

APPLICATION NO: 24/00236/FUL	OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren
DATE REGISTERED: 24th February 2024	DATE OF EXPIRY : 25th May 2024
WARD: St Pauls	PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Wavensmere Homes Limited
LOCATION:	Car Park North Place Cheltenham
PROPOSAL:	Development of car park for 147 dwellinghouses (Class C3) incorporated into a part 4 storey / part 3 storey apartment block and 3 storey townhouses with associated: parking; refuse and recycling storage; sustainability features; landscaping; tree works; open space; biodiversity enhancements; drainage; pedestrian links to adjoining streets; and enhancements to existing vehicle access off North Place.

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	29
Number of objections	23
Number of representations	2
Number of supporting	4

15 Monson Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4EN

Comments: 18th March 2024

I object to the application due to the height of the proposed buildings in the north east corner, adjacent to Northfield Passage and Monson Avenue. The height of the proposed buildings will reduce light and privacy to the existing properties. I do not object to the site being developed for residential purposes but the proposed buildings in this corner of the site are too high and too close to the existing properties. They are not in keeping with the existing 2 storey properties in Monson Avenue and Northfield Terrace.

Flat 1
3 St Margarets Terrace
St Margarets Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4DT

Comments: 6th March 2024

letter attached.

18 Northfield Passage
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JL

Comments: 16th July 2024

Looking at the map, the taller buildings are positioned in front of the smaller houses in Northfield Passage, blocking light and affecting privacy.

The architectural design of the properties is not in keeping with a regency town centre. Better examples are found in Gloucester Place.

The car park, even though it has not had any work done to make it a smoother surface is busy all week, and overflowing at weekends. Where is this need going to be met?

There is very limited parking for current residents, so unsure where all of the residents of the new flats are likely to park as the streets can barely accommodate existing vehicles. Saying it's a town centre development, will not facilitate people's needs.

The still 'ongoing' Dowty House development was invasive and houses were shaking. This also resulted in an infestation of mice in the neighbouring properties.

I understand we need more housing, but a better design and fewer dwellings should be considered as I believe 147 is too many for that site.

How will the site be accessed safely to not disrupt residents and already flowing traffic on a very busy St Margaret's road and North Place, both during and post development?

18 Northfield Terrace
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JJ

Comments: 15th July 2024

Having read through many of the other comments - I concur with their points. We do feel that the area should be developed however have grave concerns on a number of matters.

1. The design as previously commented on is not in keeping with the architecture of Cheltenham and the buildings in this area in particular. It is bad enough having to look at the back end of the eyesore that is the Dowty building with black cladding.
2. Parking - we struggle in Northfield Terrace as it is with parking and do not think that this development will make our lives any easier.
3. Traffic - will the local traffic system be adapted to cope with the increased traffic to the area? Currently the junction of North Place and Clarence Road gets extremely congested to not only drive but it can take a while to cross safely on foot - this will only worsen.

4. Town parking - where on earth are all the cars that currently park in the Black & White going to park moving forward? The car park is full most days and definitely at weekends.

5. When the development of Dowty House took place - we felt the foundations of our house shake on numerous occasions - we cannot imagine what will happen if this development goes ahead. Let alone the dust that appeared on the car and in the garden making it impossible to hang out washing for months on end.

6. Taking in to account many comments on the height of the buildings - and should they go higher we will lose all privacy in our garden and it appears that security has not been accounted for either.

We ask that the Council take into consideration the comments of those that will be most affected by this development.

5 Northfield Terrace
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JJ

Comments: 18th March 2024

The development will cause me and my family to have a lot less privacy and will affect the natural light into our house and Garden. There will also be a lot more constant noise with the new houses and people living there.

If the development goes ahead there will be a lot of noise due to building work.

Could affect my children's chances of getting into local schools due to more families being in the catchment area.

The area will be over developed with housing

3 Northfield Terrace
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JJ

Comments: 3rd March 2024

1. Will the boundary wall between between Northfield Passage and the existing car park be kept?

2. There is not enough parking space, and none at all for residents of the largest block. Presumably all of these residents will be granted residents permits for zone 10, further increasing the already cramped spaces in the surrounding areas. I already have to park on a different road multiple times per week.

3. Both North place and Portland street car parks can get full on the weekend. With one being removed, what is the plan to address this? The NCP in the brewery quarter usually has queues outside as well.

