

APPLICATION NO: 13/01683/REM		OFFICER: Mr Ian Crohill	
DATE REGISTERED: 1st October 2013		DATE OF EXPIRY : 31st December 2013	
WARD: Battledown		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Persimmon Homes		
LOCATION:	GCHQ Oakley, Priors Road, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Approval of reserved matters pursuant to Outline Planning permission ref: CB11954/43 and ref:01/00637/CONDIT for the erection of 311 dwellings and associated roads, footways, parking, landscaping, drainage and public open space.		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	19
Number of objections	17
Number of representations	2
Number of supporting	0

The Oaks
Harp Hill
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PR

Comments: 13th January 2014

I have been sent a letter from your department regarding the above application, relating to the erection of 311 dwellings on the GCHQ Oakley site.

I have tried to view the detailed plans on your web site, but an error shows up saying "exception error" so I cannot see them.

However, there is a very significant and real need to evaluate the traffic flow in this area. I live at The Oaks, Harp Hill, GL52 6PR having recently moved there a few months ago from the Montpellier area.

Harp Hill is currently used as a mini motorway, with high speeds and excessive volume of traffic for what is essentially a lane. People come off the B4075 Hewlett Road to avoid the junction with the A40 London road due to excessive traffic build up. Queues are often as far back as the junction with Atherley Way from the A40, hence the use of Harp Hill as a short cut, as people try to get to the A40. They currently come up Harp Hill before turning onto Greenway Lane before connecting with the A40 again in Charlton Kings opposite the Esso petrol station. Greenway Lane has had traffic calming measures introduced, I can imagine for exactly the reasons I state for Harp Hill. I have been on Harp Hill 2 months, and have had 3 significant near miss accidents on coming out of my property, one near miss on trying to enter my property (car behind was travelling far too fast, and did not expect anyone to be stopped turning into a property).

Harp Hill is currently, already dangerous, excess speed, volume of traffic, and is not structured for the current volume of vehicles travelling along it. It is simply not possible to add 311 dwellings to a location that will substantially increase further this traffic. What is already a potential death trap will become without doubt a major source of incidents.

Harp Hill is meant to provide access to local properties and for the recreational users of Cleeve Hill, it is not designed as an A-road, not even a B-road.

Possibly a study of traffic flow at the A40/B4075 junction can reduce queuing times at peak periods, certainly the current 4 directional flow is too high for the junction, one direction needs to be rerouted to reduce traffic light sequences. The incentive for a short cut is time, and only reducing traffic delays at this junction (without a new relief road being built) will impact on decisions of drivers.

Considerable thought must go into the road situation surrounding the development, Cheltenham already has a terrible traffic issue, and this development will only impact further on this. 311 dwellings is far too high for the infrastructure surrounding the plot if no relief road is created to take people onto the A40 to enable access out toward Oxford. I can imagine similar scenarios for the roads leading into Cheltenham town centre. The road network cannot cope with more vehicles without a change to the capacity, it is madness to keep building houses when anyone who lives in the town can clearly see the road network is inadequate. It is incomprehensible that the council can agree to building more houses without having in place a suitable traffic management scheme. It seems it will need total gridlock before any sense is forthcoming. That will be too late.

I do hope I do not have to suffer a serious road incident on Harp Hill to prove my point, but I repeat, the current traffic flow is already too fast and dangerous without the impact of another 400 plus vehicles in the same location.

Thank you for your time

High View
Harp Hill
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PR

Comments: 27th October 2013

HOW WILL HARP HILL BE ABLE TO COPE WITH VEHICLES FROM 311 NEW RESIDENCES?
ARE YOU WIDENING ANY OF THE ADJOINING/EXISTING ROADS? ARE YOU BUILDING
NEW ACCESS ROADS?
HAVE YOU PREPARED NEW TRAFFIC PLANS?

43 Yorkley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FP

Comments: 14th October 2013

Whilst the principle of the development has been established through the outline permission, I consider that the application fails to deliver a sustainable development for the following reasons:

1. Mix of the market units is inappropriate. Only one two-bed house proposed out of a total mix of around 15% 2 bed units, virtually all apartments. Greater mix of smaller dwellings is required to meet the needs of local people.

2. Affordable housing mix is also too narrow. More dwellings required. Too many apartments. Battledown already has a number of apartment blocks.

