

APPENDIX 2

13/01605/OUT

Land at Leckhampton

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	603
Number of objections	587
Number of representations	10
Number of supporting	6

Representations are listed in numerical order *by address*. All names and signatures have been redacted to ensure data protection. Representations submitted by post are grouped together in batches (1-12) and attached at the end of the main letter report.

APPLICATION NO: 13/01605/OUT		OFFICER: Mr Craig Hemphill	
DATE REGISTERED: 17th September 2013		DATE OF EXPIRY : 7th January 2014	
WARD: Leckhampton		PARISH: LECKH	
APPLICANT:	Bovis Homes Limited & Miller Homes Limited		
LOCATION:	Land at Leckhampton, Shurdington Road, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Residential development of up to 650 dwellings; mixed use local centre of up to 1.94ha comprising a local convenience retail unit Class A1 Use (400sqm), additional retail unit Class A1 Use for a potential pharmacy (100sqm), Class D1 Use GP surgery (1,200sqm,) and up to 4,500sqm of additional floorspace to comprise one or more of the following uses, namely Class A Uses, Class B1 offices, Class C2 care home, and Class D1 Uses including a potential dentist practice, children's nursery and/or cottage hospital; a primary school of up to 1.72ha; strategic open space including allotments; access roads, cycleways, footpaths, open space/landscaping and associated works; details of the principal means of access; with all other matters to be reserved.		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	603
Number of objections	587
Number of representations	10
Number of supporting	6

1 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HG

Comments: 17th October 2013

I am writing to object to the proposed development of land off Kidnappers Lane, Cheltenham. As a Leckhampton resident I am very concerned about the impact of increased vehicle traffic in the area if the development goes ahead. We already have congestion on Shurdington Road and Church Road and this proposal seems to place more pressure on those roads by its location next to those existing thorough fares.

Likewise as a parent of children in the area, we are constantly struggling with the lack of places at the nearest secondary schools. The proposed development would place extra pressure on Balcarras and Bournside Schools and make it even more difficult for local residents to get a place in a local school.

Considering that the Joint Core Strategy has not been finalised and includes a development in this area, I feel that the development application is premature. There is a JCS display and request for comments in the Borough Council's lobby. Is this development application taking precedence over the JCS consultation?

As a local resident I would like to see an agreed-to comprehensive plan in place that show some thought has gone into addressing the needs of the city and the region, rather than individual development applications undermining the JCS mid-consultation. If it is not the intention of the Borough Council to follow through with the JCS, let's throw it out and just focus on development applications.

1 Barnfield
Blackstone Edge Old Road
Littleborough
Lancashire
OL15 0JL

Comments: 22nd November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th – 22nd November)

1 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th – 29th November)

1 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th – 29th November)

1 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 16th December 2013

I am strongly against any proposal to build on the Leckhampton fields unless absolutely necessary. The above planning application should not be considered until the astonishing discrepancy between the JCS and ONS estimated figures for the number of new homes needed is further investigated; the result of such an investigation may negate the need to build on those fields.

My objections against building on those fields is based on my experience of living very close to them and go beyond my personal enjoyment of their natural attractiveness and the opportunities they offer for farming and recreation. Those fields are a natural soak away for the water flowing off Leckhampton and, particularly, Crippets Hills. I experienced the 2007 floods in those fields and in the Warden Hill estate and have several times since then seen the excessive water-logging of those fields after heavy rainfalls. I am not convinced that the developers' plan for controlling such flood water would be wholly successful at such times.

A major obstacle for all such plans that I have seen over the years is the unsuitability of the local road system. The A46 is already extremely busy during rush hour periods and is a narrow road which inevitably bottlenecks into an even narrower section as it approaches the top of the Bath Road. The huge number of houses proposed in this development plan (along with a further 795 planned for the Chargrove area) would add considerably to the traffic congestion and increase the air pollution to an unacceptable level during peak periods on the A46, Moorend Park Road and the Bath Road. Church Road running through Leckhampton Village (a key link for drivers

wishing to get to Swindon and the M4) is unavoidably very narrow and heavily congested at rush hours. The developers propose to block off Kidnappers Lane in order to encourage traffic from the proposed estate to use the A46 and Moorend Park Road for such a journey; however, there is nothing to stop such traffic using Farm Lane to approach Church Road.

Finally, all the plans I have seen have ignored the need for a secondary school (both Bournside and Balcarras Schools are over-subscribed). Apparently all the children living in the proposed development will conveniently be of primary age! The proposed primary school would need to be built well in advance

1 Charlton Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9FB

Comments: 22nd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st – 25th October)

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

1 Charnwood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HN

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

1 Chatsworth Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AG

Comments: 17th October 2013

We strongly object to this development and would like to comment in particular on the traffic issue as I believe there is a consultation due.

The current situation is that Shurdington Road is a car park at rush hour. Church Road is gridlocked at rush hour and frustrating at the best of times. As a pedestrian on Church Road I have been approached at speed on the PATH by vehicles using the path as a road (whilst taking my daughter to school). Pollution levels on these roads already exceed EU safe levels.

Nothing is being done to alleviate this situation now and the building of this development can only make things a lot worse.

The developers have not given satisfactory answers to these problems, putting in a few widened paths will actually make it even worse for cars to get past.

Surely it is madness not to address this issue before allowing this development to go ahead. Do we really want to make Cheltenham like London?

I would like to write our full objection to this development at a later date.

Comments: 21st October 2013

We strongly object to this development and all others in the area. It is a shame that residents are having to repeatedly write in to defend this area and I fear that many people will find they do not have the time to write yet another comment.

This application needs to be considered alongside all the other proposals for the area and I urge the council to take into consideration all comments made on the Brizen Farm application on Tewkesbury BC, which are relevant to this app.

It seems that CBC is intent on ruining south Cheltenham. This is a sought-after area to live because of its proximity to the hill, the AONB, and green space which enriches people's lives by bringing the countryside and wildlife to our homes. The character of Leckhampton will be lost forever if this development goes ahead. We can not continue to keep building housing estates like this forever so please save these fields. The developers have no concern for the loss of green space and its wildlife; they can't even leave Lotts Meadow alone!

There are still huge issues which have not been addressed:

- How will the roads cope, which are already gridlock and dangerous?
- How will we reduce pollution which already exceeds EU levels?
- How will we cope with more flooding, this area is waterlogged?
- Where will we find school places? Will this new primary school be ready to take pupils as soon as they move in? I doubt it, they will be taking local places until the new school is ready.

These points are ALREADY an issue with the current levels of housing and traffic.

We are not just talking about 650 houses; there are more a Brizen, Farm Lane and Up Hatherley Way to add to the problem.

There are several statements in the JCS which if applied to this development would stop it from going ahead.

We urge this council to turn down this application.

1 Hannam Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AS

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

1 Japonica Drive
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WD

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

1 Jasmin Way

Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HZ

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

1 Kenelm Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JW

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

1 Liddington Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AH

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

1 Merestones Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2ST

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

1 Peregrine Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LW

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

1 Southern Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AN

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

1 Southfield Approach
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LN

Comments: 11th December 2013

I wish to object to the proposed development for a number of reasons.

1. Traffic congestion - Shurdington Road, Moorend Park Road and the alternative route to the A417/M5 along Church Road are already seriously congested, with pollution levels at times above EU limits. A development of 650 homes, many of which will have 2 cars, will make an already congested situation gridlocked. Add further traffic if the GP surgery moves (in its current location many people can walk to it) and for the proposed school and care home, and the result will be gridlock at peak times. The traffic expert at the recent public meeting said the road was at capacity but that doesn't stop developers suggesting more traffic if it can be 'mitigated': how can adding any more traffic, however mitigated, to a road at capacity make sense?
2. Flooding risk - in 2007 my mother in law in Warden Hill had to take in her neighbour when the maisonette below hers flooded. The fields handle the run-off from the hills but even they can't always cope. The developers are unsure how well their proposed ponds will work as they'd be below the water table. This is a huge risk to take in an area already proven to flood - never mind the potential impact on one of our main trunk roads, which is already at capacity.
3. The estimates for new homes are unproven and over-estimated, well beyond those the ONS estimates we need. And where are the jobs in Cheltenham for all these people? The new development in Hatherley still isn't full, and the new development on Pilley Lane will fill some of this demand when they're completed shortly. There are also industrial and brownfield sites that surely should be considered before building on our green spaces?

I am personally affected and deeply concerned about the impact of this development and strongly support the case for preserving the land as a Local Green Space.

1 Southfield Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LE

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

1 The Firs
Old Station Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AU

Comments: 30th October 2013

I am writing to express my very great concern at the outline planning application submitted for a development off Kidnappers Lane and the small holdings area for 650 houses.

As you are no doubt aware, the traffic levels in the Leckhampton area are already extremely problematic. I commute to the centre of Cheltenham from Leckhampton by bicycle and was forced to change my working hours to a less busy time because I was so concerned about safety

issues from the number of cars and the speed at which they drive, not to mention the unpleasant and unhealthy levels of air pollution.