71 Orchard Way
Churchdown
GL3 2AP

Comments: 24th April 2024

The developer requested feedback to the design and then proceeded with the exact same design regardless of the public sentiment. What is the point of a conservation zone if developers can build in exactly the same way regardless of location? Towns that build in ways that disregard local character repent for decades to come by building in a way that is 'fashionable' for a specific time and period, rather than the timeless character of Cheltenham.

Recently, in Gloucester, a councillor said that every time she passes the 1960s building that housed Sainsburys she thinks "how did this get signed off?". We are doing the exact same thing now.

The council always likes to brand itself as the 'most complete regency town', but this looks nothing like the rest of the regency centre which does so much to bring tourism and prosperity to the town. We are not in a position where we need to sign off any design.

This design could be implemented in any, and every, town across the UK. It's not hard to build in-keeping with the regency style, and it's been done successfully in other locations in Cheltenham.

We all want to see this site redeveloped, but done so in a sensitive way that makes it fit in with its surroundings, rather than a copy and paste example which does nothing to enhance the town.

Please re-consider the design and remember that we are custodians of the town, and building a Cheltenham for future generations. Surely we want to leave them the one that we inherited from the regency period that is still effortlessly brilliant 200+ years on.

28 Cleaveland Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9HN

Comments: 24th April 2024

The site definitely needs redevelopment but that in the manner planned. The design for the development is not in fitting with the town and its heritage. It's very much a "copy and paste" design, which will be a blight on the town for decades to come

5 Sydenham Villas Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6EG

Comments: 10th April 2024

This application is low grade, lacklustre with poor proportions and cheap finishing which does not fit in with the general architecture in Cheltenham. The Council should be trying to ensure that new building in this Regency town is of high quality and matches the historic surroundings of this site.

The buildings could be much higher allowing for a higher density of dwellings. 114 dph is too low on this site if the Council is to reach the net zero targets it has set itself and better quality buildings will last much longer.

It is the duty of the Council to enhance the built environment and insist that developers do not build the cheapest houses they can get away with. Why would the Council want to approve something so shoddy when it is in their power to improve the built environment of the town. After waiting over 40 years surely we, the citizens of Cheltenham, can expect more.

46 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JR

Comments: 25th March 2024

Redevelopment of the north place car parks is desirable but only if what replaces them complements or enhances the architectural heritage of the town. Unfortunately the current proposal does neither. As proposed it is devoid of architectural merit creating bland monolithic blocks.

We object to the proposal as submitted and suggest the following points be considered as a minimum:

- . The proposal will place significant additional load on local infrastructure - schooling, medical and dental etc. How is this being addressed?
- . No parking is provided for the apartment block. Why is undercroft or basement / part basement parking not being considered?
- . One parking space per 3 bed house is unrealistic. Under current regulations this will put increased pressure on already crowded zone Z10 parking. Residents of this new development should be excluded from Zone Z10 parking area as without such restriction there is potential for in excess of 300 additional permits for on street parking in Zone Z10.
- . How is lost public parking serving town centre to be re-provided - these car parks are heavily used particularly at weekends?
- . Proposed air source heat pumps are less efficient than ground source heat pumps. The development provides an ideal opportunity to install a district system of centralised ground source heat pumps and the developer should be encouraged to do so.
- . Developers are notorious for building new housing on a phased basis trying to match construction to sales rather than building out the total development. Timescale restrictions should be imposed to avoid construction dragging on with inevitable detrimental impact on surrounding area

- . Is the development to be a gated community as similar nearby developments? If not how are the proposed open spaces to be managed to avoid them deteriorating?
- . The proposed design for rear gardens facing onto North Place and the pocket park with low walls presents an open invitation for burglary
- . Without garages and with unfenced front gardens the nominal bin storage indicated will be inadequate to accommodate the numerous waste, recycling and garden waste bins required, leading to bins spreading far and wide.

27 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JP

Comments: 25th March 2024

We would like to raise the following points in relation to the above Application

1. The 153 proposed dwellings are in a conservation area. As such the plans do not reflect an appropriate design for the area and the comments made by Historic England in their 'Consultee Comments' are meaningful.

In support of the above we would like to reference the uninspiring and shocking development of the Grade 11 Dowty House which is undergoing completion on the adjacent Monson Avenue. If this low level of expectation and standard of build for new residences in the conservation area is to be repeated here everyone should have a need for concern.

2. 153 homes, with 87 dwellings likely to qualify for school places both in the Primary and Secondary sectors will have a significant impact on existing educational establishments. Also on Doctors surgeries and dentists. These areas of infrastructure are not given significant concern.

