APPLICATION NO: 13/02139/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Emma Pickernell
DATE REGISTERED: 18th December 2013		DATE OF EXPIRY: 19th March 2014
WARD: St Marks		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	New Dawn Homes	
LOCATION:	32 Church Road, St Marks, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment of site comprising the erection of 6no. 1 bed apartments and 5no. 3 bed houses	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	19
Number of objections	18
Number of representations	1
Number of supporting	0

27 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 6th January 2014

I write to strongly object to this third application for the former Police site. My reasons for objecting remain for the previous application for fewer dwellings.

- 1. Over development of the site creating a density that is not in keeping with the surrounding properties.
- 2. The development would be out of keeping with the local area and adversely affect the present street scene.
- 3. Living in the area we have witnessed a number of traffic accidents in this location, and believe that the indicated parking allowance is insufficient, leading to an increase in on street parking.

Gainsford Cottage 45 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 6th January 2014

Letter attached.

St Marks Church Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 7th January 2014

My first concern is that we have not had any notification of this development through the post and only heard about it from a resident at the very last minute.

As the administrator of St Marks Church, I daily experience problems with the many cars parked on both sides of Church Road which is used by people commuting from the railway station as well as other places of work. I am very concerned that this development will result in at least 11 if not more cars needing to park in the road with only 5 spaces available off road. The position of the development near the end of the road will exacerbate the difficulties as people will park in the road near the junction causing problems for those turning into and out off Church Road. In view of the fact that the smaller development was refused I cannot see why this has been considered.

10A Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AN

Comments: 8th January 2014 Letter attached.

51 Devon Avenue Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 8BY

Comments: 23rd January 2014

I wish to express my concerns regarding the above application and wholeheartedly support the objections raised with yourselves by residents. I will not repeat those concerns as they are already well documented.

However, the overdevelopment of the site, lack of provision of adequate parking on the site, overlooking into nearby properties and safety issues regarding additional traffic are major issues.

I would urge the committee to strongly consider residents valid objections and refuse this application.

24 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AN

Comments: 7th January 2014

Like many other Church Road residents I have received no official notification of this new application for the development of the site at 32 - 34 Church Road; despite the fact that my house is located only two doors away from the site and I have submitted objections to the two previous development applications.

My objections remain the same as before: FAR TOO MANY DWELLINGS IN SUCH A SMALL SPACE. The resulting car parking and traffic flow problems will be horrendous. The flat roof design proposed for the properties is totally out of character with the neighbourhood and will stick out like a sore thumb. (It is worthy of note that the design bears no resemblance to the tasteful promotional material currently on display at the site!

28 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AN

Comments: 6th January 2014

I strongly oppose this latest submission that aims to secure permission to build an even greater number of dwellings than previously refused applications. My specific objections are:

- 1. <u>Parking</u>. Church Road is already congested and it was acknowledged that the development envisaged in the original application would exacerbate in-road parking issues; increasing the number of houses further will only make this parlous situation considerably worse. Specifically for us, turning into our driveway will be made much more difficult.
- 2. <u>Privacy</u>. Our house will be directly overlooked by the 3-storey apartment block, eroding our privacy considerably the addition of balconies in this latest revision of the plans would make this much worse.
- 3. <u>Traffic</u>. The addition of a 6-foot wall at the apex of an already dangerous junction will pose a clear traffic hazard. This has been clearly demonstrated by the thoughtless positioning of the advertising hoarding at this very position, restricting the view of oncoming traffic and making turning at the junction considerably more difficult a wall will be even worse!

The timing of the application over the Christmas and New Year holidays is concerning; it demonstrates a cynical approach to securing planning permission and a disregard for local residents.

Flat 2
The Ferns
30 Church Road
St Marks
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 7AN

Comments: 29th December 2013

I would like to request that the filter light to turn right onto Gloucester Road from Lansdown Road be increased in view of the increased traffic that would result from this, and the recent change to access direct to Church Road from the Lansdown Road. At present the junction doesn't always allow access to our road, and you can get stuck in the middle, which is potentially dangerous.

47 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AW

Comments: 6th January 2014

I was disappointed to discover that there has been another planning proposal for the site in Church Road. I am pleased that the site is being developed and that the old derelict police houses are being replaced. However, I have some concerns regarding the high density of the housing and the resultant parking problems.