3. Some elements of innovative / interesting design. However, a number of areas lack high quality design.
4. Site layout lacks legibility any permeability in places. Looks like a maze in parts.
5. Apartment blocks at the front of the site appear bulky and dominate the frontage. This is further enhanced by the rising ground levels. Certain apartment blocks also lack architectural detailing on certain elevations.
6. Apartment blocks do not appear to have any amenity spaces.
7. Lack of usable green space on the site. Significant sized site should have more public open space for residents to enjoy. Hard standing dominates.
8. Plots 109, 221, 294 & 297 lack sufficient natural light to rear elevation main habitable rooms through roof lights.
9. Parking court adjacent existing Battledown development lacks natural surveillance.
10. Parking to plot 40 too isolated from dwelling.
11. Proximity of plot 40 to 44 could result in a loss of privacy. Same for plot 43 to 41.
12. Whilst appreciating that the level of affordable housing would have been lower than current requirements, it is very unfortunate that only 12% of the development will be for social housing.

In conclusion, the proposed mix, design and layout require further work to help provide a high quality design that integrates and enhances the surrounding area.

The development so far on Battledown lacks any architectural design or interest. Therefore, this is a great opportunity to enhance the built environment in this area.

47 Yorkley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FP

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I have only lived on this estate for a few months but am already deeply concerned by the amount of traffic chaos that I have experienced. With an extra 300 - 600 cars using the same entrance/exit route I fully expect the problems to get considerably worse.

I agree with everyone else when they say that the current system of having one entrance/exit route is simply unworkable and a danger to everyone. We have been informed that when working on phase 1 and phase 2 the entrance by Sainsburys was built to incorporate phase 3! Well in my opinion that thought process was simply not good enough. I would like to know why phase 3 could not have their own entrance/exit which was previously used by employees of GCHQ?

The roads in the estate are littered with cars parked on the roads and on bends causing very dangerous blind spots. On numerous occasions I have had to reverse back to allow a car coming the other way to get through and witnessed near head on collisions!

The health and safety of residents living on the estate needs to be a primary concern and I do wonder how on earth a fire engine or ambulance could get through the parked cars in an emergency!

In my opinion the building of many more apartments on the estate is the wrong way to go and they look devoid of create thought.

Phase 3 would also inhibit the views of Cleeve Hill for residents living on Yorkley road with numerous trees cut down and wildlife also affected.

In my opinion I believe that the thoughts and very real concerns of local residents will count for nothing anyway as the need for housing and profit for those concerned always takes priority.

51 Yorkley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FP

Comments: 12th November 2013

Objections for the following reasons:

Proposed access through the current development and in particular Yorkley Road for proposed car parking for circa 12 car park spaces to be able to access and utilise the proposed allotment in the adjacent recreation field: it should be noted that when accessing allotments people come and go frequently every day of the week. The roads created currently within Phase 1 and 2 could not cope with this continued frequency and additional traffic. The noise of constant visitors arriving and departing with gardening equipment, shutting of car doors/car boots and further clanging of the proposed chain/metal fencing to be used for access will also be a noise nuisance and will be continual on all days of the week. The proposed car parking spaces and allotment are too close to adjacent properties on Yorkley Road and Goodrich Road and noise nuisance should be noted. This will be continual with frequency of visitors through all hours of the days and nights. It should be noted that the car parking spaces proposed will be just below the windows of adjacent properties on Yorkley Road and Goodrich Road.

Consideration should also be given with regards the teenage youths who currently group together most weekend evenings/nights on this plot of land. They are currently out of harms way on this plot and not vandalising properties or cars, despite being very clearly heard when they talk as the land is close to the properties on Goodrich Road and Yorkley Road. What will these youths be able to do instead and where can they go? We must hope that they will not be vandalising the TWO parks in Yorkley Road any more than they have currently. What safety measures will be put in to place for the protection of cars which have allocated parking spaces right next to the parks? Currently there is no policing of these parks during the evenings. Vandalism and noise nuisance are already a concern to adjacent properties. Will there be a prevention of further noise nuisance and vandalism?

In addition to the frequent coming and going of traffic for the proposed allotment I further object to the access for a further circa 500 cars. The current infrastructure cannot cope. Cars are abandoned on grass areas due to lack of parking for the numbers of residents within the currently occupied buildings and trees and bushes have been driven over as the roads are too narrow for cars to manoeuvre. There have already been several domestic animals killed in this area as they have not seen traffic approaching and neither has traffic seen them. Concern that this will one day happen to a child or adult.