3. Parking - adequate and realistic provision for this is unconvincing given the high number of homes proposed. Understandably people living nearby are seeking reassurance that the current Residence Permit areas will not be flooded with vehicles. Similarly where will all those currently using the car parks park?

4. Green space and trees and planting. The Application would benefit hugely if more focus was given to proper landscaping and not simply maximising the number of dwellings that can be squeezed onto the site. The reason central Cheltenham is so appealing is that green spaces are valued and has benefitted from a legacy of past good planning.

We do not disagree with the site being developed, however, as others have commented, there are too many residences proposed for the site and it would be more appropriate to have builds of more inspiring design and worthy of their location than in the current proposal.

Flat 6
Clarence Court
Clarence Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2AX

Comments: 9th March 2024

These car parks are completely full on Saturdays. Local people coming from outside the city centre struggle enough as it is to find a place to park, and I feel that taking these spaces away will damage the local economy by steering people away from driving into town in their free time if there is nowhere safe to park. It would be very important to consult locals more widely to gain an accurate consensus, i.e those who need to drive to get to town but are still living in Cheltenham.

Flat 10
Hazelhurst
24 Eldorado Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2PT

Comments: 3rd April 2024

This scheme is a fantastic idea and will add valuable homes and community to the area.

It will have a positive economic outlook on the local area, too, with more people at hand to use the local facilities in the Brewery.

My only suggestion is that the homes could be an extra story taller to be more in the regency styles of Cheltenham as a whole.

22 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JP

Comments: 27th March 2024

Letter attached

Comments: 19th March 2024

Planning Application 24/00236/FUL

There are a number of concerns and reservations about the proposed development made by Wavensmere Homes and Pegasus Planning Group Limited regarding North Place Cheltenham, which need to be shared with you.

The principle concern and objection to the scheme, as with previous failed attempts, is that the true potential and best outcome for this site is yet again being sacrificed or at least set aside. The site connects large 19th century buildings in both Pittville to the north and the town centre to the south. Any potential development of North Place Car Park or indeed the adjacent Portland Street Car Park site, the most prized and important real estate areas in Cheltenham, has been a local scandal as there has been a scarcity of credible schemes since the older properties were demolished around the 1980's. The current scheme as outlined is no better and fails spectacularly to capture its true worth to the town.

While there is no favour for pastiche regency developments or benefit that a more modern approach would work much better there is a huge dividing line that quite often supports poor architecture that neither recognises Cheltenham's past or stimulates a potential modernist and revivalist future. This scheme is appalling with regard to the former and fails spectacularly to deliver any New Heritage value in the latter. I therefore urge Cheltenham Borough Council and their Planning Department to consider very carefully the consequence of accepting this ill-conceived scheme based on the need for expediency over a lack of foresight that will only result in a poor legacy for the town during their tenure.

There will of course be broad, political and social reasons as to why this area should be developed, such as:

- 1) Central Government housing targets should be met, but suggest not at any cost if viewed as a diktat that cannot be overridden by important local requirements, sensitivities and standards.
- 2) North Place and Portland Place sites have been an eyesore for far too long at the expense of previously failed schemes, which is no excuse in itself.
- 3) It is important to develop brownfield sites as a first principle, but further suggest this should not be at the cost of degrading what should be a credible architectural landmark statement about Cheltenham.
- 4) To encourage people to live in town centres is something CBC is only just beginning to get to grips with as the new norm, therefore it should be undertaken by employing real long term benefit and not just as a simple short term marketing exercise. The current strategy has resulted in a conflict of balance between this short-sighted ill-thought-out underlying urban policy and a much greater and sensible visionary one. Support for all of the above four points in principle is only given if the other parameters of credibility are taken into account.

There is also the sensitivity and appropriateness the design of the estate to be considered by the Planning Committee.

Wavensmere Homes market themselves as Urban Regeneration Specialists, but their consistent one adaptive design that fits all housing solutions as shown in previous schemes they offer in other areas may well satisfy the brownfield site argument where an office block/industrial style approach is more aligned to more extreme industrial areas, it is certainly not an appropriate solution for this site considering Cheltenham's unique proud and different heritage.

