



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

S. 78 PLANNING APPEALS

APPEALS BY Hinton Properties (Grovefield Way) Ltd

SITE: Land off Grovefield Way, The Reddings, Cheltenham, GL51 6RF

APPEAL 1 - APP/B1605/W/18/3200395

Hybrid application seeking detailed planning permission for a 5,034 sq.m of commercial office space (Use Class B1), 502 sq.m day nursery (Use Class D1), 1,742 sq.m Aldi food retail unit (Use Class A1), a 204 sq.m Costa Coffee retail unit and drive-thru (Use Classes A1 and A3), with associated parking, landscaping and infrastructure works. Outline planning permission sought for the erection of 8,034 sq.m of commercial office space (Use Class B1), together with associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure works, with all matters reserved (except access).

APPEAL 2 - APP/B1605/W/18/3214761

Hybrid application seeking detailed planning permission for 5,914 sq.m of commercial office space (Use Class B1), 502 sq.m day nursery (Use Class D1), 1,742 sq.m food retail unit (Use Class A1), with associate parking, landscaping and infrastructure works. Outline planning permission sought for the erection of 8,034 sq.m of commercial office space (Use Class B1), together with associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure works, with all matters reserved - except access (resubmission).

SUMMARY OF PROOF OF EVIDENCE

of

MR. PHILIP STADDON

ON BEHALF OF

Cheltenham Borough Council (The Local Planning Authority)

NOVEMBER 2018

PJS Development Solutions Ltd

Registered UK Office: 26 Lea Crescent, Longlevens, Gloucester Gloucestershire, GL2 0DU
Company Registration No. 08445492 VAT Registration No. 175100145
www.pjs-development-solutions.co.uk info@pjs-development-solutions.co.uk

SUMMARY

My name is Philip Staddon. I am a Planning professional with wide ranging experience. I provide Planning evidence on behalf of the Local Planning Authority in support of its decisions to refuse planning permission for the two appeal proposals, both of which include significant non-B1 development content on this identified employment site.

My evidence explains the history of the site, including the appeal decision in 2007 to allow Class B1 development on this (then) Greenbelt land, due to the significant shortfall of employment land in Cheltenham.

My evidence sets out my view that both appeal proposals will result in a significant reduction of land available for B1 employment floorspace delivery in this location. I explain that Scheme 1 would displace 1.38 hectares of consented B1 employment land and Scheme 2 would displace 1.08 hectares of consented B1 employment land.

I calculate that, using the Appellant's B1 floorspace density elsewhere on the site, this land could accommodate up to 6,373.50 square metres of office space, which I regard as significant. I further explain that, taken with the consented and now built BMW showrooms on part of the 2007 appeal site, the current appeal proposals would reduce the amount of land available for B1 employment development to less than half of the original site.

I explain that there is an undisputed significant shortfall of such employment land in Cheltenham and a widely held recognition of its importance to the local economy to support office based businesses and drive growth. The Grovefield Way site is the only currently available site in Cheltenham that can help meet the shortfall through an office business park development.

I set out that the proposals would not only reduce land available for its plan-led purpose of B1 floorspace delivery, but it would notably dilute the site's qualitative character and function as a business location and would fail to create a high quality business environment.

I explain that the development plans, in their statutory and emerging forms, are up to date, consistent with the NPPF and consistent with each other. The development plans promote and support B1 employment development on this site. The plans do not promote the displacement of planned employment land, which is in short supply, by unrelated developments for shops, drive-thru coffee outlets and day nurseries, all of which already exist nearby and cannot, in any event, deliver the same economic benefits to Cheltenham.

I conclude that the appeal proposals' introduction of substantial non-B1 land uses would conflict with the development plan and will result in demonstrable and significant Planning harm. I assess that the proposals do not constitute sustainable development and request that the Inspector dismisses both appeals.

Philip Staddon BSc, Dip, MBA (Distinction), MRTPI.