High Density of Occupation:

The planning application is attempting to squeeze a large number of houses onto a very small plot of land to the detriment of the surrounding area and community. The original successful appeal 11/01196/FUL was for 5 x 3 bedroom houses and 5 x 1 bedroom flats. The new plans 13/02139/FUL add an extra 1 bed flat, which could result in an extra two people and two cars. The density of occupancy will be much higher than the majority of the surrounding properties. This will result in extra traffic and increased roadside parking in an area where these issues are already a problem.

Parking:

I believe that the high density of housing on such a small area of land will lead to an increase in parking on the surrounding roads.

Document 'REFUSED REVISED PROPOSED PARKING ALLOCATION' attached to the successful appeal 11/01196/FUL shows that there are 19 car parking spaces (including garages) for 5 x 3 bedroom houses and 5 x 1 bedroom apartments. The new planning application 13/02139/FUL adds another 1 bedroom apartment, but still retains the same 19 car parking spaces. So, there are potentially two extra people and two extra cars, but no extra car parking spaces. This does not even address an increase in visitors.

Overall, the development does not appear to include enough car parking spaces for the number of occupants. The flats have a double bedroom and a study and so could easily accommodate 2 people with 2 cars. A total of 9 parking spaces have been provided when there could be 12 cars.

It is also reasonable to suggest that each of the 5 x 3 bedroom houses could have two cars associated with them. The plans suggest that the 3 bedroom houses will use their garages to park a car. However, it is often the case that garages are not used for parking due to the inconvenience of manoeuvring a car into the garage and also accessing the car in the garage when there is a car parked on the space in front of it. Therefore, the overspill will inevitably end up parked in the street.

Where will visitors park? There are no allocated visitor spaces for the flats, so this will exacerbate the parking problem.

Church Road is very narrow and if parking worsens and cars park on both sides of the road, there will not be enough room for refuse trucks and emergency vehicles to pass. Extra parking will also make it difficult for me and other property owners in the surrounding area to access our driveways.

Change in Distribution of Parking:

The successful appeal 11/01196/FUL plans split the housing facades more evenly over the two different sides of the plot as one of the 3 bedroom houses faces in the opposite direction to the other 4 x 3 bedroom houses. This means that parking is more likely to be split over the roads on the East and West sides of the plot. The new plans for application 13/02139/FUL propose that all the 5 bedroom houses face towards the West and also move an extra car parking space for the flats on to that side. Therefore, it is likely that most of the parking problems will affect the road on that side, concentrating the problem in one area instead of splitting it more evenly between the East and West sides, and similarly exacerbated with visitors.

Finally, I would like to raise the fact that letters were sent out to local residents over the Christmas holidays. Many people go away over the holidays, so it may be that not everyone has had the chance to reply or had time to give such a considered response as they may have done. Also, I have not seen planning notices erected in the local area. Apologies, if I have missed them, but if they have been omitted, then the proposals may not have reached as many of the local residents as they could have done.

39 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 6th January 2014

Having only received the latest advisory of plans on the 20th Dec with a response date of the 7th Jan I cannot but help feel suspicious. Is this a ploy to minimise community feedback in the hope everyone is away for Christmas!

We strongly oppose these plans for 3 reasons:

1) Over Development

The previous application was REFUSED by committee based on the over density of the proposed plans. This was based on 5 Flats and 5 houses. These new plans are for the same amount of houses BUT 6 flats. This is a gross overdevelopment for such a small piece of land. The flats by virtue of their height, width, depth and location will dominate the plot and therefore have a daily detrimental effect to our and surrounding properties including in our case the lack of privacy given the apartment windows look straight into both our young daughters bedrooms and our living room. Furthermore we will experience reduced levels of daylight through our property, increase in noise and night time light pollution. Surely the existing plot cannot cope where once there was accommodation sufficient for two families, with now up to 40 people. This level of density cannot be tolerated in a non-city centre environ.

2) Lack of Parking

The lower end of Church Road is already a very busy road with Parking on both sides including the existing pavement areas around the existing plot. This is further compounded on Church Service days also when there are events not just at the church but at the Triumph garage. When this development goes ahead the new residents must be forced to use their garages as previous granted applications for this site have suggested. I request the planning committee visit church road on a Sunday morning to see the lack of parking there currently is.