The design of the buildings as illustrated are too 'utilitarian' with terraced housing blocks showing little character or innovative design integrity, which give the whole site an 'army barracks' style feel. The 'gulag' office block style building that fronts St. Margaret's Road is even more of a concern. Overall there is no differential detail in any of these buildings to break up the over-linear monolithic look as would normally be seen in Regency Architecture presentations in the past. The 'pocket park' approach for the shared public spaces is reminiscent of 'back-to-backs' of the 19th century. In short the proposition is distinctly unattractive with dreadful lazily designed solutions, which are the most underwhelming examples of appropriate modern architecture ever to be offered. The scheme appears to be designed to an imposed budget rather than exemplifying a credible and creative solution.

The use of materials suggests that a Victorian brick solution is more important than stucco walls or ashlar stone facing is something I find inappropriate to previous solutions given to large swathes of central Cheltenham throughout its earlier period of great development and some modern planning history. There is however a cautionary tale regarding poorly executed examples of 'stucco' solutions applied to modern buildings around the town as well as the misuse of terrible modern cladding as seen in the appalling build executed in the adjacent Dowty House's approved planning application. Equally the recent Minster development is currently not something worthy of support as it too is so awful due to the use of fashionable container solutions, never mind its initial creation, that it has in effect degraded another important landmark site in Cheltenham.

Pegasus Planning Group Limited originally letterbox dropped a leaflet in December 2023 to local home owners and was headlined as a 'Public Consultation' based solely on a CGI sketch, which was nothing more than a poor marketing exercise and was therefore "unregulated". Given the fact that the scheme had already been presented to CBC at a council meeting around that time it raises a worry regarding "statutory and therefore legal requirements" over sensitivities related to the true application of a public consultation.

Furthermore, there is little evidence that parking issues for the area are being fully considered due to an inconsistent policy from CBC, which often states that residents who live in town centres do not require the use of a personal vehicle, yet encourage people from surrounding areas or from afar to come to Cheltenham to shop, dine and relax on a grand scale, especially in support of its nighttime economy policy. I would hope greater consideration would be given to concerns over local impact and also a prescribed solution as to how CBC are going to redirect 1000 vehicles per day due to the loss of this current prime car parking area.

Finally a very weak level of public consultation, despite perhaps meeting basic statutory requirements, suggests that the importance of this site in this current Planning Application proposal does not fully engage with the standards of expectation for

Cheltenham. The planning team need to support the need for a much better solution for this landmark site and address the major problems raised within the current application and therefore should reject this scheme, one that should never have even got off the drawing board.

22 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
GL50 4JP

Westhall
Lansdown Parade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LH

Comments: 8th April 2024

Why has the applicant prepared numerous documents about the area and then disregarded the information when preparing their proposals? Below is one example;

"Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment
North Place Car Park, Cheltenham, GL50 4DW

Green Infrastructure

4.29. A limited amount of green infrastructure is found within the site due to the existing land use and prominence of hardstanding. A mature London Plane tree and two semi mature trees are found at the southwestern extents of the site near to A4019/St Margaret's Road. No further substantial vegetation is found within the site. Beyond the site boundary to the west lies a mature Lime tree in close proximity to A4019/St Margaret's Road."

The North Place site has one historic feature on the perimeter, namely a 200 year old healthy Plane tree, and the proposals have made no attempt to preserve it. The Plane tree is the only environmentally important feature, but is proposed to be removed.

This tree is a similar age to their long lists of protected buildings in the area and it has been totally disregarded with no attempt to design around this prominent feature on the main road. It was originally one of a row of trees along the road, as shown on their historic map extracts.

Large long lived street trees should be proposed along the entire St. Margarets Road and North Place frontages to improve air quality in the area. They would also help to minimise overheating and weather impact for residents and provide a more pleasant outlook and privacy for occupants. Large trees regulate air temperature in contrast to hard surfaces of buildings and paving and are important to combat the effects of climate change.

Street trees are not necessarily native varieties, because they have to tolerate both adverse ground conditions and air pollution. Their form is usually relatively narrow and capable of growing tall enough to allow doubledecker buses and HGVs to pass under

their canopy. These are not the type of short lived ornamental trees which are normally found in domestic gardens.

This is an opportunity to create a design a structure of street trees along the roads similar to those in the nearby Clarence and Wellington Squares, and numerous other areas in town. This is the character of Cheltenham and the proposals do not reflect this unique feature of the town.

Management Suite
Cupola Tower The Brewery
Quarter
Henrietta Street Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4FA

Comments: 8th April 2024

As the managing agents of The Brewery Quarter in Cheltenham, we are writing to express our support for the planning application submitted by Wavensmere Homes & BBS Capital for the development of new housing in the area. We believe that this proposal will bring significant benefits to the community and the area as a whole.