It should be noted that the roads are currently of extreme danger due to the sharp bends and clusters of cars parked. When there is ice on the roads during the winter periods the dangers further increase, in particular around the blind spots. There is DANGER OF DEATH.

Current lack of car parking space causing hazards: how can any increase to vehicles in this area enable a flow of traffic? Consider residents coming and going from driveways near Sainsburys, already a hazard.

How can emergency vehicles access current properties and where will they park? There is CURRENTLY NO SPACE FOR PARKING AND DIFFICULTY FOR MANOEUVRE OF ALL VEHICLES. This is a considerable HEALTH AND SAFETY CONCERN.

It is noted in the glossy brochure entitled Land at GCHQ Oakley Development Phase 3 From the Ground Up, under the section entitled New Homes, The Key Facts, that the height of the apartment buildings will not exceed the height of the existing buildings on the site. This is INCORRECT. The proposed apartment buildings do indeed EXCEED THE HEIGHT of the current white buildings. The current buildings are one floor only, THE PROPOSED BUILDINGS ARE NOT ONE FLOOR ONLY. It should be noted that the HEIGHT of the proposed apartment buildings will create a LOSS OF LIGHT between the hours of 6am and 10am as the sun rises from behind this site. The current properties on Yorkley Road and Goodrich Road will be impacted by LOSS OF LIGHT between the hours of 6am and 10am as the sun rises from this position. It should be noted that properties do not have windows for all aspects and therefore this is the ONLY LIGHT RECEIVED ALL DAY.

It should further be noted that properties within Phase 1 and 2 of the current development will lose the enjoyment of views to the area of outstanding natural beauty. Proposed BUILDING HEIGHTS EXCEED what is currently in situ.

It should be noted that the proposed plans for Phase 3 seek to cut down the majority of the trees in the area which have been in situ for many years. As expected within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, there are numerous wildlife that currently live in this habitat. What will happen to this wildlife as there are only numerous dead or otherwise new and stick like plants planted by Taylor Wimpey in which animals cannot live. Do the council or developers propose to rescue all the animals before any demolition and re-home them as much as is possible in the local area or are they intended to be killed/die during the demolition?

35 Goodrich Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FT

Comments: 16th October 2013

I think the properties are a great investment and most welcome, but certainly with the road as it is we are struggling to access our current properties with the increasing traffic. This in itself will become a safety hazard with no doubt someone bound to be injured. I have seen this on happen on occasions; to be honest it almost happened to me because of vehicle parking in unreasonable locations and making blind pots for oncoming traffic.

I have tried addressing this on your recommended website but struggling to access. I would like to voice my concerns and hopefully it would be counted in with all other complaints of the same.

Priors Road as it is currently is a health and safety hazard not mentioning further up on the road where blind section on bend to access the road to the properties close to currently GCHQ .

I have on many occasions as well as many others been traffic jammed for over 30 minutes at the entrance of Priors Road because of heavy vehicles traffic from Sainsbury's offloading trucks. Also the road is blocked by people parking on side of there properties with just about a car width and making it impossible to pass through.

With increase traffic on this road can only be a hazard waiting for an accident to happen someone is bound to get ridden over I have seen it , its a disaster at times and eventually the government will be held to responsible should some life be taken because or concerns have not been taken into account.

Hopefully this email is in reach of the right persons and the concerns are taken seriously with regards to health and safety of the current traffic not mentioning what still to come.

Comments: 22nd October 2013

I was asked once again to voice my opinion I tend agree with most of the house owners in the estate that a second entrance to the estate via Harp hill is excellent idea to ease of the traffic. This will ease a vast amount of traffic for people wanting to go home instead of passing by Sainsbury's, especially for those staying further on top of the estate. We must also take into consideration that the people on the estate have families and friends - this also adds to the traffic jams. The current traffic entering Priors Road will not only be traffic for the people living in the estate but all passing traffic in the surrounding areas accessing Sainsbury's for the afternoon shopping. In most days this is a traffic jam do not want to imagine with further increase home owners traffic.

I have witnessed on many occasions where kids on skate boards were almost run over because of the traffic and the blind bends/spots cause by current cars parking ridiculously on the side of the roads blocking the roads. I have been forced reverse the car just to allow the current traffic to flow. I live at the top of the estate and witness near misses many times I can see this is waiting for an accident to happen where alternately the council will be held responsible as this has been reported on more than one occasion. There have been incidents where I have left my car at the entrance of Priors Road until the traffic jam has cleared. Most of the local residents have young kids living on this estate and therefore my main concern is for there safety. We must remember kids are easily distracted and I am sure one incident is to far many. It's early stages, therefore a further access consideration can be easy planned for and justified as a health and safety. Therefore access from harp hill can only be welcomed and a blessing to you and everybody living on the estate.