3) Increase Traffic

The current plan with the proposed vehicular access intended would mean hazardous turning movements close to a major junction as a result of the newly configured lower end of Church Road where you can no longer turn right into from the Gloucester Road (opposite TGI s)

In the light of the outcome of the previous applications, and the general controversy surrounding these plans, I would like to request that any new application for this site from these developers is considered by the full Planning Committee. We are a family focused road in church road and have a tremendous community feel and spirit which the road prides itself on and whilst we all welcome the site being redevelopment we mustn't lose the community we have by shoe-horning in 1 bed flats instead of very much needed family homes.

37 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 7th January 2014

Letter attached.

49 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AW

Comments: 7th January 2014

I would like to reiterate my comments in my previous letters dated 12th September, 14th November and 21st November 2011 regarding the redevelopment of the above site. The fact that there is now 2 apartment blocks being proposed will exacerbate the problems with car parking and more traffic on the roads in the vicinity of this development. We believe potentially this will also exacerbate the already known problem of being able to easily access drives safely. We are aware there is a shortage of affordable properties close to town but surely something more in-keeping to the area i.e. just houses would be more beneficial to all concerned.

35 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 6th January 2014

Firstly I would like to make the point that although we have had the official length of time to respond to this application I do not think it fair to count all the public holidays over the Christmas period in the allocated time. I think we should have been given longer than normal or wait until the New Year. If we were trying to contact, find out about and converse with the council it would not have been possible as they were on holiday, as were many of the residents.

As a revision to the previous planning application I would expect only minor changes. However adding an additional dwelling I would say is a major change. At the hearing of a previous application for this site the councillors voted against it due to a too high density of population and the developers did reduce this as a result. Now with this revision it has increased again. Surely this should be rejected in the same way.

Now all of the 3 bed houses are facing the same way and so will have access to the same road the issues of safety as driving round, parking, reversing off drives will be more severe. The highways agency have obviously realised that this corner is dangerous considering the recent changes to the junction at the end of church road and Gloucester road. More cars and traffic are only going to aggravate the problem.

From the plans drawn up it seems that the building is going to extend onto the wider pavement at the tip of the plot where the 2 roads meet. It is already hazardous driving around that corner because of the angle of the junction. If the development extends over the pavement and the wall that is drawn on the plans does get built it will significantly restrict the view round the corner.

As a member of St. Mark church I have in the past informed the church congregation of the plans for the site as this will severely affect their parking for Sunday services as well as the many other times in the week that it is used by church members and otherwise. Many have expressed a concern and objected to the last plans. However this time due to the unfortunate timing, for us, of the letter I have not been able to let the congregation know of the plans. Therefore I pass on the objection from the congregation as well.

41 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AL

Comments: 5th January 2014

We live opposite the proposed redevelopment of 32 and 34 Church Road and therefore will be significantly affected by the proposed scheme.

The comments on record show that there is no unreasonable opposition to a development taking place. For example, a development incorporating 2 or even 3 good quality homes in the space available is likely to be quite welcome.

The Church Road residents who will be affected by the current proposal are being quite realistic in their appraisal of the obvious consequences of the current scheme receiving planning approval. If this scheme to squeeze eleven new families into such a small urban space is approved and completed, it must be accepted that any problems created, for either the established or new residents, will be of no concern to the Developer. An approved planned development entails approved planned consequences for the community.

Specifically, we object to the proposal on the following grounds:

The original proposal, which went to appeal, was for 5×3 bedroom houses and 5×1 bedroom apartments. The current proposal has increased this to 6×1 bedroom apartments.

The proposed buildings will be 3 storeys high, and will overlook our 2 storey house (and neighbouring houses) with the consequent loss of privacy.

The density of the development will mean a significant increase in traffic and parking problems. Church Road is already a congested area, with the road used for parking for the church, railway station, and the hotel and restaurant nearby, as well as residents. The 3 bedroom houses (and possibly the one bedroom apartments) are likely to have 2 cars per household, which means a potential increase of 22 cars in this small area. Whilst we note that there is provision for garages and parking, most people use their garages for storage, and there is not provision for parking spaces for 22 cars (and none for visitors). This means that people living in the development will park on the road, in an already congested area. Delivery vehicles often have trouble accessing houses in the road already. The police leafleted parked cars in Church Road last year highlighting the difficulties of parking, and the fact that emergency vehicles would not be able to access Church Road because of parking on both sides of the road. The development will make an existing problem far worse and possibly dangerous.