I understand that proceeding with the above development would lead to an additional estimated 1,000 vehicles exiting onto the Shurdington Road. This can only result in making the existing situation worse; morning queues will lengthen, and frustrated drivers will pose a real hazard to pedestrians (including local school children) and cyclists.

Furthermore, whilst the planning application may include the construction of a new primary school, there are already insufficient secondary school places for children in the town, and this problem will only be worsened by an influx of residents associated with the new development. The number of jobs in Cheltenham is also falling, and building houses on the periphery of the town will just create commuter dormitories for the M5.

I am certainly not ignorant of the fact that more housing needs to be created to accommodate the rising population within the town and to contribute towards the economy of the area, but I believe that this particular application is premature and should not go before the Planning Committee until the JCS for the area has been finalised and the aspects of planning, transport, environment and population estimates verified.

1 The Firs
Old Station Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AU

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

1 Treelands Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DA

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

1 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

1 Woodlands Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RT

Comments: 2nd October 2013
We strongly object to this whole application, as we would probably be one of the most affected families if this should go ahead, with our main outlook located directly opposite the proposed

three-storey buildings. The view that we currently enjoy from our bedroom window is one which we would very much love to keep - the wonderful hills, the pigs, the deer and foxes running around the fields - it would all be gone and this would make us very sad.

Should this be approved we would plea that these buildings be only two storeys high.

There are too many houses with not enough supporting infrastructure. The houses would be so close together and with cars parked outside would not allow emergency service vehicles such as fire trucks to get through.

These fields are full of water in the winter and will be so even more if this is all concreted over.

The traffic along Shurdington Road is already gridlocked in both directions outside our house every weekday morning and this development will make it so much worse, with increasing noise and air pollution. It is virtually impossible to pull out onto this road so if this does go ahead, then mini roundabouts should be installed together with a 30 MPH limit.

There is provision for primary school children but no additional provision for secondary school age children - where are they supposed to go when the local secondary schools are already over-subscribed?

These are such wonderful fields and there are plenty more areas which could be used instead of here. It would make far more sense to bring back into use all of the empty houses that we currently have around the county.

There is no need for additional shops and supermarkets and there are plenty of office block buildings which are unoccupied, so we don't need more of them either.

We urge this application to not be approved.

10 Allenfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LY

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

10 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 30th October 2013

With regards to the above application as a local resident I have grave concerns with regards traffic implications from this proposal, specifically the Shurdington Road which is already heavily congested and secondly with regards to the implications for secondary education provision in the area.

This application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified.

10 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

10 Eynon Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QA

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

10 Fairfield Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PQ

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

10 Hobby Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LP

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

10 Oxford Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HJ

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

10 Pickering Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LB

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

10 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 12th December 2013

I write to register my strong objection to the above planning application. My objection is on a number of counts which I have detailed below.

Given the evidence from the 2011 census and the Office of National Statistics (ONS) projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, the proposed development is unnecessary. The huge uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure must first be properly resolved. There is no real certainty about the level of housing demand in 20 years and many variables that could impact this which cannot be easily modelled - for instance, the state of the economy, the level of domestic and international migration, social trends. JCS assumptions on household size, employment growth and birth rate are also flawed and poorly evidenced. Many more houses are currently being built than inwards migration demands and moreover jobs in Cheltenham are shrinking. Current projections based on interim, short term figures are unacceptable. Verification by the ONS of JCS population projections over the next 20 years must be taken up and evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) used to inform estimates of housing need.

I am concerned that Cheltenham Borough has joined Tewkesbury and Gloucester to produce the JCS for the whole area but does not currently have an NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) compliant plan even though the JCS needs to be NPPF compliant. This must make local planning, which is required by the NPPF 'to meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change' impossible. There is also no clear brownfield policy - one must be provided prior to the JCS being finalised.

The traffic congestion in peak periods which would be created by this development, along with the other proposed developments in Hatherley, Brockworth and other areas south of Cheltenham, would be horrendous and totally unacceptable. Cheltenham does not have the road infrastructure for this level of development and no solution is offered by the planning application of the already substantial and painful traffic problems in and out of south Cheltenham. The suggestions that are provided in the planning application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are questionable and tenuous. I am concerned that that the risk of accidents from increased traffic queues and pollution to the many elderly people who live in this area and children who walk daily to school will rise, as well as traffic incidents for commuters who have no option but to drive to work. There will undoubtedly be a knock-on impact elsewhere in the area, for example, Moorend Park Road. Queues leading to this area, in and out of Cheltenham, at peak times are already long. I was concerned to learn that transport and traffic modelling will not be available until after the JCS consultation has finished. Surely, this should be a pre-requisite to any planning.

Traffic pollution in these same areas (A46, Moorend Park Road, Church Road) can only increase with the increase in slow moving and stationary traffic. It is well publicised that Borough Council figures show that pollution levels already exceed EU-permitted limits at the Moorend Park Road junction, while pollution in Church Road is also above EU limits during winter months.

Finally, the Leckhampton fields are valued for their amenity, landscape, ecological and historical value by both the local community and visitors to the area. I and my husband and our friends regularly use the Leckhampton fields for recreation. I strongly support Leckhampton with Warden Hill and Shurdington parish councils submission of a Neighbourhood Planning Concept Plan, which includes an evidenced proposal for the Leckhampton fields to be protected as a Local Green Space of Special Community Value. I urge Cheltenham Borough Council to give this due and proper consideration.

In summary, this application is premature and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for Cheltenham-Tewkesbury-Gloucester City has been finalised. In addition, all aspects of planning, transport, environment and population estimates in the housing targets must first be verified and robustly evidenced. I and other members of the public in this part of Cheltenham must have confidence that housing targets being proposed in the JCS are objective, transparent and in accordance with the needs of the area and not based on flawed and unsound assumptions.

102 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

103 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EE

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

104 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

105 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

105 Promenade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1NW

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

108 Farmfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RA

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

109 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PE

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

109 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EX

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

11 Allenfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LZ

Comments: 25th November 2013
Our objections to this application are several.

We have used the Leckhampton green fields for recreation for our whole lives. Our children (and our dog!) are doing the same. The loss of this green space will be truly devastating and will destroy the area for us, many other families who live in Leckhampton (and beyond) and of course the wildlife that lives there.

Beyond the private schools and Pate's, Cheltenham secondary schools already worry us both in terms of capacity and quality. Additional people in the area will greatly magnify this problem. We fail to see how such scale of development can be considered by the Council until a clear strategy and implementation plan to service Cheltenham's secondary education is in place.

Pollution levels are already too high on Shurdington Road and Church Road. This is already a major concern for people who live in Leckhampton, particularly families such as ours with young children. An extra 1000 cars exiting onto Shurdington Road does not bear thinking about. This is before considering the increase in traffic and the associated impact on travel times and road safety. The affect on workers and parents who live in Leckhampton and need to travel by car to work and to drop children at nursery or school in the morning will be significant and clearly unacceptable. In our case we need to do both, which will be the situation for a lot of parents. We cannot travel anywhere without using Moorend Park Road and it appears that Moorend Park Road would be gridlocked every morning.

Development on this scale on the Leckhampton green fields will destroy the identity of Leckhampton as a village and suburb of Cheltenham. Such green and relatively affluent suburbs help give Cheltenham its identity and make Cheltenham an attractive place for relatively affluent people to want to live (and of course spend money in the Cheltenham economy).

These proposals will have an unacceptable impact on the quality of life for the existing residents of Leckhampton but will also impact on Cheltenham as a whole.

For those of us who were born in Cheltenham and have worked hard throughout our whole lives so we can afford to live in Leckhampton and raise our children here, such scale of development is shocking.

Notwithstanding the above we quite frankly find it unbelievable that this application could be approved, or even considered, given the holes in the basis of the JCS, particularly (but not only) the basis behind the calculation and over-estimation of the housing need in Cheltenham. We would question the legal viability of an approval to this application.

11 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HG

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

11 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

11 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

11 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

11 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

11 Fairfield Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PF

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

11 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

11 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 17th October 2013

I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to any and all development on the land between Shurdington Road and Church Road in Leckhampton. The reasons for my objection are as follows.

This is valuable green belt land around our town, and the loss of habitat would be disastrous to local wildlife. In addition, many people, including myself, use that land for walking and for leisure, and its loss would lessen our quality of life in this area.

There is already a flood risk in this area, and a stream that runs along side this area which in times of heavy rain already floods our garden. Building 1100 houses and the services to provide them will cause acres of run-off, and cause flooding to the new homes and existing homes. Your last consultation was flawed in respect to flooding. The report said that there was no danger of flooding along that stretch but failed to note that in times of heavy rain, ground water rises from a drain on Shurdington Road at the top of Woodlands Road, and drains away into another drain further down Shurdington Road. The water authorities say that is not a burst pipe, it is ground water from the rain which currently soaks away into a drain. If you build on that land the water will have nowhere to go, and that land will flood, as well as the land around it and along Shurdington Road. Building ponds for 100 year storms is patently inadequate when we had 3 100 year storms last winter.

The proposed junior school is all very well, but where will these children go at aged eleven? Bourneside, Chosen Hill and Balcarras Schools are already at capacity. When we are sending children across town already to Pittville, is there really room for hundreds more?