28 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 21st October 2013

Phase 3 Oakley

I'm not against the development, but I cannot accept the current proposals for VEHICLE ACCESS.

As a resident of Phase 1 of the Oakley development the traffic is already a problem (mainly because of the cars parked on Clearwell Gardens and Redmarley Road). Many times I have to reverse in order to allow other traffic to pass, both Clearwell Gardens and Redmarley are in many areas one lane roads because of the huge numbers of cars parked on the road (due to the serious lack of off-road parking spaces available). Redmarley Road, next to Sainsbury's, it is serious problem as it is the only access to such a large number of houses. Any issue on that section could prevent emergency services reaching hundreds of houses.

I'm very concerned about the extra traffic the Phase 3 development could create. Adding more than 100-200 cars daily (very pessimistic view, more likely 500+) to these roads will cause havoc and increase the danger for all the residents (many of the pedestrian crossings and pavements are already blocked by parked cars at the moment).

Because I cannot see how parking can improve on these two roads (Clearwell Gardens and Redmarley) in the future (it will only get worse in time when people can afford more cars per household) the only solution I can see it is to not allow traffic through existing development and to provide access for the whole new development to Aggs Hill. It has already being used by a large number of GCHQ employees for so many years so I cannot see why this should be a problem.

Comments: 20th January 2014

Looking at the revised layout drawing published here on the 2nd of Jan 2014 I can NOT see any changes that address the main concern raised by the residents of stage 1 and 2 of the development: vehicle traffic on the existing roads. Based on this I strongly object to the current plans for the vehicle access.

I'm also surprised than not everybody in the estate is aware of the stage 3 development and the fact the hundreds of vehicles will use these roads when this stage is complete. It looks like the letters regarding the application were not sent to every household in the estate. Quite shocking in my opinion!

37 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I live in Clearwell Gardens and feel the road cannot support the proposed plans. Parking is already an issue and the Road is not wide enough to support all the extra traffic.

26 Brockweir Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FW

Comments: 9th October 2013

NOTE: Some of my neighbours before they purchased their houses had searches conducted and they were informed that the final stage development included the top of Brockweir Road becoming a cul-de-sac, resulting in the access/exit for us going out of the top of the site onto the bottom of Aggs Hill. Evidently then, Taylor Woodrow were aware of the impending traffic flow problem. This is potentially a major traffic flow problem that needs sorting out before the final development starts.

Phase 3 development Oakley

1. VEHICLE ACCESS

Your statement - FROM THE GROUND UP document September 2013 - "The upgraded road junction serving Sainsbury's and the existing development has been constructed to a capacity which can accommodate the delivery of the final phase" is from my experience as a resident of Phase 2 totally untrue. This situation will get worse when the petrol filling station is installed.

The present entrance/exit from this estate is fraught with danger. At the traffic lights on Priors Road the two lane out and the one and sometime two lane in route is a problem. At the bus stop point the road is reduced to an 8 feet gap one way. The large lorries delivering to Sainsbury's have great difficulty accessing the depot. The Local council has resorted to leaving stickers on cars where the dustbin lorries have access difficulty. The Fire Brigade found when they tested the site they had to mount kerbs and negotiate around parked cars because of the narrow routes around the estate.

The present 1 and 2 phases are not constructed to a parking density of 2.33 cars per household, AS IS INTENDED - YOUR STATEMENT - FOR PHASE 3. In fact, many of the houses have no allocated parking but use the road immediately outside their houses. This and the fact that a lot of houses have been purchased as letting opportunities and as a result have more than the expected one car per household, has caused parking problems throughout the estate.

During the snow falls of the winter two years ago the site was littered with cars that could not get up the estate and it was only a light fall of snow.

I see that you have also introduced in Phase 3 social engineering into the estate. Those who can afford the most expensive houses the "preferred 40" have their own access on and off of the estate. The remaining 271 households with up to 2.33 cars per household lets round this up to 631 cars have to join the other phase 1 and 2 residents (300 plus households) in fighting to get onto Priors Road.

The present road layout cannot handle this.

SOLUTION

1. Entrance/Access for all of phase 3 should be out through the top point and not just the "preferred 40" householders. There should be no car access down through phases 1 and 2.