Here are several key points to consider in support of the planning application:

Wavensmere Homes & BBS Capital Proposal: The proposed development by Wavensmere Homes & BBS Capital offers a thoughtful and comprehensive solution to the unused North Place car park site. The proposed design will link the site to other key developments in the town such as The Brewery Quarter and provide residents with easy pedestrian access to the local amenities.

Redevelopment of Unused Space: The North Place car park has been vacant for approximately 40 years and stalled a decade ago when a previous commitment fell through. This proposal presents an opportunity to revitalize this space and contribute positively to the local area.

Affordable Housing: The proposed mix of houses and flats will provide 1-3 bedroom accommodations that are more affordable than many options currently available in Cheltenham town centre. This is crucial for addressing the housing needs of a diverse range of residents.

Green Space and Environmental Sustainability: The development not only offers housing but also includes provisions for green space, public realm enhancements, and environmentally sustainable homes. This aligns with modern urban planning principles and will enhance the overall quality of life for residents.

Reduced Pressure on Highways: By replacing the existing car park with a mixed-use development, the project will create less pressure on local highways compared to the current usage of the site.

Economic Stimulus: The development is poised to bring significant economic benefits to the town of Cheltenham. The influx of new residents will contribute to increased consumer spending in local businesses, further stimulating the local economy. This injection of economic activity will not only benefit the immediate vicinity but also have positive ripple effects throughout the broader community, supporting local businesses and fostering continued growth and prosperity in Cheltenham.

In conclusion, we firmly believe that the proposed housing development will be a positive addition to the Cheltenham community. It will provide much-needed housing, enhance the environment, and contribute to the overall well-being of the area. We urge the planning authorities to carefully consider these points and approve the application.

26 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JP

Comments: 24th March 2024

I am concerned about the inevitable pressure to allow residents to park on-street, most likely in residents parking zone Z10; which would have an overwhelming impact on the ability of Clarence Square residents to park. I note the comments that residents should not get residents parking permits, but find it hard to believe that this suggestion will remain in force over time.

180B Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AE

Comments: 15th July 2024

The opportunity exists to create an environment that mirrors and supports the heritage of Cheltenham. Providing space, trees, and quality homes is essential. Providing buildings of character that meet the needs of the town is essential. Design frontage, access, and space to achieve something suitable for the town, or develop elsewhere. Unfortunately the label "could try harder" applies.

Comments: 4th April 2024

Develop the site by all means, it's long overdue. But selecting such inappropriate designs for this location is fundamentally flawed. Why selecting a developer with experience in Birmingham and Derby for example, with no, literally no concept of design needs for a regency town, its crazy. Find a different developer, or saddle the town with a shameful legacy of no imagination and degradation of what Cheltenham has to offer.

1 Pittville Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2QZ

Comments: 3rd April 2024

This is such an opportunity for the town. This proposal wastes that opportunity. The best that can be said of it is that it doesn't include the Maersk-container style architecture favoured in so many new houses. For a town so proud of its architectural history, for town that trades in its architectural beauty, this is not nearly good enough.

37 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JP

Comments: 2nd March 2024

Insufficient car parking for the number of dwellings (nearby car parks are usually at or near capacity and are often expensive). Where are all of the vehicles currently using these two car parks expected to park?

Ensure that residents of this development cannot apply for local residents parking permits as specified in the Transport report.

The dwellings are small, according to the floor plans. The number of dwellings should be reduced so that these properties can be proper family homes, rather than small boxes that are not practical.

The elevation drawings show buildings that are not at all in keeping with the adjacent Listed Buildings.

My experience of heat pumps was not positive. They don't work in very cold weather and they are energy inefficient in low temperatures. Finding qualified technicians to service said heat pumps is very difficult.

I do not object to the site being developed but it needs to be a sympathetic, sustainable development.

1 Furrow Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3NB

Comments: 12th April 2024

I am delighted by the prospect of seeing this wasted space in the centre of Cheltenham be put to good use. These proposals however do the town a disservice, both in functionality and aesthetics. Cheltenham is a beautiful town full of brilliant architecture. The proposal does not add to this legacy, it looks generic and must be improved. Parking has not been adequately considered. Cars should not dominate the landscape, but people need cars. Perhaps underground parking should be considered.

76 Naunton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7BG

Comments: 5th April 2024

It is disappointing that it has taken so many years for the Council to come up with such an awful scheme.