Shurdington Road and Bath Road are already groaning with traffic at maximum capacity. Thousands more cars a day will bring these roads to a gridlock situation; the smallest disruption through accident or road works already cause tailbacks that can stretch for miles, and that even during the weekend. The situation with traffic pollution on those roads is already above EU levels; 1000 new cars would make it worse. This will be even worse if, as proposed, they change the traffic flow at the Air Balloon Roundabout, sending yet more cars down Shurdington Road towards Bath Road and town.

We don't need more houses. There are plenty of houses for sale in the area; the estate agent pages make up most of the local paper on Wednesdays as it is, and too few people to buy them. And family dynamics are changing; significant numbers of people are living at home for longer because they cannot afford to leave. Building thousands of new homes will not significantly bring down the prices to put them in range of these first time buyers. We have no idea what the housing needs in the future will be; destroying valuable land now for future needs that may never be realised is madness.

We have objected again and again to these plans. To threaten this land again is unacceptable.

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

11 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 17th October 2013

I am against any development on the land between Shurdington Road and Church Road in Leckhampton. The reasons for my objection are as follows.

This is valuable Green Belt land around our town, and the loss of habitat would be disastrous to local wildlife. In addition, many people, including myself, use that land for walking and for leisure, and its loss would lessen our quality of life in this area. We buy our meat from local butchers who source from livestock kept in the fields that Newbridge proposed building over.

Shurdington Road and Bath Road are already groaning with traffic at maximum capacity. Hundreds more cars a day will bring these roads to a gridlock situation; the smallest disruption through accident or road works already cause tailbacks that can stretch for miles, and that even during the weekend.

There is already a flood risk in this area, and a stream that runs along side this area which in times of heavy rain already floods our garden. Building 175 houses and the services to provide them will result in more run-off, and risk flooding to the new homes and existing homes.

Bournside, Chosen Hill and Balcarras Schools are already at capacity.

We have objected again and again to similar plans. To threaten this land again is unacceptable. If this application goes through, this and other developers will be pressing hard to have their plans for 1000+ further houses built in the same surroundings. Please do not set us on this slippery slope. Please protect this green area of Cheltenham.

11 Mead Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7DU

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

11 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

11 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 22nd November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

11 Westbury Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EN

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

114 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EA

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

114 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BY

Comments: 8th November 2013

Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

116 Caernarvon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3JR

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

12 Fairfield Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PQ

Comments: 14th October 2013

I wish to strongly OBJECT to the above planning application for 650 houses off Kidnappers Lane in Leckhampton for the following reasons:

- 1) This is a significant development which should NOT go to the planning committee until the JCS for the area has been finalised. This will determine what development is required in each area.
- 2) This proposal is a significant development in green belt land and out of proportion with the existing landscape.
- 3) This development will have a significant impact on the local environment removing green fields for recreation, increasing traffic beyond over-capacity levels (an extra 1000 vehicles onto the already congested A46), adding to air pollution breaking EU levels and overstressing secondary school capacity to breaking point.

I trust my objections will be lodged accordingly and the planning committee will reject this application.

12 Frampton Mews
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6UG

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

12 Gordon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ES

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

12 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

12 Justicia Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3YH

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

12 Merlin Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NF

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

12 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LT

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

12 Moorend Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EZ

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

12 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EU

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

12 Southcourt Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DW

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

12 Tayberry Grove
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WF

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

123 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DQ

Comments: 13th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

124 Farmfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RB

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

125 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DQ

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

126 Warden Hill Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3EH

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

127 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NY

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

128 Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HF

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

12A Moorend Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EG

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

13 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

13 Hawkswood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DT

Comments: 25th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

13 St Albans Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DW

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

130 Warden Hill Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3EH

Comments: 31st October 2013

I am writing to voice my objections to the proposed development of new homes being built on Leckhampton fields. Reference 13/01605/OUT

As a local resident I frequently travel by car from Warden Hill to Leckhampton and beyond, using the current roads and am aware of the congestion which already exists along these routes. I believe that any increase in traffic would be a massive price to pay to gain new homes in this area. As a cyclist I am aware of the limited road space, and there are no footpaths along some of the 'back routes'- as there is only just space for two cars to pass as it is. At present it is a relatively safe area for young people to get out on their bicycles, learning independence and getting exercise in a rural setting. This would be lost, I fear.

The area is highly valued as a beautiful space as it stands, and should not be developed. It gives access to the countryside and country walks to those living modestly locally, which is of great value and benefit. The walks across the fields and up the hill are a pleasure and should be treasured and preserved.

Furthermore, there are other issues of concern to me, such as potential flooding, pressure on over subscribed schools and provision of other amenities. I am afraid that the need for housing is not great enough for us to lose what we have here.

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

131 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BZ

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

132 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BX

Comments: 8th November 2013

Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

14 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

14 Chatsworth Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AG

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

14 Moorend Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EG

Comments: 20th November 2013
I wish to object to the proposed development of 650 homes on the Leckhampton Fields on the following grounds:

Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) is approved and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly resolved.

The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to these grave traffic problems. I am very concerned by the resulting health and accidents risks.

I strongly support the case made in the Leckhampton with Warden Hill and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and views from Leckhampton Hill.

14 Norwich Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HE

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

14 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 25th October 2013
Why are you not listening to us? WE DO NOT WANT THESE HOUSES HERE. You are supposed to represent us. You are supposed to be working for us. The Lib Dems promised us they would fight development in this area and on other areas of Cheltenham's greenbelt land. YOU HAVE BROKEN YOUR PROMISES TO US. WE WILL NOT VOTE FOR YOU AGAIN!

I feel SO let down. I feel SO STRONGLY that you are ruining our beautiful town. Where are our green spaces going to be? Who will buy these houses? There are new developments all over the place already which the developers CANNOT SELL. Why? BECAUSE NOBODY WANTS THEM!

This particular development proposal for Kidnappers Lane is ridiculous, particularly as it proposes to close Kidnappers Lane where it meets Church Road and Shurdington Road. This will push more traffic onto Farm Lane and other surrounding roads. It does not solve the traffic flow problems which the developers acknowledge already exist and will be made worse by the development. All it does is shift the problem onto other roads. The roads here cannot take any more vehicles, let alone 1000. What assurance can you give me that the existing traffic flow and the effect on it of this development has been properly studied before this development goes ahead? Already it is extremely difficult to turn right from Kidnappers Lane onto Shurdington Road, even outside rush hours and the developers are proposing to put in extra traffic lights but they have told me that they cannot put in anything as sophisticated as the ones at the Moorend Road crossroads. How then, are they going to deal with the back up of traffic from the lights into Shurdington? Can you assure me that these issues have been investigated?

I understood that we are already breaking EU levels on pollution in this area. How then can we justify adding another 1000 vehicles? The children are being taught at school that we must conserve energy because all the cars are creating pollution and it is damaging the ozone layer. How do we explain the extra traffic to them? This is THEIR world and THEIR future environment.

There is no secondary school planned for this development. Where are the children going to go?

I thought that the JCS was not yet agreed. If not, then this development should not be allowed to go ahead. THE DEVELOPERS SHOULD NOT BE DECIDING CHELTENHAM'S FUTURE. WE SHOULD.

Cheltenham should be known for its green spaces and countryside, not its urban sprawl.

This area of Cheltenham is particularly attractive, abutting the Leckhampton Hill AONB and providing a link for Cheltenham to the Cotswolds. How can Cheltenham call itself a centre for the Cotswolds if the route between Cheltenham and the Cotswolds is banal housing developments with no green spaces apart from the gardens in the centre of the town.

THIS IS OUR TOWN. YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO SPOIL IT.

Why are you not listening to the CPRE and the Gloucestershire Wildlife Association? They are campaigning against developments just such as these. They are in the WRONG PLACE.

LEGLAG has worked conscientiously and carefully to produce proposals for a Country Park in this area. Why are you not listening to their wisdom and experience and expertise?

Cheltenham should be forced to build on its brownfield sites before ruining areas like this one FOR EVER.

I understand there is a new motorway junction going in on the northwest side of Cheltenham. That would provide a much better location and infrastructure for development.

I expect confirmation from you that my comments have been received and will be considered.

14 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AQ

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

14 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AQ

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

14 Southcourt Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BT

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

14 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 30th October 2013

I would like to express my extreme concern about the planning application to build on green land in Leckhampton.

I do not accept that we as a country need to build more houses than those that can be sustainably provided on brownfield sites. I think it is shocking and disgraceful that government policies dictate that we must continually see the loss of our beautiful countryside. Once these green fields are built on they will never again be able to be enjoyed by generations to come. The quality of life for the residents of Cheltenham will gradually deteriorate to such an extent that this beautiful town will no longer be the desirable place to live that it currently is. The roads are already far too busy and traffic jams are becoming a daily feature of life. My daily journey to work has worsened beyond all recognition in recent years and this can only get worse with more building.

There are many species of wild life in the Leckhampton area and I despair as to where they will all be able to relocate to.

This application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified.