2. If this is not acceptable then the road system must allow all of the estate residences to drive from the top to the bottom using either entrance point.

I, for one, need to get to the A40 at least three times a week, using either Greenway Lane or Ham Lane. Other residents are in the same situation if they are going towards Oxford, Cirencester, the M5 Junction 11a or the South West side of Gloucester. At the moment the route used is off the Estate at Priors Road junction and then up over Ham Hill. The shorter route would be out through the top of the estate to the top of Ham Hill away from the heavy traffic already on Priors Road in the mornings. The reverse would apply in the evenings.

I don't know who I am sending this Email to but assume that it is to Persimmon. I would appreciate a reply and would recommend that you talk to us residence to achieve a satisfactory resolution for what will be a traffic flow problem.

Another problem for us residence is how the heavy goods vehicles are to access the estate during the Phase 3 building period?

Send your representatives here to visit us concerned householders.

6 Ruardean Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GG

Comments: 22nd October 2013

Phase 3 Oakley

I'm not against the development, but I cannot accept the current proposals for VEHICLE ACCESS. The current use of 2 roads (Clearwell Gardens and Redmarley) as filters for the development is unacceptable as a number of other people have said the roads are no more than single track lanes, this is due to the number of cars parked on the side of the road due to the inadequate off road parking supplied on Phase 1 and 2. Looking at the plans the main section of Phase 3 will have to use the existing 2 filter roads this will increase the traffic by my estimate of 200/300 cars a day(I believe this is an conservative estimate), we already have issues with Sainsbury's delivery vehicles not being able to gain access to the store due to the parked vehicles this then causes traffic from the estate to back up so the additional traffic phase 3 will introduce will only serve to make matters worse. We were informed that the hole of Phase 3 would have complete access from Aggs Hill and not as it appears the chosen 40 odd houses.

Comments: 10th January 2014

I have just reviewed the new 'revised drawings' following receipt of a letter from Cheltenham Borough Council Planning office dated 7/1/14 and was hoping (possibly naively) that some attention may have been taken following the number of residents who have commented on this application, referring to the access and the increased number of vehicles using the 2 (two) existing main roads through the estate.

From what I can see nothing has changed apart from a nice little pond being added, the concern over the increased number of vehicles using the already overcrowded roads seems again to have been over looked / ignored.

I have stated before that I am not against the planned development but strongly believe that this issue needs to be re-looked into. The existing 2 main roads throughout the estate merge into one near the superstore; this area is a major safety issue with cars parked all over.

The two main roads are not much better due to the lack of car parking on the estate and yet looking at the plans, it is still the intention to have the minority of "exclusive" type housing have its small access road and the vast majority of the proposed estate using the existing already overcrowded roads.

15 Alvington Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FS

Comments: 12th November 2013

I am writing to express my concerns over aspects of the proposed Oakley Phase 3 development: specifically the proposal that, with the exception of 40 units at the very top of the site, all the remaining 311 units will only have vehicular access to and from Priors Road.

The existing road widths and parking of cars already create a number of pinch points and problems with the flow of traffic in and out of the estate. Additional traffic will exasperate this existing problem.

There are insufficient car parking spaces, especially near the blocks of flats. As a consequence cars park on the roadway and on sharp corners. In addition there is extra traffic created by the Sainsbury store both by shoppers and delivery vehicles.

With the present volumes of cars at Oakley the road system can just about cope. An potential extra 500- 600 cars will create traffic problems even if access to the estate is allowed via Harp Hill as well as Priors Road.

To restrict access to Priors Road will increase traffic volumes to such a point that gridlock will occur at busy periods, making life unpleasant for all residents in the area. At peak periods it will also be difficult for emergency vehicles to gain access to the site.

I strongly suggest that to mitigate the inevitable increase in inconvenience to both existing and future residents, access via Harp Hill must be available to everyone, making access flexible when problems occur.

Additionally given the potential development to land North of GCHQ phase three i think the development would benefit from a more strategic approach to green open space to connect up the wider landscape to benefit people and wildlife. I would like to also see as environmentally sustainable development as possible.

4 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 3rd November 2013

I have no objection to the building of 311 houses in the Oakley Phase 3 development however I strongly object to the proposal of providing access to the homes via either Clearwell Gardens or Redmarley Road; the road layout in the estate is poorly designed and the problems are exaggerated cars parking on the road due to the limited off-road parking spaces for existing residents.

