

APPLICATION NO: 25/01567/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Lucy White
DATE REGISTERED: 15th October 2025		DATE OF EXPIRY : 10th December 2025
WARD: Park		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Robert Deacon Builders Ltd	
LOCATION:	Broadlands Lodge 56 The Park Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Creation of new vehicular access to the university car park. Demolition of The Farmery buildings and erection of 2no. dwellings. Change of use of Broadlands Lodge and the Farmery Lodge to residential with associated extensions, access and landscaping.	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	17
Number of objections	15
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	2

23 Charles Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 9HH

Comments: 13th February 2026

NONE GIVEN

1 Barberry Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2RB

Comments: 13th February 2026

Planning Application 25/01567/FUL - Broadlands Lodge 56 The Park Cheltenham
Gloucestershire GL50 2RN

I would like to object to the proposals for the redevelopment of Broadlands Lodge 56 The Park in particular with reference to the developers Plots 2 & 3 relating to the site at present occupied by The Farmery. I have no great issue with the plans for Plot 1 Farmery Lodge, or Plot 4 Broadlands Lodge as I consider the plans have recognised the character of the building as lodges and also removed an unsympathetic extension added in the latter part of 20th century to Farmery Lodge and represent recognition of the building character in the surrounding area. My grounds for objection are as follows:

1) Historic Importance of the Park and further loss of Cheltenham Regency Heritage
A key feature of Cheltenham's attractiveness to both residents and tourists is its architectural heritage specifically it's Regency heritage which forms a substantial part of Cheltenham's history. Whilst in the past the importance of this has not always been

recognised and unsympathetic development of the area has occurred we are now in an age where our architectural history is recognised both by academics and the general public as an important part of our identity and it is important we protect this to ensure a continued interest in the town for both those wishing to live here and those visiting as well as protect it for future generations.

The Park is a part of this history and the parkland at the centre of The Park is a defining feature of the original design to set off the large villas surrounding the central open space reflecting many similar developments of the time in London, Bristol and Bath. It is not just the listed properties that line the perimeter of the Park but the parkland itself that is The Park. It is important when considering this development, the whole is considered rather than the part and it is for this reason the Park became part of The Park Character Area and Appraisal Plan (CAAMP) which includes under Action TP11 actions to retain openness and protect views.

In considering the proposals, as per Section 72(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 it is important that special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of a conservation area. The proposed development particularly Plots 2 & 3 would detract from preserving or enhancing the character of the Park area and be a further erosion of the Park's Regency character as well as that of Cheltenham as a whole and furthermore act as a precedent for further developments in this location and encroachment of this open area to the detriment of the character of the Park. In addition, such a development would undoubtedly be used to support future applications on similarly sensitive areas in the town.

2) The lack of consideration in the design of the proposed development to the Regency Character of the specific locality and over development of the site:

a) Loss of characteristic openness of The Park - The site itself is on the southwest side of the Park an area which is, in the majority, open park land and this proposal should not be considered an infill site. The present buildings are ancillary to the villa and university buildings to the northeast of the Park. The majority is single storey with a small area of low rise two storey buildings. In support of the scheme, it is suggested the overall size of the development is not significantly bigger than what is already present. This does not consider that the new development (Plots 2 & 3) is not only two storey in height but is flat roofed, developing the dwelling area to its full extent at a height of 7.15m & 6.8m respectively with no variation in design to lessen the impact. This will have significantly increase the visual mass and impact compared to the present Farmery Buildings where only in a small part does it reach a ridge height of 6.275m. This visually will have a significant impact on the view across the Park from both the Merestones Road and Moorend Park Road directions as well as impact on the nature of the Park in this location eroding the openness of the location.

b) The developer suggests the contemporary design proposed would provide an 'interesting contrasting architectural approach' and has in support of this style referred to other modern developments in the Park area. This is not a reason for allowing the proposals. As per Section 72(1) special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of a conservation area needs to be considered. Two wrongs do not make a right and what has been done in the past should not be slavishly followed if it does not uphold the principle set down in the 1990 Act.