140 Broad Oak Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3LL

Comments: 30th October 2013

I am writing to object to the proposed planning application for building of the residential development & various retail units. This area is a key area for so many endangered or at risk species of both bird, mammal & plant life. We should be protecting this area not destroying it. As this land is on the edge of AONB it should be preserved as it contributes to the overall setting.

It is also an area which absorbs the run off of excess water from Leckhampton Hill is heavy rain, if built on, the natural green prevention of flooding will be disrupted and will have a devastating effect on local communities.

The local people do not want this development & whilst I realise this may not be an official reason for refusing planning permission it should be a consideration. At the moment this area is in a rural setting which is a key reason why the existing residents moved or stayed in this area. By building these urban extensions it destroys the very essence of why Cheltenham is so well loved.

Even with the proposed primary school within this development & I am assuming that the actual funding for the running of the school will fall to local government which is debatable if this is economically viable there is no provision in the locality for additional secondary school provision. With all the local secondary schools at bursting point it will mean more movement on the local roads which cannot cope with the existing traffic. The infrastructure is not there to provide the needs for additional doctors & hospital facilities this scale of development would warrant.

146 Farmfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RB

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

149A Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AD

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

14A Winchester Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HA

Comments: 8th November 2013

Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

15 Allenfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LX

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

15 Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HQ

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

15 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PS

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

15 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PS

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

15 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 27th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 11 (14th - 20th December)

15 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HF

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

15 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HF

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

15 Japonica Drive
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WD

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

15 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 13th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

15 Short Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DY

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

15 Southfield Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LE

Comments: 6th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

15 The Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PH

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

15 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

155 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DG

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

16 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

16 Hazlewood Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RX

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

16 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 31st October 2013

The application for development off Kidnappers Lane, Application No. 13/01605/OUT should not be considered until after the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised. This will require verification of the transport, environment and population estimates in the housing targets.

The development itself will result in an increase in traffic congestion onto the Shurdington Road.

Additionally, the retail units and primary school will result in additional traffic from outside of the proposed site adding to the traffic congestion.

All this additional traffic will exacerbate the already high levels of air pollution on the A46.

The primary school does not address the insufficient senior school places, both at Balcarras and Bournside

16 Sissinghurst Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3FA

Comments: 18th October 2013

Simply to repeat the cogent points that the vast majority of the (so far) 92 Public Comments have already made:

Quality of life of Cheltenham residents negatively affected

Flood risk issues exacerbated

Shortage of secondary school places to take the proposed junior school leavers.

Traffic congestion in this area has to be reduced in future. This will simply make the situation worse, with associated issues of emission pollution, lost economic time and reduced road safety.

Are thousands of new homes really needed? The JCS predictions are not agreed by all to be realistic, including some government department projections and census data.

Essentially there is significant local opposition to these proposals. It is an affront to our local democracy not to respect these views.

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 1 (3rd - 11th October)

16 Southern Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AW

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

16 Tamarisk Close
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WL

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

16 Tensing Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LX

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

16 Thompson Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PL

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

16 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

16 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 14th October 2013

I wish to register my objection to the above-mentioned outline planning application on the following grounds

Such a development would produce an enormous number of additional vehicle movements on road which are already very congested, particularly at peak travel times and the plan shows no improvement to the existing main routes. The re-alignment of a couple of junctions, viz - Kidnappers Lane onto Shurdington and Farm Lane onto Church Road might improve visibility at these points but will in no way reduce traffic flow. Closing the eastern end of Kidnappers Lane may stop it being used as a 'rat-run' but will add the number of vehicles currently used by residents to those having to exit onto the A.46. The air pollution produced by these extra vehicle movements will significantly add to the already broken EU levels that occur. Any public transport which might be provided would again increase pollution. School vacancies are a serious concern with local Senior schools showing no plans to increase capacity. There is a serious risk of flooding from water running off Leckhampton Hill. Serious re-consideration of the JCS of Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury Councils in respect of their transport plan must be undertaken before any consideration can be given to the planning proposal. The use of green belt and white land must be rejected at least until all brown field sites have been utilised. Such a plan, together with proposals for houses near Hatherley Way and Brizen, would further the Joining up of Cheltenham and Gloucester

163 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AD

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

17 Allenfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LX

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

17 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 30th October 2013

I am writing to state my very strong objection to outline planning application 13/01605/OUT for the erection of 650 houses on land at Kidnappers Lane and the Smallholdings, Leckhampton.

Once again we are faced with this same proposal, to build on and ruin forever a very large slice of the unspoiled land of Leckhampton. It was unacceptable before and it is unacceptable now. The various reasons for objection all still apply. This appears to be Cheltenham under attack from developers, with no consideration of the residents, their needs or wishes. I consider that such construction would cause severe and permanent damage to the environment of this area. A lovely part of the south of the town would be destroyed forever. Valuable landscape (the AONB and Leckhampton Hill) would be damaged. It would spoil the outstanding views from and towards the Cotswold escarpment. The damage would be clearly visible from the high ground for miles around. It seems to me that building as proposed would be a significant step towards joining Cheltenham and Gloucester, so that a single urban area would result. The Green Belt is intended to prevent such coalescence. I consider that the additional traffic which such a scheme would generate would have a major adverse impact upon Leckhampton and the surrounding area. The effect on Cheltenham will be undesirable, with a larger population, more traffic, more congestion and more shops, to name but a few of the results to be expected.

Flooding in the area is already a difficulty which the development seems likely to exacerbate. I understand that previous reports of HM Planning Inspectors have recommended against developing this land. The council should, I think, have regard to these recommendations. Now that the council is in the middle of consideration of, and consultation about, the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester, it seems to me that the Strategy should be finalised before the Planning Committee considers the application for this huge scheme. Fundamentally, the population estimates contained in the housing targets, which have been widely criticised, should be validated, or amended, before any further action is taken. Further, all aspects of planning, transport, environment should be verified in advance of consideration of this application.

Overall, in my opinion, it would be a grave mistake to proceed with the scheme.

17 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 30th October 2013

I write to state my very strong objection to outline planning application 13/01605/OUT for the erection of 650 houses on land at Kidnappers Lane and the Smallholdings, Leckhampton.

Once again we are faced with this same proposal, to build on and ruin forever a very large slice of the unspoiled land of Leckhampton. It was unacceptable before and it is unacceptable now. The various reasons for objection all still apply. This appears to be Cheltenham under attack from developers, with no consideration of the residents, their needs or wishes.

I consider that such construction would cause severe and permanent damage to the environment of this area. A lovely part of the south of the town would be destroyed forever. Valuable landscape (the AONB and Leckhampton Hill) would be damaged. It would spoil the outstanding views from and towards the Cotswold escarpment. The damage would be clearly visible from the high ground for miles around. It seems to me that building as proposed would be a significant step towards joining Cheltenham and Gloucester, so that a single urban area would result. The Green Belt is intended to prevent such coalescence.

I consider that the additional traffic which such a scheme would generate would have a major adverse impact upon Leckhampton and the surrounding area. The effect on Cheltenham will be undesirable, with a larger population, more traffic, more congestion and more shops, to name but a few of the results to be expected. Flooding in the area is already a difficulty which the development seems likely to exacerbate.

I understand that previous reports of HM Planning Inspectors have recommended against developing this land. The council should, I think, have regard to these recommendations. Now that the council is in the middle of consideration of, and consultation about, the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester, it seems to me that the Strategy should be finalised before the Planning Committee considers the application for this huge scheme. Fundamentally, the population estimates contained in the housing targets, which have been widely criticised, should be validated, or amended, before any further action is taken. Further, all aspects of planning, transport, environment should be verified in advance of consideration of this application.

Overall, in my opinion, it would be a grave mistake to proceed with the scheme.

17 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HF

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

17 Liddington Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AH

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

17 Liddington Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AH

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

17 Peregrine Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LN

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

17 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

17 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

17 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

17 Treelands Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DG

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

17 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 16th October 2013

Octavia Hill, who founded the National Trust said that 'open spaces and places of beauty are essentials to everyone's way of life, whether they know it or not'. Without people like her, there would not be many beautiful places for recreation like Hampstead Heath.

We must fight against the ever expanding housing which threatens to devour our open spaces, so that we can preserve places of natural beauty for the general public.

I am strongly opposed to developing this, or any other land around Cheltenham.

17 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 15th October 2013

This development would be contrary to promises made in the Lib Dems election manifesto, and so would be undemocratic, and possibly illegal. The damage to wildlife, air quality and drainage would be calamitous. The local infrastructure and amenities would be overwhelmed since they are already at breaking point. It would be a stupid, irreversible and immoral 'rape' of the land. But I expect it will go ahead....sigh

17 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

176 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AE

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

179 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AD

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

18 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

18 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

18 Eynon Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QA

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

18 Moorend Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HA

Comments: 10th December 2013

1. Car ownership in & around Cheltenham is very high & it's probably two vehicles/household . Accordingly you don't have to be a mathematician to say that this proposed amount of housing will introduce at least an extra 1000 vehicles onto the country roads around the area. There are regular "confrontations" along Church & Hall Roads. The junctions of these roads with Leckhampton & Shurdington Roads are also "very busy" at the each end of business hours.
2. CBC is obviously having in finding local housing sites within the town boundary. Why don't they examining the possibility of resitting of our F.C.Football Club to the Racecourse Complex?