Finally, we would like to comment on the timing of the proposal and letter to residents. The letter arrived just before Christmas, in an envelope that looked as if it was advertising material, and could have easily been discarded amongst other Christmas post. We would respectfully suggest that letters are sent out again to residents for comment on the proposal, clearly marked to indicate that they are related to the proposed development.

33 Hatherley Lane Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 6PN

Comments: 7th January 2014

I work at St Mark's Church so I am in the vicinity of this site many times during the week. Already there is pressure on parking along and access to Church Road. This is a fairly small site so to put

so many new properties on to it will cause excessively more problems. Already, access to and from the A40 has been recently substantially curtailed because of traffic hazards in the area. Further down Church Road, both because of increased volume of traffic and cars (from commuters using the station) parking along Church Road and Fairmount Road, it is already dangerous trying to exit from Fairmount Road into Gloucester Road to turn right and get back on to the A40. It's only a matter of time before there will be accidents at more intersections in this area.

I understand that planning permission to develop this site less heavily has already been refused, so why has a further application for even more homes been allowed?

I have been passing that empty property on the site for a long time and it is only very recently that a board went up at all and it remained completely bare for a while. So it would seem that the developers don't want people to know what they're up to. Such subterfuge is deliberately underhand in my opinion.

I hope the authorities will seriously reconsider this application.

8 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7AH

Comments: 6th January 2014

I am a resident of Church Road and have made representations to the Council in respect of previous planning applications for this property. I am making this objection in some haste since I was only alerted to this latest application by another resident of Church Road on 6th January 2014; no information was provided to me by the Council.

I wish to object to this application on the following grounds:

- (i) that the Council has failed in its duty to consult local residents, since it failed to consult me personally despite my having raised previous objections;
- (ii) that the Council has failed in its duty to provide adequate time to make representations;
- (iii) that the same planning reasons which I put forward in 2011 to reject this development (and which the Council accepted when it rejected that application) are still relevant to this application. I therefore repeat my previous objections which will be on file.

I further wish to draw the attention of the Council that the record at the Land Registry (ref GR287899) relating to the transfer of this property to the current owners on 20 September 2011 contains the following statement "The Transfer to the proprietor contains a covenant to observe and perform the covenants referred to in the Charges Register and of indemnity in respect thereof'. A summary of the restrictive covenants is contained in the Land Registry record. I have extensively researched the details of this restrictive covenant, which are dated 1851 and 1927 and are clearly still in force.

I therefore believe that the proposed development is in contravention of these restrictive covenants, and should not proceed until the legal force of the restrictive covenants is confirmed.

9 Drayton Close Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 9QB

Comments: 6th January 2014

I oppose this 3rd application from the developers with the strongest objection having seen the plans for this small plot. Whilst not a neighbour to this plot (I feel sorry for those that are!), I will be affected as a regular visitor to Church Road. It is already very hard to park on service days and nigh on impossible to park for the mother and toddler Thursdays. I took my husband to bell ringing prior to Christmas on Monday night and I ended up parking on Griffiths Avenue - it was that busy with cars parking both sides of church road.

I have to say this application nearly passed us by (where are the site notices!!) if it wasn't for a large sign advertising the development I wouldn't have looked on the internet. Furthermore I could not see a planning application for the signage which is over-sized and obscures the already dangerous junction. I am concerned that when flats are built on this junction there will be accidents either involving vehicles or pedestrians or both.

14 Griffiths Avenue Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7BH

Comments: 6th January 2014

As churchwarden at St Mark's Church in Church Road I am very concerned about the lack of parking available on this site. It is possible that this number of houses and apartments could require parking for around 16 vehicles when I understand that only 5 spaces will be provided.

19 Milton Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL51 7ET

Comments: 7th January 2014

It came to my attention yesterday of the application for extension to the development of 32-34 Church Road.

As the most senior Churchwarden at St Mark I wish to respond on behalf of the parishioners with whom I have spoken, on behalf of friends who live within sight of the development and also personally.

It is unfortunate this was submitted over the Christmas period, as had this come to my attention sooner I should have been able to dwell on it longer and provide a more fully considered response. I should note that there is a feeling that this was a deliberate attempt to avoid community feedback and, whilst I'm certain it is all above-board, it does leave a feeling of grievance towards the whole project.