The traffic for the new homes should be routed via the existing GCHQ site entrance and not Clearwell Gardens or Redmarley Road, particularly as the roads leading to the entrance of the GCHQ site were more than capable of serving the employees who used to work there.

6 Brockweir Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FW

Comments: 8th October 2013

We have a number of concerns regarding the extra traffic this development will generate and the affect this will have on access to the current and new development.

1. We believe that the whole of the new development should be accessible via the existing entrance off Greenway Lane/Aggs Hill.

The existing entrance to the development on Redmarley road is a bottleneck for traffic entering/exiting the development and shopping at Sainsburys.

Should this road become blocked for any reason the the whole development will become inaccessible for residents, and more importantly emergency services.

We note that the Design and Access Statement of the development plan has restricted access via Greenway Lane/Aggs Hill due to the area being an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the entrance being narrow. However this entrance previously served the GCHQ site and 1000's of employees so we believe that a precedent for this level of access has been set and this should not stand in the way of the development being fully accessible from both entrances.

2. We would like to see parking enforcement measures in place on the entrance to the development on Redmarley Road.

Due to local residents and Sainsbury's customers parking (including in the bus stop) on this road it is effectively a single file road which already creates problems accessing the development. The extra traffic from the new development will only make this situation worse. Therefore we would like to see double yellow lines on Redmarley Road combined with regular visits by traffic wardens to ensure that cars parked there are fined and the road kept clear for ease of access to the development.

3. We would also like to see traffic calming measures put in place throughout the existing development, specifically on Brockweir Road and Yorkley Road.

These two roads are both long and straight and have no cars parked on road, therefore existing traffic drives down the street very quickly creating a dangerous situation for local residents as car parking is on the opposite side of the street from the houses on Brockweir Road. However my

main concern is that this is an existing residential development with several families with young children, and considering the locations of the playgrounds on the development (right next to the roads leading into the new development) this extra traffic will pose a huge risk to local residents and their children.

Therefore we propose that something should be put in place (e.g speed-bumps) to restrict the speed of traffic on the development. This should also add weight to the argument for making the entire development from both entrances to reduce the volume of traffic transiting the development.

Comments: 5th November 2013

I am writing in regards to the Reserved Matters Planning Application for Phase 3 of the development on the former GCHQ Oakley site to ensure that current issues with Phases 1 & 2 are taken into account:

Adoption issues of existing roads and development

General issues of current road layout and access to be considered for the Phase 3 planning application

Adoption issues of existing roads and development:

After discussion with the Highways Authority we understand that there are several issues with the adoption of the existing roads which are currently sitting with Taylor Wimpey to resolve. These include:

- Roads on the left of the estate (travelling into the estate)
- Street lighting
- Gulleys
- Potholes
- Road layout of the entry junction to the estate
- Others?

Mr Baker and Highways Authorities: could you please advise what the current status is and what the plan is going forwards taking into account Phase 3. Will the adoption of Phase 1 and 2 be independent from Phase 3?

Mr Baker: as Taylor Wimpey currently owns the roads, are there plans for an agreement with Persimmon (Phase 3 developers) with road usage of Phases 1 & 2 for construction traffic access to Phase 3? (Including road upkeep, cleaning and repairs)

Issues with current road layout:

Redmarley Road - single point of access + traffic bottleneck - this currently serves supermarket + estate traffic and will serve Phase 3 + Petrol Station + Allotment traffic.

On-street parking effectively makes this a single track road.

Existing traffic in this bottleneck is already causing collisions, near misses, congestion, delivery issues for supermarket, but most importantly access issues for emergency services. On several occasions ambulances and fire-engines were delayed entering the estate and we have witnessed several collisions.

In the event of road works on Redmarley Road, how will the development even be accessed? How is this junction supposed to cope with an extra 600+ cars from Phase 3 and the Petrol Station?

Other issues with current roads

As set by the covenants of the development and the planning permission the speed limit is 20 mph, but is not enforced.

The straight stretches of road directly adjoining the playgrounds are subject to reckless driving and speeding, endangering children's safety.

Several houses have parking spaces on the opposite side of the road, making crossing the road for car access dangerous.

The strictly no parking zone in the bus stop by Sainsburys is not enforced, and is regularly used as an easy parking option for Sainsburys shoppers increasing the congestion in the bottleneck of Redmarley Road. Redmarley Road is also used as an easy parking option for Sainsburys adding to the congestion

We would therefore like traffic calming measures in places across the development and restricted parking measurements enforced on Redmarley Road.