18 Oxford Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HJ

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

18 Peregrine Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LL

Comments: 17th October 2013

I am writing to express my objection in the planning application Kidnappers Lane 13/01605/OUT

Leckhampton does not have the infrastructure for this level of development, the Shurdington Road is already at capacity and will not take an approximate additional 1000 cars.

The Local Senior schools are already oversubscribed, so Children will have to go to schools further away, again adding to the volume of traffic.

Air pollution is also another concern, and with the proposed developments this will only make matters worse. There will also be the increased risk of flooding. A brownfield first policy must be adopted, if we can regenerate run-down urban sites, this will preserve the open countryside.

With this level of development you will change the look and feel of Leckhampton; this is NOT what the local people want. You must reconsider the application and get verification on the transport, environment and population estimates contained in the housing targets.

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

18 Southcourt Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BT

Comments: 1st November 2013

I object to the planning application 13/01605/OUT. I am concerned about many elements of the proposal, but mainly over the future schooling and the danger the proposed developments will leave children with out schools. this in turn with the amount of traffic on the roads and breakdown of the transport system

187 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AD

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

19 Allenfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LX

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

19 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 6th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

19 Giffard Way
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PW

Comments: 31st October 2013

I am writing to object to outline plan ref 13/01605/OUT. I am concerned about this application for several reasons: the environmental impact, the number of houses proposed, and the impact on already overcrowded roads. This application should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury has been finalised, and all aspects of population estimates in the housing targets have been verified. Whatever happened to fulfilling housing needs by building on brownfield sites first?

19 Gordon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ES

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

19 Gordon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ES

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

19 Gordon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ES

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

19 Sarah Siddons Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LW

Comments: 11th October 2013

I wish to register my support for the whole development.

19 Selworthy
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3YA

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

19 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

192 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AE

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

193 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AD

Comments: 21st October 2013

This is a wholly inappropriate location for such a massive development. The local roads could not cope with the influx of traffic (and be assured people will use their cars to get to supermarkets, schools and employment etc no matter how many over-optimistic statements are included about cycleways, additional bus services primary school and shops). Losing green fields to concrete and tarmac would have a devastating effect on the local environment both for wildlife and local residents who have enjoyed walking the footpaths across and alongside the fields for decades if not centuries. These houses are not even needed! The application is premature while the JCS is still at the start of its public consultation period.

199 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AL

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

19A Thompson Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PJ

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

2 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HQ

Comments: 6th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

2 Azalea Drive
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3EA

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

2 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 6th November 2013
My prime objection to this application is that it is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the great uncertainties over housing need, jobs, traffic and transport, schooling and have been properly resolved.

2 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 6th November 2013

My prime objection to this application is that it is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the great uncertainties over: housing need, jobs, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly resolved.

2 Charnwood Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HL

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

2 Chelmsford Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DN

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

2 Ewlyn Terrace
Fairfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PD

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

2 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

2 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

2 Hobby Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LP

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

2 Jasmin Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HZ

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

2 John Moore Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LY

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

2 Kenelm Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JW

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

2 Kenelm Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JW

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

2 Larchmere Grove
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3NS

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

2 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LT

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

2 Tensing Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LX

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

2 The Spindles
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QD

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

2 The Spindles
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QD

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

2 Treelands Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DA

Comments: 13th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

2 Whitley Court
Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BJ

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

20 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

20 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

20 Hawkswood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DS

Comments: 4th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 1 (3rd - 11th October)

Comments: 29th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

20 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LT

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

20 Moorend Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EL

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

20 Southcourt Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BT

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

20 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

20 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

20 Woodlands Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

202 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EQ

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

21 Arthur Bliss Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LN

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

21 Chelmsford Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DL

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

21 Durham Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DF

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

21 Hawkswood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DT

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

21 Lichfield Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DQ

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

21 Lincoln Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DD

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

21 Merestones Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2ST

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

21 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ER

Comments: 25th November 2013

I wish to object to this planning application for 650 houses and other building between Kidnappers Lane, Church Lane and Shurdington Road in and adjacent to Leckhampton.

This development is not sustainable in terms of road transport. The A46 Shurdington Road and Church Lane are already highly congested in rush hour periods and exceed EC pollution guidelines in the winter. The increase in traffic generated by such a large development cannot be accommodated by the road infrastructure in this part of the town.

This development seeks to anticipate the Joint Core Strategy. Another developer has already described the road infrastructure as broken. The JCS transport plan and traffic modelling are essential pre-requisites to considering any more development in this area.

The area has had experience of flooding in the recent past and the drainage is already at the limit of its capacity.

The sewerage system in this part of town also has limited scope for increased flow.

The JCS seeks to minimise developmental impact on the Cotswolds AONB. This development threatens the amenity of the Cotswold Edge in the AONB and the Cotswolds Long Distance Footpath.

The basis of the JCS predictions of household growth are already under challenge from the Office of National Statistics and the Bristol Planning Inspectorate Local Plan Team. There is no sound basis for anticipating a requirement for this number of extra homes in the plan period to 2031 and any proposal for development at this stage cannot be justified before all aspects of the plan, likely housing and job growth, education provision, environment and sustainability assumptions have been verified and the plan adopted.

21 Paddocks Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4NU

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

21 Pilford Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EJ

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

21 St Davids Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HL

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

21 St Davids Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HL

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

21 Waterford Court
Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LA

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

22 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 17th October 2013
I object to the proposed development based on

- (1) Traffic Flow data used for the project assumes optimistic parameters, hence predictions are not sufficiently robust for decision making
- (2) Traffic flow along Shurdington Road will increase to cause gridlock
- (3) Route along Kidnappers Lane to be removed will lead to congestion elsewhere
- (4) Traffic turning out of Salisbury Avenue will have to wait longer in peak periods
- (5) Schooling has not been properly considered
- (6) Loss of amenities / green space to local people

- (7) Maintenance of sustainable drainage has not been considered - please ask how the permeable paving will be cleaned, this requires use of a mobile jetting unit to unblock the gaps between bricks. Local Authorities have been employing jetting companies to clear porous paving because the paving blocks up and becomes impermeable. If this happens then there will be more flooding in Winchester Way because the runoff rate will increase once again, thus leading to the old problems again
- (8) Church Road junction into Farm Lane is already dangerous. Traffic calming by means of speed bumps along this long road is considered awkward. Emergency vehicles will use this route, so the highways department may end up putting speed humps up that people drive around which may lead to accidents

22 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

22 Champion Park
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WA

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

22 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 29th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

22 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

22 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

22 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

23 Amaranth Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3YU

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

23 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HG

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

23 Giffard Way
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PW

Comments: 13th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

23 Hawkswood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DT

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

23 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

23 Tamarisk Close
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WL

Comments: 31st December 2013

Further to the public consultation a month ago at Leckhampton Primary School, I would like to make a couple of extra points. (1) The recent weather has completely waterlogged some of the fields which are intended for this development. Personally, I would steer well clear of buying a property on this land. (2) It has also been brought to my attention how difficult the Moorend Park Road / Leckhampton Road junction has already become due to parked vehicles making it single track just by the Hall Road junction. Additional traffic would cause terrible tail-backs here, especially if the Kidnapper's Lane is blocked to traffic going east-west from Hatherley through to Charlton Kings.

I had already expressed concern about the school situation and I would like to reiterate the fact that since St.James is already taking on an extra 15 children per year, that the Secondary School provision is not sufficient to absorb an even larger cohort that will present itself once the new estate is occupied. The losers will be existing residents that will no longer fall within the catchment area for Bournside e.g. St Marks, Leckhampton (East) and the Reddings.

It has also occurred to me that the new residents on the estate will not be obliged to choose the new primary school as their first choice. Many will opt for the (established) local school which has outstanding results (within walking distance). Children in east Leckhampton (Old Bath Road, Pilley and Charlton Lane) will lose out as the new estate is nearer to Leckhampton Primary than they are. We could end up with a terrible logistical nightmare for these families as they are forced to send their children to schools further afield. Nobody will want to buy homes in this area either!

Finally, the pollution situation as it stands is already unacceptable for families that have asthmatics. It has alarmed local residents that this is already very bad. Please don't make a bad situation even worse.

23 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 8th November 2013

Letter attached: WEEK Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

24 Chelmsford Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DN

Comments: 15th October 2013

I am writing in the strongest possible terms in objecting to the above planning application, it is ill conceived and premature. It is madness to allow overzealous developers and lobbying groups to ride rough shod on a process that will destroy the Leckhampton community, I have attended presentations by Curtain & Co regarding this application which on average produced a 97% objection rate, nevertheless they are allowed to pick away at the reducing green open spaces, including green belt, we have left to produce an unwanted urban sprawl. There has to be a line drawn somewhere, and we are certainly at that point now.

It is obvious that the known problems of traffic congestion, pollution, flooding & education have not been thought through. The A46 already has a major problem at peak times with traffic backing up to Shurdington and beyond, should this development go through the problem will stretch back to the Brockworth roundabout and beyond.