I should state that there are some very well thought through aspects of this project. If this were not eating into time with my family I would consider responding in a more balanced fashion with more comments.

So I must object to this application extension on the following grounds:

1. The provision for parking in the area is already at a premium. This development will principally affect the residents of the area and make day to day parking an issue.

On top of this, at St Mark's we have provision for 395 attendees and even with half of this capacity we struggle with parking. We are already looking to consider inventive ways of helping with this issue for local residents however the reduction in parking around the area will compound the issue. This is a weekly issue on Sunday mornings and for events such as Remembrance Day, Christmas and weddings, this will have an even greater impact.

- 2. The design statement part 3 clause 2 does not feel like it has been met. The flat roof and square block style of the developments does not feel in keeping with the opposite housing and thus does not feel like it will enhance the area. Granted the flats opposite are not entirely dissimilar but their presence towards Gloucester road feels more respectful of the area.
- 3. If I'm correct, the reference to PPG3 in part 6.3 is not entirely relevant as this has been replaced by PPS3. The principle drive behind PPS3 is to provide sustainable dwellings for people in a community. Indeed community is the focal point of this document. The community aspect of this development has not been drawn out within the report and the reference to "housing density" feels inappropriate. There is clearly a place for this; however this should not be used as an argument to simply provide the developer with a route to maximising financial returns, if it comes at a cost to local residents.

Thank you for taking time to read this. I would of course be willing to be contacted and take time to meet to discuss this further on behalf of St Mark's Church if this were desirable to yourself.

W Church Road 11th Jenuary 2014 We hope to Committee well again be sympathetic to our objections St hacks Chellenham BUILT four nef: 13/02139/ful GUSI 7AL Towns sincerely Dear ling Crews re: Proposed redevelopment at 32 Church Koord, St Incentes, Cheltenhaum We ack now ladge accept of your letter of the hs Tracey Crews Heled of Clanning 17h Wednes 2013. Chellenham Borough Council We can only represent to objections set out in our letters of the 12th September, 16th 7 21st municipal Offices Novamber 2013, which are enclosed. Cheltenhoun, 9150 17P The reasons for the original planning cc. Comallor Mrs 87 Holliday application being refused still apply. We appreciate there has to be a development in the about site, but strongly object to the present mediterranean style design which would be totally out of character with the existing houses and Bengalows.

45 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham GL51 7AL

Mr Robert Lindsey
Development Control Manager
Cheltenham Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham GL50 1PP

21 November 2011

Dear Mr Lindsey

Revised Plans for development of site at 32 Church Road, St Marks, Cheltenham, GL51 7AL

We write once more to strongly oppose the further revised plans relating to the above. The concerns set out in our letters of the 12th September and 14th November still stand.

The revised plans show 19 parking spaces, 10 of which are attributed to the 5 houses. It is a natural statistic that 80% of householders do not park their cars in their garages, using them mostly for storage. Common sense tells us that the 5 3-bed houses squeezed in this very small site will have very small rooms with very little storage facilities, if any, and as they have flat roofs, will have no loft space.

These houses are obviously built for family occupation and therefore it is more than likely that there will be more than one car per household with one car hopefully parked on the drive and the other inevitably on the road.

We hope the Planning Committee will be more sympathetic to our very real concerns as we residents will have to live by your decisions.

Yours sincerely

c.c. Mrs Wendy Hopkins

45 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham GL51 7AL

Mr Robert Lindsey
Development Control Manager
Cheltenham Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham GL50 1PP

14 November 2011

Dear Mr Lindsey

Revised Plans for 32-34 Church Road, St Marks, Cheltenham, GL51 7AL

We write again to strongly oppose the revised plans relating to the above and reiterate all our concerns set out in our first letter of the 12th September, which was not acknowledged.

The reduced density of dwellings proposed is still far too excessive for the size of the plot.

Another one of our concerns is the visual impact of the proposed development. We would have hoped and expected you as a responsible Council to oppose any development that was completely out of character with its surrounding areas. Ultra modern flat roofed properties are ugly and in no way fit into the area. Something along the lines of the development on the corner of Church Road and Gloucester Road would be more in keeping.

We feel Cheltenham is on danger of losing its identity as the centre of the Cotswold with the mish mash of ultra modern houses that are sprouting up spoiling our lovely Town.

