

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>APPLICATION NO: 24/00605/CONDIT</b> | <b>OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren</b>   |
| <b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 9th April 2024 | <b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 9th July 2024   |
| <b>WARD:</b> Lansdown                  | <b>PARISH:</b>  |
| <b>APPLICANT:</b>                      | Cheltenham Borough Council  |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>                       | Imperial Garden Promenade Cheltenham  |
| <b>PROPOSAL:</b>                       | Variation of condition 5. (generators) of granted permission 22/01200/FUL. To enable the use of a generator, running exclusively on certified sustainably sourced HVO, in 2024-25, as part of a hybrid power set-up alongside the existing electrical infrastructure and a high-capacity mobile battery unit. |

## REPRESENTATIONS

|                           |          |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Number of contributors    | <b>2</b> |
| Number of objections      | <b>2</b> |
| Number of representations | <b>0</b> |
| Number of supporting      | <b>0</b> |

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

**Comments:** 23rd April 2024

This is the third application for the ice rink that dismisses previous decisions and requires previous conditions to be removed. It makes a mockery of the planning system and damages the credibility of the Planning Committee. Each of the previous applications used selective and misleading data to support their case and this application is no different.

The 2023 Ice Rink application as presented would not have delivered the promised improvements but the person responsible for delivering the project listened, and consulted professional Power and Noise engineers. This resulted in a much improved event, greatly decreasing the Local Air Pollution, but at a price. A loss of £74,000. In order to deflect from this Council leaders and Officers made several statements about the success of the ice rink, supposedly data from the Cheltenham Ice Rink Economic Impact Report but yet again these statements are suspect, to say the least.

1. The results are reported to be from an independent survey but the questions and the structure of the survey were influenced by Council Officers, which brings into question its impartiality.

2. All the financial figures are stated as fact when the report itself identifies them as "estimates". Worse still these estimates are based on a poorly designed survey and a flawed process rendering the data unreliable.

3. The report includes a statement for Staying visitors that "Due to the small sample size caution should be taken when interpreting the results for these respondents." The announcements made by Marketing Cheltenham and the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Culture, Tourism and Wellbeing completely ignored this advice but worse still, I have discovered that of the four categories analysed only one had a Sample Size big enough to render them reliable.
  4. The survey divided the visitors into four subsets: Staying Visitors, Staying Outside Cheltenham, Day Visitors and Residents. Only Residents met the criteria for recommended Sample Size, but how respondents were categorised as "Influenced" was ambiguous which directly influenced the figures for "additional spend".
  5. As already stated, the data attributed to categories Staying Visitors, Staying Outside Cheltenham and Day Visitors is unreliable due to their low sample size This directly effects the process "How was the spend generated by the ice rink calculated" rendering stage 1 and stage 2 unreliable.
  6. The method of establishing "Influenced" visitors is compromised by the ambiguity and confusion of question 11 and further compromised by questions 13 and 15.
  7. Stage 3 is intended to remove any spend where a visitor states "they would have spent this money even if there were no ice rink present in Cheltenham" but this question is never asked.
  8. This renders stage 3 unreliable and as a consequence the data entered into the Cambridge model at stage 4 is also unreliable. So the spend generated calculation is flawed at every stage and the data generated unreliable and inflated.
  9. The statement made by several Council Leaders and Officers that "we reduced the carbon footprint by a staggering 98 per cent compared to the 2021 ice rink on the same site" is simply untrue. There was a welcomed reduction in the tailpipe CO2 emissions but this was almost entirely due to the transfer of power delivery to the grid supply and huge auxiliary battery. In other words a lauded reduction of Scope 1 emissions but a failure to acknowledge an increase in Scope 2 emissions and no information at all about Scope 3 emissions.
  10. The Ice Rink 2023 consumed 55.76 Million Watt hours of power. That is enough power to run 16 homes every day for the period of the event. Put another way - that is enough power to run One Cheltenham home for Two Years. This supports the argument that running ice rinks in temperate climates such as Cheltenham is just not sustainable.
  11. The delivery and positioning of the equipment caused severe damage to flower beds and areas of the lawns (the Auxiliary battery alone weighed 10 tonnes). This has been repaired but the long term effect of the compaction caused is yet to be realised.
- This gaslighting of the public, the Cabinet and the Planning Committee is unworthy and lacks the propriety to enable a proper decision to be made. This application should be rejected or at least deferred until the Survey and the Economic Impact Report can be properly assessed and the data verified.

22 Imperial Square  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 1QZ

**Comments:** 15th April 2024

Over the last 3 years the council have had 37 applications and approved them all. There is literally no point in entering into this box ticking exercise, however I will do.

Growing plants to make fuel and then shipping it half way around the world is NOT GREEN. Please do not dress it up as being green because you are kidding yourself and misleading others.

Then using this to run events that are poorly attended and are paid for by tax payers (Ice rink and big wheel were lossmaking) that can ill afford it, is not a sensible use of public money. However I'm in no doubt that you will make some spurious claim about the average teenage ice rink goer adding nearly £70 to the local economy (£1.6m divided by the visitor volumes) each trip.

Move forward, slap yourself on the back and pray to god that the global environment does not tip past the point of no return in your life time and that those that can't afford food do not read too much into the loss making stats of the events.

I'm objecting because it is an eye sore, costs the tax payer money they can't afford, is not environmentally sound, and so on, blah, blah, blah. You probably haven't got this far as you have already clicked let's go for it.