Education:

Although a primary school is planned where will these children go when they require secondary education? There are simply not enough places.

Flooding:

Again the A46 is always prone to flooding, will balancing ponds solve the problem with the extra thousands of tons of concrete to contend with? I doubt it.

The JCS are now quoting 33,000 homes required between now and 2031, but the census carried out by the Office of National Statistics in 2011 published a figure of 20,000 and backed up by Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

There was a report in the press recently that the JCS had considered plans to build a new town, this would surely be the most sensible route to take, but of course with all the utilities in place for developers to tap into it becomes an easy option, but at the same time decimating this AONB.

24 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PR

Comments: 23rd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

24 Giffard Way
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PP

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

24 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LT

Comments: 25th September 2013

With regard to potential flooding from watercourses, Section 14 Table 11 states that 'Buffer strips alongside Leck 1, Leck 2 and Leck 3 and localised minor ground raising alongside Leck 3 will maintain separation between development and the 1:100 year flood plains associated with these watercourses. As a result there is negligible fluvial flood risk to the development.

The effect of such ground raising will, in the case of Leck 3, be simply to increase the risk of flooding on the opposite bank of the watercourse - in an area which has been recognised in Figure 3 of the plan as being liable to flooding. In other words, whilst ground raising will provide protection for the development site, it will exacerbate the risk to existing properties on the opposite side of the watercourse.

For this reason, development should be excluded from the area adjacent to Leck 3.

24 Moorend Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HA

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

24 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AQ

Comments: 24th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

24 The Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PG

Comments: 5th November 2013

I strongly object to the planning application for the area of Kidnappers Lane and small holdings. Yet again must we draw your attention to chronic traffic congestion on the A46 (Shurdington road) into town and the consequent rat runs created by said congestion. Some busy mornings I can wait some 5 minutes just to pull out of my street. 24 The Close. I also consider other issues to be a relevant objections overcrowded schools lack of a good public transport link, a lack of other amenities, and yet more erosion of pleasant fields and countryside.

243A Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EF

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

25 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 6th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

25 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

25 Peregrine Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LN

Comments: 15th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

25 Tamarisk Close
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WL

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

25 Timperley Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RH

Comments: 18th July 2014

Letter attached: BATCH 12

25 Warren Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HW

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

25 Woodlands Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RS

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

26 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PR

Comments: 11th December 2013
I wish to object to the proposed development of the following grounds:

I believe the JCS has over-estimated the number of new homes needed.

Neither the roads nor the local schools could deal with the extra traffic and children generated by so many new homes. I live on Church Road, Leckhampton and have given up trying to get the car out onto the road during the rush hour, it is way too stressful. Extra traffic would just exacerbate an already difficult situation. All the local schools are full to bursting, too.

Not only is the traffic on Church Road and Shurdington Road too busy already but the extra pollution would adversely affect the local area.

Some of the fields flood in the winter (and even in a wet summer) so building on them makes no sense.

I think about 98% of the local population are against such extensive building of houses in the very pretty area, could you not listen to us?

26 Greatfield Lane
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3QQ

Comments: 17th March 2014
Letter attached: BATCH 12

26 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

26 Mead Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7DT

Comments: 6th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

26 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LU

Comments: 27th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 11 (14th - 20th December)

26 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 14th October 2013
I strongly object to the development for the following reasons:

1. Prematurity of application
2. Flood risk
3. Lack of capacity on roads to support increased traffic
4. Lack of secondary school provision for incoming/ existing children in the area.
5. As a parent and health professional I am gravely concerned about the loss of open space. Only last weekend my children were out blackberry picking, looking out for sheep, ducks and chickens in an area allocated for 'high density housing'.

Time and time again local residents are having to argue the same points to protect the land that is so precious and means so much to our community. The development is not wanted, not needed and will leave a permanent scar in a once beautiful part of Cheltenham.

26 Moorend Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EH

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

26 Rothermere Close
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3UU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

26A Winchester Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HA

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

27 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

27 Rosehip Court
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WN

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

27 The Greenings
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3UX

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

27 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

27 Warren Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HW

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

28 Durham Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DF

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

28 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LU

Comments: 14th October 2013
I have many objections to the proposed development. The application should not be considered before

1. The JCS report is finalised
2. In isolation from other development plans.

I am surprised that so little change has been made from the plan submitted for public consultation on 22nd Sept 2012, despite the objections made by a large majority of those who attended. My objections to the detail of the plans are,

1. Loss of amenity,
This is the last area of open land in a highly populated parish. Any development of this land should include much more in the way of Green corridors/Linear parks/Public open space for the benefit of the existing population, any new population and the abundant wildlife of the area.

2. Traffic,
The numerous pages in the application are not for the layman but if one dwelling in three has a vehicle emerging in the morning rush hour, an additional car will be joining the Shurdington Road congestion every 15 seconds. The proposals do not deal with this problem adequately.

3. Flood Risk.
The flood risk assessment deals mainly with managing the development itself. Although they say on Page 28 "No increased risk to third parties alongside the development" on page 40, they propose to raise the level of a considerable area of the land alongside the watercourse, LECH 3, by a minimum of 0.5 metres. This, together with the plan to increase the capacity of the drainage ditches feeding into LECH 3 will increase the flood risk to Merlin Way in the event of an exceptional weather event. This is unacceptable.

I would urge all Councillors and Officers to reject these proposals and encourage a much lower density that is more in keeping with the image of Cheltenham as a green and pleasant town.

Comments: 3rd July 2014

Further to my e-mail of 14th October 2013 detailing some of my objections to the development proposal - I am pleased to see that the JCS Pre-submission document reinforces my arguments with the following statements:-

1, VISIONS AND OBJECTIVES

"Development that does not compromise the quality of life of present and future generations".
"A town within a park"

2, STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4

"Conserve natural environment"
"Improve green infrastructure"
"Provide movement corridors for people and wildlife"

3, GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

"All development should make a positive contribution to the green infrastructure"

I would contend that the application does not deal adequately with any of the, above, requirements of the JCS strategy document.

I urge that all Council Officers and Councillors ,again, to reject the application and demand a more suitable plan for this area.

28 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 23rd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

28 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 23rd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

28 Treelands Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DE

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

284 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AP

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

287 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AJ

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

289 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AJ

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

28B Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HG

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

292 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AP

Comments: 29th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

298 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AP

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

2A Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

3 Azalea Drive
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3EA

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

3 Gardenia Grove
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HR

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

3 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

3 Kenelm Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JW

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

3 Pilford Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9HA

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

3 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AG

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

3 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AG

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

3 Silverthorn Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

3 Southfield Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LH

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

3 The Spindles
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QD

Comments: 2nd December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 12

3 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

30 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

30 Campion Park
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WA

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

30 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

30 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

30 Hillary Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LD

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

30 Moorend Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HA

Comments: 18th October 2013

1) Given the magnitude of this application, it would be preposterous and undemocratic for this to go the planning committee before the consultation on the Joint Core Strategy with its contentious new housing targets is completed and the JCS endorsed by the people it affects.

2) There are no cycle lanes, bus lanes or rail routes to serve a big development in the site proposed, and I have serious concerns about the impact of the increase in traffic onto Shurdington Road at peak times. It is also obvious that Farm Lane and Church Road in Leckhampton would become a significant rat-run to avoid queues on the A46. Farm Lane is a small country lane, unsuitable for any increase in traffic, especially larger vehicles that will serve the commercial and community enterprises envisaged in the application and which are equally likely to "rat-run".

Church Lane in Leckhampton is already at close to chaos at peak times, traffic flow being badly restricted by resident's parked vehicles. The children and parents from Leckhampton Primary School also spill out onto Church Lane and any increase in traffic along it would have serious safety implications. Any significant increase in usage by larger commercial vehicles would be particularly concerning.

3) The smallholdings and fields that would have to be sacrificed for both this application (and the equally large associated further development already flagged) signal the "countryside" and the edge of Cheltenham. This proposed development would simply signal urban "sprawl". Cheltenham needs to value and maintain its ambience, identity and scenic location or it will lose the very things that make it attractive in the first place.

30 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2HA

Comments: 29th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

30 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BS

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

302 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AP

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

31 Hillary Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LB

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

31 St Michaels Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RP

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

31 Waterford Court
Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LA

Comments: 18th October 2013

Sir - have you discussed the increase in population as envisaged by the proposal to build 650 houses in Leckhampton with CHELTENHAM GENERAL HOSPITAL?

A surgery is all very well, but hospitalisation will also be required. We are talking at least 2 people per house - = another 1300 potential patients? And A & E here is already closed at nights. Perhaps Gloucester Royal should also be consulted

Both hospitals are already overstretched.

I would like confirmation that you have had full discussions with the Chief Executive

32 Lichfield Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DH

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

32 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

32 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HD

Comments: 22nd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

32 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JD

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

325 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AJ

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

326 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AL

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

33 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HG

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

33 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ER

Comments: 22nd November 2013
I wish to object to the planning application for 650 new homes in Leckhampton.