Yours sincerely

c.c. Mrs Wendy Hopkins

45 Church Road St Marks Cheltenham GL51 7AL

Mr Robert Lindsey
Development Control Manager
Cheltenham Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham GL50 1PP

12 September 2011

Dear Mr Lindsey

Planning Ref: 11/01196/FUL - 32-34 Church Road, St Marks, Cheltenham, GL51 7AL

We write to oppose the planning application relating to the above and set out below our reasons as follows:-

1. DENSITY

Surely to build 13 dwellings on such a small site on which stand a pair of semi detached houses, is totally excessive and shows total disregard to existing residents.

2. VISUAL IMPACT

The two recent developments in Church Road blend in, to a degree, with their neighboring properties. The planned new ultra modern looking properties, especially the two blocks of flats described by the Developers as "book ends", stand out completely dominating and overshadowing the whole area, altering the whole character of Church Road with its old Church, Edwardian type detached houses and bungalows.

3. TRAFFIC

Church Road is very much used as a through road. We cope with enough traffic which is generated by the Church with services, weddings, funerals a nursery and meetings held at the Church Hall on a regular basis. Customers from TGI Fridays, the Motorcycle garage, visitors and staff at Holly House park their cars in the road as do some train commuters who leave their cars all day. Add to that visitors to existing residents then hopefully you will appreciate that Church Road, at times, is pretty "full up". Surely commonsense dictates that such a high density development on such a small area will generate even more traffic and parking problems, not to mention possible safety problems, causing existing residents much concern to say the least.

We hope that you will, as a Council, take note and care enough about our concerns and reconsider developing the site in sympathy with the existing community.

Yours sincerely

Robin Hollow, 10a Church Road, St. Mark's, Cheltenham, Glos. GL51 7AN

07/01/2014

The Director of Planning Cheltenham Borough Council The Municipal Offices Cheltenham

Ref. 13/02139/FUL

BUILT

Red -7 JAN 2014

ENVIRONMENT

Dear Sirs,

We are residents in Church Road and object strongly to the way the developers of the site 32-4 Church Road have been treating the neighbours over this site. The plan involving 5 flats and five houses is quite bad enough. The request to change this plan to 6 flats and five houses should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

BUILT

Read - 6 JAN 2014

Cresby 37 Church Road St. Marks Cheltenham GL51 7AL

6th January 2014

Ms Tracy Crews
Development Manager
Cheltenham Borough Council
PO Box 12 Municipal Offices
Promenade, Cheltenham
Glos. GL50 1PP

Dear Ms Crews

Proposal: Redevelopment 32-34 Church Road, St. Marks, Cheltenham, GL51 7AL Ref: 13/02139/FUL

- It is an obvious gross over development. Eleven dwellings are squeezed into a ¼ acre triangular plot, which is literally sandwiched between the two through roads of lower Church Road. Both roads are very busy at peak times with traffic moving in both directions from the two main roads. Between 8 am and 8.20 am there is a constant stream of school children on foot and bicycles.
- There is inadequate provision for parking. Two cars per household is now the norm. The extra cars and visitors cars will exasperate existing parking problems. Already the cars overflowing from the car park of no. 30 Church Road line the road and pavements. Due to the proximity of the Rail Station, GCHQ and the motor cycle business, there is already a plague of long-term parking. Sunday brings no respite, with the parking of church-goers' cars. Weddings, funerals and other functions bring further problems.
- The three story apartment block will loom up in front of my house. The open aspect, ambiance and privacy I now enjoy will be destroyed.
- The existing splay at the apex of the sited was clearly arranged for traffic safety. The proposed development encroaches onto this splay (which is in effect public property). This encroachment together with the adjoining apartment block will clearly affect road safety.
- If the proposed development is allowed to proceed, the telegraph poles and lighting standard will have to be relocated. The residents should be consulted.

Page 2

Also I wish to complain about the timing of being informed of the new proposal. Due to Christmas holidays and New Year, there was insufficient time to consider the details and full implications of the new proposal.

Yours faithfully.