It is a poor-quality scheme which does not feed into the local area, or enhance Cheltenham in any way.

It does nothing to alleviate the major traffic and parking issues in the vicinity, nor in the town generally.

The brutal apartment block is particularly offensive.

12 deansway
London
n2 0jf

Comments: 9th April 2024

As owners of the nearby Regency Hall in Fishers Lane we wholeheartedly support this application for the following reasons:

The Car Park has been vacant for as long as I can remember and causes traffic problems when busy and an eyesore when not. This development will reduce the traffic and revitalize the area.

This development will provide much needed Family Housing to the area with affordable housing and reduce the car usage

Green space and public realm will be provided which is a plus for the surrounding area

In conclusion I can only see positives to this development.

45 Alstone Croft
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8HB

Comments: 19th April 2024

Highly disappointing to see yet another boring, lazy, unimaginative monolithic development offered. Astonishing that this sort of architecture is still waved through by developers and planning. When do we as a society wake up from this unimaginative greyscale slumber? What will generations after us think about this development?

Where is the critical thinking over provision of parking? Is this really considered suitable quality housing if there is little thought about the way the space is actually used for people living there? Terracing might be a good way to wedge in as many houses as possible, but have we not moved on from narrow Victorian style shared back alleyways and gardens?

The reports from the civic society and CAP are damning. It's hard to disagree with all the points made.

We all agree that the car park is of little value as it is, and I think housing is perfect use - but Cheltenham and its people, and the potential new occupiers to this housing, deserve so much more.

Strongly object on the basis that this could be so much better. If this is approved in its current format, then this would be an incredible act of self sabotage for Cheltenham.

49 Clarence Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4JR

Comments: 10th April 2024

In terms of scale, plan, elevation and detail the developers have made no effort to integrate their scheme with the landscape and architecture of the surrounding area. This can be achieved (see the modern developments of flats between Clarence and Wellington Squares and also Albion Place). The developers should be required to make much more effort on this very large and prominent site.

Cotswold View
45 The Burgage
Prestbury Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3DL

Comments: 9th April 2024

I'm writing in support of Wavensmere Homes' and BBS Capital's proposal for redeveloping the old North Place "Black & White" car-park. The site has been empty for decades, most recently because of Morrisons withdrawal from their commitments in 2014. As a very busy car-park it is a viable investment and these proposals demonstrate that the owners have worked hard with CBC to find a solution to deliver homes in the town centre that can be afforded by a large part of the local population, not just the wealthier and older residents. To come forward with a deliverable mix of houses and apartments with public realm, green space and high sustainability credentials is no easy feat in current economic conditions, especially with a commitment to 20% affordable housing. It's too easy for people to criticise the proposal, but with inflation and interest rates running high, this site could easily be a car-park for the next decade. This plan will complement our Dowty House project, create local jobs and economic value, cementing this edge of centre site as a desirable place to live.

Kind Regards
Dowty House Project

1 Jersey Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2SZ

Comments: 3rd April 2024

I all for this waste land to be developed as it has been left empty for far too long. My comments are;

The proposed architecture and design isn't really good enough for this high profile location in Cheltenham. The design is very basic and lacks any imagination or flair. Gives the impression that the developer is trying to do the least amount of work for the maximum profit. The architects have a blank canvas they should be able to produce something far better.

The development will remove carparking spaces from central Cheltenham whilst increasing the number of cars into the area. Where will these cars go? There needs to be sufficient parking for this development which at the moment is lacking.

This development benefits the financial desires of the developer over the needs of both old and new residents.

Happy with the principal of redevelopment however the current plans should be rejected, with the developer told to come back with a plan that will benefit Cheltenham rather than the developers shareholders.

1 Pittville Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2QZ

Comments: 13th March 2024

Given the existing planning system I have no expectation that you will refuse permission for this disappointing, unambitious development. The combination of townhouses and flats is appropriate; the massing and heights are uncontroversial; the style is plain but can reasonably be presented as a modern echo (albeit on a painfully reduced scale) of the terraces of Regency Cheltenham.

But what *should* be built here? It's a site that connects large 19th century buildings in both Pittville to the north and the town centre to the south: a golden opportunity to heal the rift between the two, by doing what local people consistently say they want, which is building not in some watered-down pastiche but in authentic Regency style - as was done very successfully for a while in Cheltenham (for example on Imperial Square, or even nearer to this site at Grosvesnor House on Evesham Rd). Sadly the approach to planning in Cheltenham seems to have regressed since then, and in England's dysfunctional housing market developers do not respond properly to demand signals (traditional features, high ceilings and decoration do all command a premium in the market, yet very rarely feature in new developments), so it will not happen organically.