My objection is on 2 grounds;

1) I do not think that there is (nor planned) the appropriate infrastructure to support such a huge number of new homes

The local roads will be impacted to such a degree that traffic congestion will be horrendous. The A46 Shurdington Road is already heavily congested at peak times and this proposed development will make the situation impossible. Traffic using Church Road will also be greatly increased. This is a bottle neck at peak times and with a primary school close there will be the increased risk of road accidents.

There will also be insufficient school places to cope with the increased local population. I appreciate that a new primary school has been proposed - although this will not be built until later? A new primary school should be built right from the onset. My biggest concern however is about secondary school places. Leckhampton as a catchment area is currently caught between Balcarras and Bournside. With 650 new homes in the area this will put an unprecedented demand on these 2 local schools that they simply cannot meet. The building of a new secondary school would be essential.

The infrastructure of the local area must be considered. It is not just about the building of new homes - it the impact of these additional families - the cars they drive, schools they will want to

attend etc - that Cheltenham Borough Council have a responsibility to consider and make appropriate plans for.

2) The number of homes is too high!

I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to development. Quite the opposite. I fully appreciate the wider government policy and that of the JCT to build additional homes in the area. Leckhampton would make a fantastic home to new families and the community would benefit. My issue is with the volume of homes proposed.

Why can this not be reduced to something more sensible such as 300 homes? At least some of the greenbelt area around Leckhampton should be protected. This is precious space that once built on can never be replaced. I would suggest that any land 'saved' could be used for a new Leckhampton community park. This would bring tremendous value to the area and provide a place of recreation to both existing residents and new families moving to the area. This would be far more sensible option and cause much less overall impact to the local infrastructure (as outlined in Point 1)

I implore you to consider these views and those of many residents of Leckhampton that do not want their village and surrounding area ruined.

I will be attending the public meeting on Weds 27th November at Leckhampton Primary School where I hope to raise these views again and question some of the decision making regarding this planning application.

33 Pilley Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ES

Comments: 25th October 2013

I write to state my strong objection to planning application 13/01605/OUT for the erection of 650 houses on land around Kidnappers Lane in Leckhampton.

Yet again we are faced with what is in essence the same proposal as before, to build on and spoil forever a very large slice of Leckhampton's green fields. It was unacceptable before and it is unacceptable now. The various reasons for objection all still apply.

I strongly object to these proposals to build houses in Leckhampton and Shurdington. I consider that such construction would cause severe and permanent damage to the environment of these places. Valuable landscape (the AONB and Leckhampton Hill) would be damaged. It would adversely affect the outstanding views, from, and towards, the Cotswold escarpment

I do not think that landscaping can possibly obscure the damage, which would be clearly visible from the high ground for miles around. It seems to me that building as proposed would be a significant step towards joining Cheltenham and Gloucester, so that a single urban area would result. The site is in the Green Belt, which is intended to prevent coalescence between Cheltenham and Gloucester.

I consider that the additional traffic which such a scheme would generate would have a major adverse impact upon Leckhampton and the surrounding area. As a professional that uses church lane everyday to commute to work I know first hand how busy it is already, the addition of extra houses/cars would cause major traffic issues and would have an adverse effect on the air quality and local environment.

The effect on Cheltenham will be incredibly undesirable, with a larger population, more traffic, more congestion and more shops, and the negatives effects on the natural environment and local wildlife will be horrific. Flooding in the area is already a difficulty which the development seems likely to exacerbate. If more fields are filled with building foundations where is excess water supposed to drain away?

We live in transient times, and I accept that change must happen but I strongly believe this should only be the case if the change is for the better these proposals seem purely motivated by money and not in the interests of the current or future population. We moved to this area for the good balance of shops, housing and above all green areas in which we walk our dog and our child plays. I feel that often with new developments the residents who already exist are not considered highly enough and what the impact would be on their lives.

I would question how you have come to the ridiculous figure of 33,000 houses to be built in the Cheltenham and it's local areas, this seems to be a gross over estimation of requirement unless you are actually intent on encouraging a vast population inhabiting the region from other areas of the country and from abroad? With unemployment levels as high as they are the amount of young adults being able to afford/wanting to afford their own housing is lower than in previous years, with many choosing to stay at home longer to save money, so who will fill these houses?

Having a young family myself I want this area to stay green, full of nature and beautiful open spaces. I feel that extra housing would drive people out of this area heading for greener lands. We have chosen to move here , a safe haven from pollution and traffic, with an abundance of wildlife on our doorstep. Yet you actively seek to deny future generations this healthy lifestyle, in a time when childhood obesity is ever encroaching on our nation, this is totally ridiculous. as a parent, I know we are living in times where technology and ICT is highly prominent in children's lives I know the importance of encouraging children to enjoy the outdoors and appreciate nature. This will become harder and harder to do if surrounding green belted areas are built on for monetary profits. The cost on the NHS to treat obesity is phenomenal and I believe that taking away places and opportunities for children to be active will only add to this on-going, growing problem.

It is about time that politicians started to listen to the people of this nation before they abandon it completely. It would be a grave mistake to proceed with the scheme.

33 Pilley Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ES

Comments: 25th October 2013

I write to state my strong objection to planning application 13/01605/OUT for the erection of 650 houses on land around Kidnappers Lane in Leckhampton.

Yet again we are faced with what is in essence the same proposal as before, to build on and spoil forever a very large slice of Leckhampton's green fields. It was unacceptable before and it is unacceptable now. The various reasons for objection all still apply.

I strongly object to these proposals to build houses in Leckhampton and Shurdington. I consider that such construction would cause severe and permanent damage to the environment of these places. Valuable landscape (the AONB and Leckhampton Hill) would be damaged. It would adversely affect the outstanding views, from, and towards, the Cotswold escarpment

I do not think that landscaping can possibly obscure the damage, which would be clearly visible from the high ground for miles around. It seems to me that building as proposed would be a significant step towards joining Cheltenham and Gloucester, so that a single urban area would

result. The site is in the Green Belt, which is intended to prevent coalescence between Cheltenham and Gloucester.

I consider that the additional traffic which such a scheme would generate would have a major adverse impact upon Leckhampton and the surrounding area. As a professional that uses church lane everyday to commute to work I know first hand how busy it is already, the addition of extra houses/cars would cause major traffic issues and would have an adverse effect on the air quality and local environment.

The effect on Cheltenham will be incredibly undesirable, with a larger population, more traffic, more congestion and more shops, and the negatives effects on the natural environment and local wildlife will be horrific. Flooding in the area is already a difficulty which the development seems likely to exacerbate. If more fields are filled with building foundations where is excess water supposed to drain away?

We live in transient times, and I accept that change must happen but I strongly believe this should only be the case if the change is for the better these proposals seem purely motivated by money and not in the interests of the current or future population. We moved to this area for the good balance of shops, housing and above all green areas in which we walk our dog and our child plays. I feel that often with new developments the residents who already exist are not considered highly enough and what the impact would be on their lives.

I would question how you have come to the ridiculous figure of 33,000 houses to be built in the Cheltenham and it's local areas, this seems to be a gross over estimation of requirement unless you are actually intent on encouraging a vast population inhabiting the region from other areas of the country and from abroad? With unemployment levels as high as they are the amount of young adults being able to afford/wanting to afford their own housing is lower than in previous years, with many choosing to stay at home longer to save money, so who will fill these houses?

Having a young family myself I want this area to stay green, full of nature and beautiful open spaces. I feel that extra housing would drive people out of this area heading for greener lands. We have chosen to move here , a safe haven from pollution and traffic, with an abundance of wildlife on our doorstep. Yet you actively seek to deny future generations this healthy lifestyle, in a time when childhood obesity is ever encroaching on our nation, this is totally ridiculous. As a primary school teacher living in times where technology and ICT is highly prominent in children's lives I know the importance of encouraging children to enjoy the outdoors and appreciate nature. This will become harder and harder to do if surrounding green belted areas are built on for monetary profits. The cost on the NHS to treat obesity is phenomenal and I believe that taking away places and opportunities for children to be active will only add to this on-going, growing problem.

It is about time that politicians started to listen to the people of this nation before they abandon it completely. It would be a grave mistake to proceed with the scheme.

33 Southcourt Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

33 St Michaels Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RP

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

331 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AJ

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

34 Campion Park
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WA

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

34 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LU

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

343 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AH

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

344 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

346 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AF

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

346 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AF

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

347 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AH

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

34A Pilley Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ER

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 13th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

35 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SD

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

35 Wells Close
Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BX

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

35 Westbury Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EN

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

356 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

357 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AH

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

36 Moorend Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EH

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

37 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DY

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

37 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DY

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

372 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AD

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

377 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AH

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

38 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

38 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HD

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

38 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HD

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

38 Moorend Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EH

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

38 Norwich Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HE

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

4 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 30th October 2013

We have been living here for past 4 years. We have moved to this house aiming to get a catchment to nearest primary school for my 4 year son. Unfortunately the school was oversubscribed and we did not get a place. We have no other option apart choosing the private school far away 2 miles(St Edwards).With current population and peak hr traffic we not able reach school ontime through both shrudington and Leckhampton roads.

As schools are oversubscribed with current population we are worried for secondary school places.

We also worried for my second child to get into primary school. We cannot afford both private option.

