visitors are staying at present? Would helping ULiving simply hurt other smaller serviced apartment providers/businesses in the area?

The applicant states that the visitor accommodation would be separated from the students accommodation and yet they state, "Guests can use the gym, refectory and laundrette" - how is that keeping students and guests separated??

Highways stated that there would not be an unacceptable impact but they have failed to explain where the visitors would ACTUALLY park. In the real world this is a problem!

There is good reason that the previous permissions limit use to students only. This is a Student Campus and needs to remain as so.

8 Albert Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3JH

Comments: 6th August 2021

I wish to submit my objection to this proposal.

Any student occupying accommodation in the Pittville 'Student Village' is not permitted to bring a vehicle to Cheltenham. This is a fine objective but has been impossible to enforce! Every year some students have managed to park overnight nearby and flout this restriction.

The vehicle regulation would not apply to the proposed non-student occupiers. This could result in upwards of 205 extra vehicles looking to park on local roads.



26-08-2021



85 New Barn Lane
Cheltenham GL523LF

Ref21/01696/FUL

To the planning department,

I object to the proposal 21/01696/FUL

We are regularly being disturbed throughout the night by noises emitting from the student village. Although these disturbances are brief (shouting, singing, screaming) they are disturbances nonetheless. We have not reported due to the short nature of those disturbances, but we are left feeling on edge.

We are concerned that the student village has not demonstrated it's ability to control late night disturbances. It can not be trusted to control non-student disturbances nor increased parking issues especially as those will be felt outside the student village.

Cheltenham Borough Council discourages commuter parking; allowing visitors to rent rooms at the University buildings without providing any parking solution on site will drastically increase commuter parking issues!

U-living has given misleading evidence in their statement about Pittville pumprooms (where parking is not overnight and limited to 4 hours maximum)



26-08-2021

[REDACTED]
87 New Barn lane
Prestbury
Cheltenham
GL52 3LF

Ref. 21/01696/FUL



To the Cheltenham Planning officers:

We wish to register our objection to the proposal reference number 21/01696/FUL :

"Temporary dual use of up to 205 bedrooms for either student accommodation (C1) or serviced apartment accommodation (Class C1) for an 18 month period commencing August 2021 at Pittville Student Village Albert Road Cheltenham".

When the student village was first proposed, we were assured it would be solely for University student occupation during term time and that the students would not be allowed to bring cars- this has been shown to be a false promise. Are we one prepared to be conned once again into a false statement just so that a large business is able to increase its profits at the expense of local residents inconveniences?

The proposal to park at Pittville Pump room overnight is impossible, as parking is limited to 4 hours maximum! There will be huge parking issues all around the area, which has issues already!

Parking is an issue, there is no onsite parking infrastructure at the University site; parking will become a much bigger issue and the proposal should be refused on those grounds.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]