People in historic towns and cities in Germany, Poland and France, where so much care has been taken to recreate what was lost and to add sympathetically, must shake their heads in wonder at the British insistence on building ugly modern buildings in direct contradiction to the clear wishes of the public.

A second perfectly valid approach would be to build something more contemporary but which is ambitious enough to bring progress to the town, a very reasonable aspiration for this large and central site. The developers cite Chelsea Barracks (in section 4.02 of the Design and Access Statement), which does precisely this in a large and central site in London. Chelsea Barracks is an excellent development, and the North Place developers should not be allowed for a second to get away with suggesting their mediocre effort is in any way equivalent. Of course the housing market in Chelsea is very different from Cheltenham's, and I'm not suggesting that anyone should or could build properties with values in the tens of millions here or anywhere else in Cheltenham. But a developer at North Place could achieve something new and positive. Chelsea Barracks has *higher* ceiling heights and *more* storeys than the Georgian and Victorian buildings around, whereas this North Place proposal seems to apologize for itself with the smallness of the buildings. Chelsea Barracks is faced in stone, as some of the better architecture around it is; North Place could have opted for stucco (as Imperial Square or Grosvenor House did) or stone (as the Cala Homes development on Lansdown Rd did) - both are typical of the town's better architecture. Instead brick has been chosen - and yes there are some low-quality precedents nearby, but why emulate the bad rather than the good? Chelsea Barracks has *more* decoration than the Victorian terraces around (which are, like Cheltenham's Regency terraces, quite simple in design), whereas this North Place proposal has less than the surrounding buildings.

As for the specifics, assuming permission will be granted, I would suggest at the very least:

1. Considering very carefully whether the brick proposed is acceptable - the renders depict a cream or very light grey colour which give the very misleading impression that the development will somehow resemble (in miniature) the town's stucco terraces. That cannot be done in brick.
2. Insisting that the party walls between houses be flat (with curved step-downs if necessary) rather than the hideous raked ones proposed.
3. Insisting on more decorative railings - this could be Victorian-style black wrought iron per the local tradition, or could equally be something modern and decorative (see Chelsea Barracks) but surely not the 70s-style bars proposed.

It could be worse, but surely Cheltenham deserves far better.

Kind regards

36 Valentine Road
Bishops Cleeve
Cheltenham
GL52 8FU

Comments: 4th April 2024

The site certainly needs to be developed but I'm amazed that this application has got this far. The parking provision for the site itself, and the town, has not been thought through.

Only 78 spaces for 153 homes? Half a car per property? If anything, you need two cars per property - experience shows that. This will cause huge problems for local people and visitors, especially when 479 spaces will be removed from the location and the town centre generally. Where are shoppers, visitors and tourists supposed to park?

The land certainly needs to be developed but there really needs to be more consideration for those who live nearby and the town's economy. This application should be rejected and something more practical and sustainable should be considered.

Flat 1
3 St Margarets Terrace
St Margarets Road
CHELTENHAM
GL50 4DT

05 March 2024

Your Ref: 24/00236/FUL

I have your letter dated 27 February asking for comments regarding the North Place proposal and have also responded to the earlier public consultation conducted by the Developers.

In essence, I support the intention to create new homes at the location and on the lines indicated.

However, my overwhelming concern relates to the anticipated level of car ownership, parking arrangements and the strong possibility of a bottle-neck via the single vehicular access and egress. In short the 'diagrams' produced in support of this Scheme are showing an "idealised" picture of a few vehicles parked on drives. This is surely not an accurate picture of what the situation will be in practice.

Also, do I understand correctly that no provision is available for the 78 one and two bedroom apartments in the four-storey blocks?

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely

Ben Warren
Cheltenham Borough Council
PO Box 12
GL50 1PP

representation

Copy of correspondence:

Dear Sirs

I am extremely disappointed that my letter of objection dated 21 December 2023 regarding the mentioned above scheme has been omitted from your planning application *Statement of Community Involvement* on behalf of Wavensmere Homes Limited to Cheltenham Borough Council.

A copy of the letter was also sent by email to Wavensmere Homes on 27 December 2023. Could you please advise why this was omitted? A further copy is reattached below for your information.

I would appreciate a quick response.