We have several photographs highlighting the traffic problems around Redmarley Road and can send them on request. Whilst there was snow and ice last winter most vehicles found it impossible to access and leave the estate due to the gradient of the roads. Rubbish was not collected for a month due to this, and residents abandoned their cars at the bottom of the estate creating more congestion at the entrance making access difficult.

We would therefore request that Taylor Wimpey (as the current road owners) install Grit bins on the development, these should be maintained by the council. The land for Phase 3 is even steeper, this will only cause more cars to be abandoned in bad weather making the problem worse

In summary we would like our concerns to be considered as part of the Phase 3 Reserved Matters planning application and we would like to understand how you think our concerns can be addressed and not just worsened by Phase 3.

Comments: 29th January 2014

Having looked at the revised proposals for Phase 3 there are no indications that the plan has been modified to lessen the traffic flow problems that will result from the plan in its current implementation.

We would again like to stress the safety issues that a single access point to large development will bring about. The access point via Redmarley Road is barely adequate for the existing development, and is in effect a single track road due to on street parking. Local residents should not be blamed for this issue as Sainsburys customers contribute a large amount to this parking problem.

The design of Phases 1 and 2 provided inadequate levels of parking for residents, hence the on-street parking. Section 6.7 of the government's Manual for Streets states that: *Parked cars can have a significant influence on response times. Developments should have adequate provision for parking to reduce its impact on response times.* This is clearly not the case.

Finally, the addition of a filling station at the Sainsburys supermarket and the extra traffic from hundreds of new houses will only add to traffic pressure at this bottleneck.

I would hate to think that an ambulance or fire engine would be unable to access the development causing deaths due to this planning decision which seems to centre around the developers desire for an 'exclusive' portion of the estate with its own private access. This does not chime with the spirit of social inclusion that is supposed to be embodied in new developments.

At the very least the granting of permission for this development should be accompanied with a requirement to introduce yellow lines to prevent parking on Redmarley Road, or even better making the whole of Phase 3 accessible via Harp Hill. This was the main entrance for the GCHQ site when it was in operation, and that was able to handle several thousands of cars per day.

Finally the layout of the existing development is not conducive to keeping traffic at a low speed, Brockweir Road has a straight section more than 70m in length and we have seen cars driving in excess of 50mph there. Neither is it conducive to even traffic flow across the estate, residents will soon discover that using the right hand side of the estate will be easier and quicker. Another access road from the existing phases to phase 3 on the left of the estate is required to encourage more even traffic flow.

31 Goodrich Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FT

Comments: 26th October 2013

Redmarley Road and Clearwell Gardens cannot withstand more traffic. It is too built up and badly designed anyway. More cars mean greater risks of accidents in an already very haphazard road.

Access planned new estate via Harp Hill ONLY please.

33 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 11th November 2013

Access to the development via Redmarley Road is already a bottleneck - (particularly with parking allowed on the road after Sainsburys access) and the situation will be exacerbated with the number of houses proposed in Oakley Phase 3 (with access via Redmarley Road). Sainsburys delivery is already experiencing difficulties. With traffic parked in this section of Redmarley Road there is an accident waiting to happen with a potential danger to local residents and children.

34 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 9th October 2013

I am responding to the invitation for comments related to the document "Land at GCHQ Oakley: development phase 3".

I would like to provide comments in two parts.

Phase 1 & 2

Firstly, before the council can consider the development of Phase 3, I think it is incumbent upon them and the developer, Taylor Wimpey, to complete Phases 1 & 2.

It is fair to say that there have been some improvements on the site. However, the responsiveness and customer-focus of the developer, and the ability of the council to manage the handover from this developer, has left a lot to be desired.

I would like to highlight a number of issues that need to be addressed. I am unclear as to whether the site has been formally handed over to the council (this has been the subject of ambiguity for some time), and, therefore, with whom the responsibility lies for addressing these matters.

Trees

I have been in correspondence with the managing agent of the site, Trinity, about the large number of dead trees that were planted by Taylor Wimpey. I have marked the dead trees in red on the attached. I have also marked dead trees that were removed but never replanted in orange on the attached. I am encouraged by a planned review of the site by Trinity with their contractors. I have attached some photos for illustration.
(Photos are available on the documents tab).

There once was a tree here - it was damaged by a Taylor Wimpey works vehicle when they were building the storm drain, but never replaced.