c) With regard to the design of Plots 2 & 3 itself, the style of the development neither reflects or complements the architectural nature of the Park and rather than reflect this appear to reflect the architectural style of many institutional buildings built in the latter half of 20th century. Whilst this may be acceptable in other less architecturally sensitive areas this does not suit the present location the proposals do not sympathetically reflect the character of the area and do not add to the surrounding landscape of this area and history. A building of such a stark contradictory style is not appropriate here. It neither

reflects or compliments the locality. The present design would significantly detract from the nature of the Park in this location and would be a further erosion of the Regency character of Cheltenham, this will directly contradict "special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of a conservation area".

d) The developer refers to specific other modern developments in support of their proposals. Whilst there are modern developments in the adjacent locality of Merestones Road and around the Park these are found on the perimeter side not on the parkland and in many cases do reflect the overall character of the Park development. Furthermore, I would highlight the properties making up part of the Rowena Cade/Arthur Bliss development referred to in support of the proposals whilst modern, do reflect the Regency style of the Park and in fact replaced the late 20th century Gloucester Technical College buildings support the case that we do not follow slavishly the decisions of previous recent developments in the area.

e) Reference is also made to the recent development at Cornerways in support of the proposed 'contemporary design. This is a very different location to the site in question, Cornerways is an area which is more significantly developed over the past and can be considered an infill site however this is not the case for this location where, as stated before, the buildings which are the subject of this application, are ancillary in purpose and set within parkland. Furthermore, the contemporary design is single storey set within an area of other residential and institutional buildings lessening its impact on the locality.

3) Summary

a) The development site is part of the CAAMP. The proposed development does not add or enhance the historic character of the Park and is located in the Parkland area of The Park not the perimeter and therefore stands out in the locality and undermines the openness and visibility in the area.

b) The allowance of such a development is likely to act as precedence for other proposals in similar sensitive localities. This is not an infill site.

c) The proposed development neither compliments nor enhances this area of the Park and detracts from the park landscape in this locality.

d) The scale of the Proposals for Plot 2 & 3 will significantly impact on the visual mass from both the Merestones Road and Moorend Park Road direction.

e) The 'contemporary design is not in keeping with the locality and will be a contrary to the rest of the site development as well as the overall nature of residential property in the Park.

f) Modern evidence cited in the Park area should not be used as justification for ignoring the importance of preserving or enhancing the conservation area. There are equally examples in the Park where modern development have worked to enhance and strengthen this character. What is the point of having such designated areas if we do not adhere to them to protect our town for future generations?

164 Hewlett Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TT

Comments: 13th February 2026

Not in keeping with Cheltenham. An atrocious design

4 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SG

Comments: 10th November 2025

I write to object to this development. As others have commented, development per se is a positive, however, the poorly considered design presented, lacks any thought to the environment within which they are going to sit. Both from material choices, size, height, and position.

The Borough plan requires that any development enhances the character of the area. It will be clear from our address, we are such a development. We thought carefully about how to achieve modernity in an area where there is both grandeur, classicism, and multiple occupancy, are all part of the community. Things that all areas need to thrive. I note that this development seeks to apply a very unimaginative use of modern rendered boxes, amongst a mix of Regency buildings and green space. In particular, I feel that the three storey height in this environment over shadows the surrounds and dominates the scene. My objection is not to the modern architecture approach, indeed I think a faux Regency would be worse. Given the amount of greenery, etc that the plot allows, 'hiding' any replacements for the buildings that currently sit there, would be a really interesting use of creativity. In addition, it seems that squeezing two large houses into that space is borne out of a development investment need and not the environmental need. This scheme is a blunt force and a blot on the landscape.

51 Merestones Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SU

Comments: 13th February 2026

I would like to comment on the plans (ref: 25/0567/FUL) for new dwellings at the University of Gloucestershire Park Campus.

In the planning documents GCC Highways requested provision of pedestrian access to the area where there is currently only vehicular access available. The developer

response rejected this on the basis that the access point is not well-used by people on foot.

This assertion is wrong and I object to the plans in their current form. This is a very popular access point to the Park with locals and visitors arriving on foot and bicycle. It is already dangerous with pedestrians (including children attending Junior Parkrun and other sporting activities) having no alternative but to share the vehicle access point with cars. Additional dwellings with additional car movements will only make this more dangerous.