Petition against the development planned on 32-34 Church Road, St. Marks

Name printed	Signature	Address
Traine printed	Oignature	37 CHURCH ROND
		ST. MARKS, CHETTENHAM, GLST FAL
		27 Church Rd
		STELLERIS
		27 Charcen Rol.
		//
		The CHERCHE ROSE
		25 CHUZZ4 R3
		33, Churcholdy
		68 Roman Rd Chelterham G151.8AA
		21 Church Ro
		9 Causen Rd.
		15 Church Cord
		5 Christis Roma St Tlate
		5 Chirch Road
		1 CHURCH RD
		UNDGEWEND 1156
		CHURCH ED
		Tourson's Here
		e-
		7 church Read.

Petition against the development planned on 32-34 Church Road, St. Marks

₁ame printed	Signature	Address
-		24 CHURCH ROAD.
		ST MARKS.
•		The Beeches
		cherech Red
		23 CHURCH (2)
		ST MARKS.
		20 CHURCH POND
		ST MRKS
		GEON HOTON, BI
		ST MARKS
		15
		7 ist and an
		3 STIMENCO
		14 Church Pol
		St. Mah
		14 Chirch Rd
		ST. Marx.
		16 CHURCH PL
		ST. MARKS
		100 CHURCH ROLLS
		ST MARK'S.
		10= Chynl Rind. 5" Har & GLSI YAN
		tring Theo House
		ECHURIH ROAD.
		96. MARKS
		8 CHURCH ROMO
		ST MITTERS CHECKENHAM
		IN CHURCH RD
		CHELTENHAM
		49 CHURCH ECAD
		ST HACKS
		49 CHURCH ROAD
		ST. MARKS CHOTOWHAY

Petition against the development planned on 32-34 Church Road. St. Marks

HILL CHURCH REST MARKS 11 12 Church Rodo: 11 6 CHURCH RODO: 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	⊿me printed	Signature	Address
11 12 Church Rodd: 11 12 Church Rodd: 11 6 CARECTRAN FLAT 5, 26 11 11 11 (HURCH ED) 11 (HURCH ED) 11 (HURCH ED) 12 Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 43 CHURCH Rd.			47, CHURCH RD,
11 12 Church Rodo . 11 6 CHURCHRAM FLAT 5, 26 11 11 11 CHURCH ED 116 (HURCH ED 118 Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH RM). 43 (MURCH RM).			
11 12 Church Rodo . 11 6 CHURCHRAM FLAT 5, 26 11 11 11 CHURCH ED 116 (HURCH ED 118 Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH RM). 43 (MURCH RM).			45 CAUREN RA
12 Church Road: 11 6 CALLECTRAN FLAT 5, 26 III II CHURCH ED 16 (HURCH ED 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH RM.). 31 CHURCH RIPD.			GT MARKS
12 Church Road: 11 6 CALLECTRAN FLAT 5, 26 III II CHURCH ED 16 (HURCH ED 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH RM.). 31 CHURCH RIPD.			
FLAT 5, 26 FLAT 5, 26 II II CHURCH ED I (HUECH ED I Sa Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH RM.).			11
ECHUSCHRAM FLAT 5, 26 FLAT 5, 26 II II (HORCH ED) Ile (HORCH ED) IS Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 22 Church Rd. 43 (HORCH ED).			12 Church Road:
FLAT 5, 26 FLAT 5, 26 II II CHURCH ED IL (HURCH ED ISa Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 22 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH ROM).			11
for 5,26 "" " (Huzer 2D) 16 (Huzer 2D) 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 22 Church Rd. 43 (Huzer Rd.).			6. CHUZCHROAD
11 CHUSCH ED 16 (HUECH ED 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 72 Church Rd. 43 (HUBCH ROLD.			FLAT 5, 26
16 (HURCH ED) 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 22 Church Rd. 43 (HURCH RM).			fur 5,26
16 (HURCH ED 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 72 Church Rd. 43 (HURCH ROLD.).			11
16 (HURCH ED) 18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 72 Church Rd. 43 (HURCH ROLD).			11
18a Church Rd. 39 Church Rd. 72 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH ROLD). 31 CHURCH ROLD.			11 CHURCH RD
39 Church Rd. 72 Church Rd. 43 (MURCH ROLD). 31 CHURCH RIFD.			16 (HUECH ED
31 CHURCH ROYD.			18a Church Rd.
31 CHURCH ROYD.			39 Church Rd
31 CHURCH RIMD.			
			43 (HURCH ROXI).
28 CHURCH RS			31 CHURCH RIAD.
			28 CHURCH RS