

APPLICATION NO: 13/02174/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Lucy White
DATE REGISTERED: 8th January 2014		DATE OF EXPIRY : 5th March 2014
WARD: Charlton Park		PARISH: CHARLK
APPLICANT:	CTC (Gloucester) Ltd	
LOCATION:	86 Cirencester Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Erection of a new convenience store (A1) with associated parking (following demolition of existing buildings on the site)	

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

165 Cirencester Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 8DB	
---	--

Comments: 8th July 2014

I write, yet again to express my extreme dissatisfaction with this planning proposal. Many local people have provided excellent well-reasoned arguments in defence of our community.

Here are some words from others:

'Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves doesn't mean worse lives for future generations Sustainable development is about change for the better The planning system is about helping to make this happen.' Ministerial foreword to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Previous Planning Permission for opening hours of the existing Car Wash stipulates that:
'The operation of car washing and valeting on the site shall take place only between 09.00 and 18.00 Monday to Saturday and between 10.00 and 14.00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with Policy CP3 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006).' Mike Redman: Assistant Director, Built Environment 30th April 2009

'A key factor in determining this application is the previous use of the sit.' GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer
Highways based their decision on the fall-back position being a Petrol Station instead of the current Car Sales which leads to a very different conclusion.

'It is impossible to stop all indiscriminate parking...some drivers will park on the carriageway.' GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

'Tuffley, Gloucester. Whilst this arrangement is similar it does not currently operate as expected, partly due to the lack of a fully enforced DMP.' GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

'In the JCS area...there has been insufficient delivery of housing...housing need in both the rural and urban areas remains a pressing issue. - Joint Core Strategy 2014

Hoping you will be brave enough to do the right thing.

32 Charlton Close Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 8DJ	
--	--

Comments: 7th July 2014

This is my third objection to this development and yet it only counts as one objection regardless that each objection has been made on a revised planning application. I find this very unfair.

I still strongly object to this application based on:

- the opening hours for a store that is not wanted and with the likelihood that current jobs in the 3 other local convenience stores could be in jeopardy.
- the impact of traffic that will stop on the side roads and the delivery lorries while children are crossing roads to get to school. Are we not trying to encourage children to exercise more and walk to school? Can the safety of local children be guaranteed?
- Cheltenham is in dire need of more housing. This should surely be considered as a prime location - why is this not the case?
- I understand this is contrary to several planning policies and am concerned that this is not being considered in light of considerable local objection. I assume that you will publish the number of objections as opposed to those in favour.

11 Branch Hill Rise Charlton Kings Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 9HN	
--	--

Comments: 7th July 2014

The revised delivery plan only serves to emphasise the unsuitable nature of this application. This narrow road is dangerous enough without large lorries frequently entering and leaving the Cirencester Road; the fact that they enter from the South and leave to the North does not reduce the hazard, especially to cyclists and pedestrians.

The Tesco delivery risk assessment on your website is for a Gloucester store; why is there not a proper risk assessment for this development?

The delivery lorries will be parked on the frontage alongside the Cirencester Road; their refrigeration units will not be turned off and this will add further to the unsightliness, noise and pollution that the development will bring.

There are so many other valid arguments against this proposal that have been made and I urge the Planning Office to reject it.

The Coach House 6 Bafford Lane Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 8DL	
--	--

Comments: 1st July 2014

While we appreciate the efforts of the planning office to improve this scheme, the fact remains that the planned development does not meet a community need, does not in any way enhance the neighbourhood and, indeed, has the potential to cause a noise, parking and traffic nuisance.

We are already more than adequately served by excellent shops and cafés which give Charlton Kings an attractive village feel. This scheme presents a threat to those existing businesses and has the potential to blight the neighbourhood with empty shop sites.

We ask that the planning officers reconsider their support of the scheme - it must be possible under existing planning law to re designate this site for residential development for which it is ideally suited. We ask our councillors on the planning committee to reflect the views of the community in Charlton Kings and their constituents by voting against the scheme or any retail development of the site.

159 Cirencester Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 8DB	
---	--

Comments: 6th July 2014

We are writing to object again to the proposed development at 86 Cirencester Road, Charlton Kings ref: 13/02174/FUL.

This development will still result in light pollution and decreased privacy as the majority of the glazing is to the front of the proposed A1 unit. The glazed area is directly opposite our living room windows. As the opening hours have now been confirmed as 7am to 11pm Monday to Saturday which is 16 hours per day for 6 days a week, and 7.30am to 10.30pm on Sundays which is 15 hours a day there will be little respite from light pollution.