Maintaining vehicle only access builds in car dependency and puts vulnerable road users at risk. It is unacceptable to proceed with this develop without provision for pedestrian movements.

4 Alexandra Street
Tivoli
Cheltenham
GL50 2UQ

Comments: 26th February 2026

Letter attached.

The Rosary
Gretton
Cheltenham
GL54 5EP

Comments: 4th March 2026

I OBJECT to the planning application ref 25/01567/FUL on the following grounds:

1. I fully endorse the comments on the previous iteration by CBC's Conservation Officer and Cheltenham Civic Society, which I believe to apply still to the latest iteration. The latest application amendment fails to address and of these concerns just by cynically knocking off the top storey. That lazy attitude in itself demonstrates the applicant's apathy towards the Conservation Area and their duty towards it.
2. The application fails to address the primary consideration, which is the DUTY under s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
3. The proposal is ugly and fails to comply with any design provisions in NPPF, the National Design Guide, the JCS or the Cheltenham Plan. It is hard to pick out any planning policy which would support such an ugly building. It is also not sufficient to hide behind the cliché that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. My 7 year old niece called this scheme ugly, even though she doesn't have 7 years' architectural training or an art GCSE to her name!
4. The proposal develops land that was never intended to be developed as primary residences (just for low level service buildings) and fails to relate appropriately to this important character area.

5. While you cannot suppose to tell the future, this proposal creates a threatening precedent for wholesale redevelopment of the inside of the teardrop of the Park. That threat is likely to become more real with the steady sell-off of University assets as the establishment shrinks and moves to Gloucester. CBC must be mindful of this threat and its potential impacts.

Yours sincerely,

2 Arthur Bliss Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LN

Comments: 9th February 2026

Thank you for giving me a chance to follow up on my original objection to this application back in October. I see know reason to change those views but I would like to add the following points.

1. I note that the University is selling off other existing buildings around this campus so it is obviously in serious financial trouble, like many other universities. The political atmosphere is changing and the evolution of AI will change the need for many courses, and indeed so many universities.
2. I cannot remember how The University of Gloucestershire came by The Park Campus in the first place but surely it was seen as a safe custodian of this historic jewel in the middle of Cheltenham. If the only way for it to exist is to sell off the estate piecemeal, then this is truly the thin of the wedge: allowing a new build on green land. What will follow if this is allowed to go through?
3. Why was Robert Deacon allowed to buy the land in the first place? Who approved that? Did they have an assurance that planning permission would be granted? I am afraid it sounds a bit fishy to many of us who live close by.
4. I can understand the need to upgrade the existing buildings to modern standards for staff or student quarters or offices but not for new build. There are plenty of new build houses round the corner off the Shurdington Road, no more are needed on precious historic open space.
5. There is no need for a new entrance. It will mean chopping down precious trees and demolishing hedgerows that are a precious haven for wildlife. I know because I walk there most days in all weathers.
6. The road round The Park is a speed track and the construction of a new entrance will cause chaos and be dangerous. A simple gravel track for access to Broadlands from the existing gate is perfectly possible without causing tree felling and digging up the daffodil field.
7. It looks as though the work at The Farmery and Broadlands has already started. Much of the interior fittings have just been dumped outside and have now been there for several months. What a mess on the entrance for visitors using the car park to view the University. An example of how little the University cares for its environment.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment again. I do hope our precious heritage can be preserved.

Yours sincerely

2 Arthur Bliss Gardens
GL50 2LN

Comments: 10th November 2025

The Park

Reference 25/01567/FUL

Address Broadlands Lodge 56 The Park Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2RN

Description Creation of new vehicular access to the university car park. Demolition of The Farmery buildings and erection of 2no. dwellings. Change of use of Broadlands Lodge and the Farmery Lodge to residential with associated extensions, access and landscaping.