Pavement

There are also pavements where Taylor Wimpey has never finished the surfacing. I have marked these in blue on the attached. I have also attached some photos.

Collapsing Paving

It is apparent that the ground was not prepared properly for the paving on the development. In a number of places this paving is collapsing. I have included photos for illustration.

Unfinished Paving or Surfacing

There are a number of areas where the paving was never finished off - particularly around signage

Areas not being maintained

There are areas near the Sainsburys store which are full of rubbish and that are not being maintained. The design of the area around the former show homes creates a rubbish trap behind the railings.

The area closest to the football fields has never been maintained and contains boarding and discarded fencing that was not removed by Taylor Wimpey when they left the site.

Road Signs

One of the most depressing things about the development are the road signs that have been damaged by Taylor Wimpey works vehicles but never replaced or repaired. These are in the entrance to the estate. The Redmarley Road sign is my particular favourite.

Other unfinished areas?

There are a couple of other areas where I would be interested to know whether Taylor Wimpey has fulfilled its obligations. For instance, this wall towards the front of the estate looks suspiciously like it should have a gate of some sort. This row of houses also looks like Taylor Wimpey has used scaffolding poles rather than proper railings?

Phase 3

Whilst I welcome the development of the old GCHQ site, there are some significant issues that need to be considered.

I am very concerned about the amount of traffic that will be funnelled through the development. As outlined in the Phase 3 brochure, the density of the Phase 1 development is very high and

there is a bottleneck into the entrance of the estate. There is a significant lack of parking at the front of the development and cars are parked on either side of the pavement which impact on the flow of cars in and out of the development.

There is a complete lack of parking control around the Sainsburys development. There is a serious need for double yellow lines to be painted. The bus stop is frequently used for parking, and there are often cars parked on both sides of the road, again, limiting the flow of traffic. I have raised previously with the council my concerns about access for emergency vehicles to the site at peak times.

The thought of 311 additional dwellings with a multiple of cars per dwelling funnelling through the development will make the situation much worse. It would make far better sense for road access to the entire Phase 3 development to be predominantly via Harp Hill. This would limit the impact on the majority of residents living in this area.

22 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AY

Comments: 4th October 2013

The Cheltenham Circular Path, which is a public Right of Way, runs along the eastern boundary of the site and must not be built over.

Footpath Secretary
Mid Glos Group the Ramblers

20 Clearwell Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5GH

Comments: 25th October 2013

I also strongly object specifically to the proposed vehicular access to phase 3 is via Priors Road/Redmarley Road/Clearwell Gardens.

Somewhat surprised by the document called 'From the Ground Up', which states that the current junction and road layout has been constructed to fit Phase 3 traffic access.

The current issues experienced at access and with Phase 1 development occurs several times a day and includes:

- Near misses of collision of cars versus cars
- Near misses of collisions of cars versus pedestrians
- Near misses of collision versus cars/pedestrians versus Sainsburys lorries delivering at the store.

These incidents are not just located at Sainsburys entrance but also further up on Redmarley Road and Clearwell Gardens. The current design is woefully inadequate and dangerous due to:

- Narrow width of road at points to only a single car width in conjunction with:
- Blind bends
- Road traverses at an incline
- Inadequate allocated parking within the current development, which causes further stricture of the road, blocks access to drives and blocks safe viewing.

Interestingly the document did not mention the number or impact of cars accessing Phase 3 - but it is sure to be 500 cars plus. This sort of exponential increase in vehicle and journey numbers will not only increase health and safety issues, but also affect living standards of residents.

The resolution to this already exists in that Phase 3 has current access via Harp Hill. This historically is used as a shortcut to Charlton Kings/A40/Cirencester Road as well as previous access to hundreds of staff to the former GCHQ site.

I would also like to note the following:

- Within the document section of the developers' application there is no consultation from highways or traffic/access survey or assessment. I would have thought this was a fundamental element for an application of this magnitude.
- The document from Persimmons titled 'From the Ground up' only makes reference that comments can be sent to a separate Hotmail addresses. With nil mention of official planning comments in form of objection via CBC planning online site or the application reference number. This could potential lead to fewer public comments being submitted.

4 Brockweir Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5FW

Comments: 15th November 2013

I object to the application on the basis that the development by Taylor Wimpey was not designed or implemented to take the volume of traffic generated by the further development proposed.

The Taylor Wimpey development has neither been completed nor adopted and maybe if this was the case improvements in the already over-burdened infrastructure could be made before a 3rd phase considered.

Thank you