This development will condemn the residents to noise pollution for 16 hours a day, 6 days a week, and for 15 hours on Sunday. It has now been confirmed that the residents will be subject to early morning deliveries at 7am and deliveries could then also be at 7pm at night, which due to the time of day will be particularly disturbing for the residents. The proposed hours of operation compare unfavourable with the operational hours of the car wash, which are limited to normal office hours. In fact the proposed hours of operation of this site will massively exceed the operation times when this site was operated as a filling station.

Despite the changes in the proposed development, it seems that there has been little change to the delivery bay. The delivery bay for the A1 unit will not be used as this appears still to involve a difficult driving manoeuvre. We therefore expect that this will not be used and deliveries will therefore take place on the highway. This will clearly produce a dangerous obstruction to traffic on the highway and in particular to traffic exiting the car park. We are also concerned that the exit from the delivery bay will cause conflict with the ingress and egress of customers.

Although the entrance to the A1 unit has been moved, the location of the entrance to the A1 unit at the side of the site adjacent to the Cirencester Road will still actively encourage parking on Cirencester Road rather than use of the parking area. Vehicles parked on Cirencester Road by drivers shopping will make this section of the road even more dangerous than it is at present. This will be especially true as there will be traffic entering and exiting this site for 18 hours a day 6 days a week and for 8 hours on Sunday.

There is no requirement for this development in this part of Charlton Kings as we are well served by the NISA, Budgens, and by a Co-op supermarket. Most residents from this area of Charlton Kings walk to these local shops rather than use cars. The proposed re-development of 86 Cirencester Road will adversely affect the existing NISA, Budgens and the Co-op supermarket thus destroying the viability of existing businesses. If the proposed re-development of this site goes ahead it will lead to the destruction of the smaller local shops which will in turn lead to more unsustainable transport rather than less.

In summary the proposed re-development of 86 Cirencester Road will adversely affect the viability of local businesses; will increase traffic on the road and make it a more dangerous place to live; and will massively increase noise and light pollution and will lead to a reduction in privacy for the residents.

13/02174/FUL 86 Cirencester Road

The NPPF is quite clear that the presumption should be in favour of sustainable development and local planning authorities should seek to find solutions to enable development to happen. The definition of sustainable given in the NPPF says that it should provide “better lives for ourselves and not worse lives for future generations”.

I would argue that the proposed development **is not sustainable** on economic grounds. The assessment by DPDS Consulting is that the Nisa shop, virtually opposite the proposed convenience store, which is well used at the moment is likely to close and there will be knock on effects to other shops in the village. Added to these job losses are those at the car wash site itself, another amenity that is well used by local and not so local residents.

I also **object to the development on social grounds**. The borough is in urgent need of housing because of the lack of a 5 year housing supply and the Objectively Assessed Need required by the Joint Core Strategy. Since the site was formerly a petrol station, I recognise that it would require greater remedial work to permit housing but this has been successfully achieved in other parts of Charlton Kings, not least in Croft Court; a development a little further south along the Cirencester Road. Housing would be acceptable to local residents and would be the preferred option as mentioned in the officer’s report. Government has recently announced that local planning authorities can use Local Development Orders to bring brownfield sites forward for housing and the borough council should take advantage of this for the car wash site.

The development **contravenes policy CP4** which requires no unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbours. A convenience store on this site will increase traffic flow to the site in terms of both cars and HGVs, increase noise on what is already an extremely busy route into town and result in increased light pollution late into the night and again in the early hours of the morning.

The application also **fails on design (Policy CP7)**. The Architects Panel have been scathing in their criticism. Indeed, I have never seen such negative remarks from them and the officer report is damning with faint praise.

I also have **concerns regarding the Delivery Management Plan**, as I do not believe that the proposals in it can be rigorously enforced. They place an additional burden on borough council officers who will rely on local residents to inform them of any breaches. The 5 Best Practice Informatives (non-enforceable) relate to aspects that will affect local residents the most to the detriment of their amenity. Overall, the amount of detail in the Delivery Management Plan suggests that this is an unsuitable site for a convenience store.

In view of all the above, I would urge the committee to reject this proposal.

Cllr Helena McCloskey

11 July 2014