Objection to Planning Application

I object to the new buildings proposed on The Park. It is a conservation area and it fulfils a much needed green space for both students and local inhabitants to enjoy. There is no need for more housing in this area. Several hundred new houses within walking distance of the University are in an advanced state of construction just round the corner off the Shurdington Road. The application to cut down trees has already been defeated so I do not understand why an area has been fenced off with notices stating : ' Keep Out Tree Preservation Area.' ! This area which has always been open is awash with daffodils in the spring and has been enjoyed by all passers by for years. What right do Robert Deacon have to fence it off when they do not have planning permission and when they intend to cut down more trees and mature hedges. Or were they in fact assured of planning permission before they acquired the land?

It was a surprise to find that the University of Gloucestershire is selling off land in a conservation area. Presumably they have financial difficulties but this desperate measure is unjustified. It was all done rather secretly. During my early morning walk earlier in the year I found some surveyors at work near the car park entrance. When I asked them what they were doing they smiled, looked guilty and said something along the lines of it was just a routine survey. I rang the Estates Office at the University and was assured that there was no intention to build there. Why the secrecy and the lies?

There are further anomalies in the planning application . The average speed of 27 to 29 miles per hour is misleading. As a resident who regularly crosses the road there are a large number of vehicles driving well in excess of this speed. Every day I observe cars and vans doing well over 40 and some at least 60 mph. It can be a race track at busy times, as any local resident will endorse.

Making another car park exit further down the road will mean significant trees, hedges and scrubland will have to be destroyed to give decent views and access for turning vehicles as it becomes a far more pronounced bend.

In summary this application should be refused. It is unnecessary in housing terms and will spoil the environment. There should also be an enquiry into how the University was allowed to sell this land and why Robert Deacon was allowed to buy it without planning permission and fence it off.

8 Montpellier House
Suffolk Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2DY

Comments: 14th February 2026

Internally the houses look fine but externally they are simply ugly. Cheltenham is a very attractive town and new buildings should be harmonious. The architects need to go back to their office and give this a great deal more thought to make the houses fit in and make the new owners proud to live there.

17 Sarah Siddons Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LW

Comments: 13th February 2026

We confirm our agreement with the assessment and objections submitted by Cheltenham Civic Society and the Conservation Officer. This is an insensitive and inappropriate proposal for The Park Conservation Area. There is no connection between what is proposed and the unique heritage and environment of this important area within this beautiful town.

14 Westal Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BL

Comments: 16th February 2026

I fully support this planning application.

It will repurpose the underutilized buildings of Broadlands Lodge and Farmery Lodge.

The additional dwellings are of a modern design much in keeping with the flats at 81, The Park which were built recently.

I understand Robert Deacon is a very experienced developer and am excited to see the work begin.

24 Fairfield Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PN

Comments: 13th February 2026

I am adding my objection to this development and join those voices already on record. I am not objecting to the return of Broadlands Lodge and Farmery Lodge to residential use, but to the proposed two new buildings. Even if the proposed height has been reduced from three storeys to two, these buildings as shown do not "preserve or enhance" the character of this important conservation area. In style they do not look right in this area, as has been explained in detail by other commenters. It is not a question of being against modern buildings per se; but rather a question of the requirement to "enhance and preserve" this particular conservation area as a whole, which is a unique combination of green space, mature trees, and important historic architecture. I also wonder if the comments of the CBC Tree Officer have been taken on board, especially the suggestion that existing driveways/access are used, rather than building new, with the removal of trees that would require.

143 Hewlett Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TS

Comments: 13th February 2026

Ref 25/01567/FUL

I am writing to give my objection to the planning proposal, above. These "monstrous carbuncles" are quite out of place and should not proceed.

15 Upper Bath Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2BD

Comments: 13th February 2026

My previous comment update does not seem to have worked.

Object.

As previous, the proposed development in no way adds to the character of the conservation area. Cheap "developer friendly" materials are not in keeping nor do they enhance the Park .

Comments: 10th November 2025

I write to object this development. Whilst I am not against the development of the site and change of use to residential, the proposed metal and timber clad 3 storey houses are not in keeping with the surrounding area.

THE PARK CHARACTER AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT
JULY 2008

PLAN - "Action TP1: The Cheltenham Borough Local Plan states that new development shall preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area." the proposed buildings do not preserve or enhance the character of the area. The use of cheap, modern materials such as concrete effect render will have an obvious negative effect and damage rather than preserve the character.