Attachment:

22 Clarence Square Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 4JP

21 December 2023

Pegasus Planning Group Limited

21 Ganton Street London

W1F 9BN

Dear Sirs

Public Consultation: North Place Car Park, Cheltenham. (New Build - Arkle Court).

As you may ascertain from my address I live but a stones throw away from the proposed development and have therefore always taken a keen interest in any potential development of North Place Car Park and the adjacent Portland Street Car Park sites.

They are the most prized real estate areas in Cheltenham and it has been a local scandal that there has been a scarcity of credible schemes or development since the older properties were demolished around the 1980's, or perhaps even before that period.

<page1image36347408.png>

Photo c.1980: *'Last house standing' in Portland Street. North Place had already been demolished and cleared.*

It is therefore extremely interesting to welcome the currently projected scheme, which hopefully will be a great enhancement to the area, put an end to the existing tragic eyesore and give credibility back to what has been pitifully sad previous planning attempts to address the situation. In short, I appreciate a development that is a high quality residential scheme providing much needed housing in the town centre.

I do have some concerns and hopefully helpful comments as follows:

1. Any representation in a CGI format or artist's impression is all too often how a scheme will end up once built and as currently proposed will be a bit of a disappointment. As a strategy pointer this presentation may be fine, but as an informative scheme it lacks any comprehensive detail in which to formulate a full and credible opinion. In view of the fact that planned works are intended to start in the Spring of 2024, this public consultation schedule gives very little consideration to official planning proposals and feels more like a marketing exercise.

2. The design of the buildings are too utilitarian. The terraced housing blocks have little character and give the whole site a barracks style feel. The *'gulag'* office block style building that fronts St. Margaret's Road is even more of a concern. Overall there is no

differential detail to break up the linear monolithic look. Cheltenham has a distinctly long and dreadful association with some of the most lazily designed and underwhelming examples of modern architecture I have ever come across. I would not wish this development opportunity to be equally criticised.

3. A major concern in relationship to the design of the large block is that despite different intentions many of these apartments will be purchased by speculative landlords and used for Airbnb purposes.

4. I am not a supporter of the view that any new building work in the centre of Cheltenham has to be carried out in the traditional Regency style normally associated with the town, which can be fine when they work, as it does in Albion Place, behind John Lewis. I do welcome modern architecture that makes a credible statement. In previous developments (near Waitrose) the modern approach to specifications such as floor to ceiling window design etc only serves to show varying degrees unsightly objects/furniture. An even worse example is the current badly built Dowty House scheme adjacent to the proposed North Place development.

5. Again due to lack of detail and specification in the sketch I would hope that issues such as modern material render, which invariably fails or stains badly within a very short period does not become a realisation. There are many examples of this in St Margaret's Road, including the facing of the Holiday Inn building.

6. I welcome the projected landscape environment and ecological merit of this scheme as well as some sort of public art sculpture/seating area, but caution against a retained space for murals as part of the *Cheltenham Paint Festival*. There is divided opinion within Cheltenham about the true merits of this festival and while some of the artists are talented in what they produce, there is a fine line between the encouragement and discouragement of graffiti. These 'artworks' are normally connected to grot spots areas, hence an association to this proposed crisp and clean residential development would appear to be an ill-fitting scenario. You will not see this type of artwork in the finer architectural areas of Montpelier, Lansdown, or on the end gables of the beautiful Squares normally associated with Cheltenham's high architectural profile.

7. Current advice and government legislation enacted by Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) is geared towards the discouragement of car use especially in centrally related residential property areas. Apart from the bus service between Cheltenham and Gloucester the local services are dire and in addition the notion that people who live in the centre of town do not need to use personal car transport or that they do not have visitors is a fanciful belief. While the scheme appears to suggest a single parking space is allocated, but not specified, to each house associated within the low rise development areas, there is no indication, if any at all will be available to the 78 apartments in this huge block. There are many fine examples where schemes in London, for example, have adequate under-croft parking and the provision of visitor/ delivery van spaces along the access roadways. However, there are also countless examples, all over the country, where vehicles illegally park half on the pavement due to ill-thought out residential schemes.

8. CBC, as part of their encouragement to drive strategy entices many shoppers and visitors from surrounding areas to come to the town by car, will therefore need to demonstrate what alternative to the current 1000 car parking spaces is being provided.

Finally, I suggest the timing of the Public Consultation is limiting at this holiday time of the year and should have been set later in January.
I trust these observations have been received as both helpful and constructive. Yours faithfully.