"Action TP7: The Council will ensure that all development respects the important views within, into and from the Park character area" the proposed buildings do not respect the view within the area as they will be clearly visible from the road due to their height and the amount of glazing.

"Action TP11: The Council will ensure the retention of the spacious character of this important central space within the Park through ensuring that any future development or redevelopment within the grounds does not erode any of the open space. This will ensure the retention of this area of green open space which makes an essentially important contribution to the character area" placing four dwellings on this site, does not ensure the retention of the spacious character.

As stated, a key characteristic: "The pattern and layout of streets, the spaces between buildings, the form of the buildings and use of quality building materials complement each other. They combine together to give the area grandeur, elegance and spaciousness;" the use of render, timber and metal cladding on this style of modular box type building with black R8019 projecting framing, does not give the area grandeur or elegance.

"5.39 Due to high levels of development modern changes and intrusions have, to a degree, negatively impacted on the area's overall character" again, 3 storeys of concrete effect render, timber cladding and metal standing seam cladding negatively impact the character of the area.

The plot of land currently offers enough foliage to obstruct the view of the proposed buildings if they were to be 2 storey instead of the proposed 3 storey.

Permitting the building of 3 storey dwellings in the central area of The Park would set a precedent for the university to sell more of its service buildings to be redeveloped into residential dwellings.

A smaller scale development, using sympathetic materials and a architectural design in keeping with the character area would be supported.

32 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 16th February 2026

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development at Broadlands Lodge 56, The Park, Cheltenham.

Aside from the obvious damage to local wildlife in this green space, which does not need to be explained, I believe the buildings proposed are clearly very far out of keeping from the high-quality architecture of the area.

Recent developments in the area have already detracted from its appeal (flat roofed, badly proportioned, inappropriate materials etc), and the proposed buildings will do further damage as they are clearly emulate this inappropriate.

I believe Cheltenham is currently making grave planning errors are causing irreparable damage to nature and spoiling important historic parts the town. This application is one such error that will contribute if it is allowed to pass.

The s72 Duty requires applicants and the local planning authority (CBC) to pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. I believe this application fails to do that.

The extant Conservation Area Assessment and Management Plan for The Park Character Area identifies the open space of this part of the Park, which forms part of its character. It has never been built on, except for the low level service buildings that are to be replaced by this application.

Please reconsider this proposal so as not to look back in regret in the years to come.

Flat B
17 Lypiatt Terrace
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SX

Comments: 13th February 2026

We confirm our agreement with the assessments and objections raised by Cheltenham Civic Society and the Conservation Officer.
This is an inappropriate and insensitive proposal for The Park Conservation Area.

The Old Coach House Tivoli
Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TD

Comments: 10th November 2025

We live very close to the proposed development and, whilst we do not object to there being any development there, we do object to the plans as submitted for the following reasons:

- Our understanding of the local plan calls for any new development to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area - this proposed development does neither
- The proposed materials do nothing to complement the style and elegance of the surrounding properties
- The proposed buildings, being three storeys high, are clearly visible from the Park, which is against the stated intention of them to blend in and not intrude on the eyeline
- Acceptance of this proposed development without alterations to height and style of the buildings sets a precedent for further similar out of keeping development on adjacent university land

From 4 Alexandra St. Tivoli. Chelt
GL502UP.

Regarding the plans to convert/rebuild/
knock down/existing red brick buildings on
THE PARK [UNIVERSITY GROUNDS] & put modern
houses.

NO. The design for luxury, expensive
'Block houses' of a design that is
SITE INAPPROPRIATE — is not acceptable.
It would be fine at Battle Down or elsewhere,
NOT on such an important historical site
in the PARK.

Also — access — not safe. Accident
waiting to happen. It is ironic that planning
is refused elsewhere for drives — modern windows
that imitate the originals, door alterations on
existing houses, but plans can be submitted
for these houses, which are quite frankly
MEDIocre



REF:

25/01567/FUL

ALT REF:

PP-14318194

SITE

ADDRESS:

BROADLANDS LODGE

56 THE PARK

CHELTENHAM

GL50

2RN