My childrens and we enjoy the local Green fields and walks. They certainly enjoy nearest pig farm. My son is very good in school nature knowledge as he spending time in green fields, plants and animals.

Please strongly reject this development .This will increase local traffic and no places to local schools and loss of green fields.

4 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

4 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

4 Charnwood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HJ

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

4 Chestnut Place
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QE

Comments: 21st October 2013
We wish to OBJECT to the above application. The reasons for our objection are as follows:-

The development will cause traffic chaos. There are already daily long queues of traffic at peak times along Shurdington Road adjacent to where the development is set to take place. The traffic layout proposed here closes access from the new development to Church Road via Kidnappers Lane, meaning that ALL traffic from existing properties plus the new houses (estimated to generate an additional 1000 vehicles) will join Shurdington Road. Additionally the siting of a primary school, surgery and other non-residential amenities there will add to traffic volumes as inevitably they will be used by people other than in their immediate vicinity. Essentially the JCS transport plan and traffic modelling for Leckhampton must come forward before this application goes to planning committee. Air Pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Shurdington Road A46 and Church Road in the winter months. The extra traffic referred to above will add to this problem. This goes against the idea of making Cheltenham an Air Quality Management Area to tackle the problem of air pollution.

Aside from the dubious wisdom of siting an new primary school within the development, there are insufficient senior school places in the area , EVEN NOW, and neither Balcarras or Bournside schools have plans to expand. Residents of the new homes could face lengthy journeys to school. The development will cause irreparable harm to the local landscape (close to the AONB) and to wildlife. On a general point, we strongly believe that developers should not be able to get

away with building on green field sites such as this, at least until alternative 'brownfield sites' have been exhausted.

This brings us back to the JCS, which is still to be ratified. Surely at the very least this application is premature and should not go before the planning committee until the JCS is finalised, and all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates on which the housing targets are based have been verified.

4 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PR

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

4 Fairfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PE

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

4 Giffard Way
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PP

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

4 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

4 Justicia Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3YH

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

4 Kestrel Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LQ

Comments: 21st October 2013

Further to the proposed planning applications as a local resident of Leckhampton I would like to raise my objection & highlight my concerns;

- Traffic; Shurdington Road is already close to grid lock on mornings & evening, let along the increased pollution risks
- Flooding; having lived in Cheltenham for some time now & seen the effects of flooding, we need to keep our green belt
- We live in Leckhampton to enable us to take our children into the countryside through local walks & I would like to see the agricultural land remain
- Lack of provision for secondary school places

I believe we will be disproportionately affected by these plans & therefore I hope the proposals are rescinded.

4 Leckhampton Farm Court
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3GS

Comments: 16th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

4 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

4 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

4 Pickering Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LE

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

4 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Comments: 14th November 2013
I very strongly object to any further development in Leckhampton as I have outlined on many previous occasions.

I do agree with all of the rehearsed comments which have been made over recent years against such developments.

Please adhere to the wishes of the local people who live here; it is their right to make such major decisions, and not bureaucrats and developers from afar.

40 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

40 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LU

Comments: 13th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

40 Moorend Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EL

Comments: 22nd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

41 Campion Park
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WA

Comments: 4th November 2013

I wish to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- a) Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing needs, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly resolved.
- b) The traffic congestion created by this development together with other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create huge traffic queues in peak travel periods. The planning application offers no solutions to the grave traffic problems.
- c) The suggestions made for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are unlikely to be successful. Church Road already suffers from severe congestion at peak times. The suggestions made are likely to encourage accidents and may well increase traffic flow elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.
- d) I am deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.
- e) Leckhampton Firelds is an area that my family and I greatly value for recreation. It should be preserved as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill, as suggested in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan.

42 Fernleigh Crescent
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3QL

Comments: 25th September 2013

I write as Cabinet member (Sustainability) for CBC. It is my view that the area shown as Community Orchard on the map would be more appropriately redesignated as further allotments (as the adjacent area already is). It is difficult to identify known demand for a Community Orchard, or who will tend it. On the other hand there is substantial proven demand for allotments, as council officers can demonstrate.

Comments: 13th May 2014

Ref Doctors' Surgery - it might provide a much better and more cost-effective service if the Doctors' Surgery facility was provided by upgrading and enhancing the existing (Portland Practice) facility in Hulbert Crescent , i.e. next to Morrisons. With 650 houses on the new site, the facility would probably be quite limited, whereas a combined facility at Portland would benefit all.

42 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

42 Pilley Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ER

Comments: 14th October 2013

I am writing in my capacity as a Leckhampton resident, to express my serious concerns about the above-referenced outline planning application. I have many concerns about the proposed development, but have highlighted below the three issues that concern me most:

Traffic congestion. This area of Cheltenham is already heavily congested, especially at peak periods, and I do not feel that this issue has been adequately addressed in the proposed plans.

Secondary school places. There is already considerable pressure on secondary schools in the area, and the addition of another primary school will only exacerbate the situation by creating additional primary places with no assurances of a secondary school place thereafter. As a parent of three, I am very concerned that the proposal does nothing to address this problem at all, and in fact seems only likely to make it worse.

Local area character. I find the proposal to build on such a beautiful area, which is a much-loved amenity for local people, frankly appalling. I fear that the character of Leckhampton (which our family moved from Hatherley to Leckhampton to enjoy), will be spoilt by the loss of this area. Aside from the impact on the ground, the view from Devil's Chimney and the Cotswold Way in this direction will become nothing more interesting than more urban sprawl, instead of the green and pleasant view it currently presents.

I would be grateful if you would take my concerns into consideration as the application process moves forward.

42 Waterford Court
Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LA

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Comments: 13th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

43 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DY

Comments: 21st November 2013

I am writing to object to the proposed development of land off Kindnappers Lane, Cheltenham. As a Leckhampton resident I am very concerned about the impact of;

- 1) the increased vehicle traffic in the area if the development goes ahead. There is already significant traffic and pollution in the area. Living on Charlton Lane we have noticed a huge increase since we moved into our property 3 years ago, let alone building another 1075 homes.
- 2) Disruption during the building of these homes - we are already experiencing a large volume of large vehicles, dirt and noise pollution from a much smaller development on Charlton Lane which has been in progress for quite some time now.
- 3) As a new parent I am also concerned about the school places in primary and secondary schools.
- 4) Impact to the environment from building on a green field site. Leckhampton is a beautiful area with lots of fields, I would not want to reduce the fields in the area.

43 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EZ

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

44 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

44 Westbury Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EW

Comments: 24th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

45 Princes Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TX

Comments: 28th October 2013

I object to this planning application for 650 houses in Leckhampton for the following reasons:

1. The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) has yet to be completed. If this is judged to be an insufficient reason, on the basis that an Inspector at appeal might judge that the absence of a plan is not sufficient to stop a 'legitimate' application, then it should still be rejected on the basis that it is not as integrated or as comprehensive as the plan within the JCS.
2. It is imperative that the JCS process is completed before this application is properly considered, as it should provide Cheltenham with a sound strategy for solving its perceived housing shortage. As part of its deliberations, it should consider the Elms Park site as a preferred location to the Leckhampton site, on the basis of sustainability. Traffic pressures at Leckhampton are more severe than NW Cheltenham. The Elms Park site can also take much more than the 4,829 houses proposed in the JCS (the AMEC Site Capacity Assessment suggests a potential of up to 15,720). So it is essential that the JCS completes its detailed traffic studies so that this comparison of sites can be evaluated.
3. In anticipation of objections to any expansion of the Elms Park site, on the basis that the build rate could not meet the perceived need, I would suggest that the JCS population growth assumptions have significant uncertainties associated with their rate of growth, even if the totals themselves prove to be correct. So the speed of building out Elms Park should not be seen as a limitation but more of a 'blessing in disguise', as a controlled building rate reduces the risk of over expansion and an over capacity of housing.
4. Leckhampton should be protected as a Local Green Space, as proposed by the local parish council, LEGLAG and Mr Martin Horwood, MP for Cheltenham.
5. If the JCS process refuses to acknowledge the significant objections from the local community, and proceeds with developing Leckhampton, then it should introduce a local Park and Ride facility as part of its Master Plan. Additionally, it should increase the targets in the developer's residential and non-residential Travel Plans for more walking, cycling, public transport and less car journeys. These targets should be supported by significantly increasing the size of the Security Bond in the contract.

45 St Michaels Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RP

Comments: 22nd November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

45 Winchester Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3EZ

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

46 Everest Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LG

Comments: 18th November 2013

I am writing to object to the proposed development 13/01605/OUT for the following reasons:

- a) Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly resolved.
- b) The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in the peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the grave traffic problems.
- c) The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.
- d) I am personally deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.
- e) My family greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. I strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill.

In summary, there is no justification for going ahead at this point in time with such a large-scale irreversible experiment in increasing the population of this area.

46 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LU

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

47 Moorend Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EJ

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

47 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BT

Comments: 11th November 2013

Please accept this email as a formal objection to the above mentioned planning application (13/01605/OUT). This objection comes from (*name withheld*) of 47 Salisbury Avenue, Warden Hill, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL51 3BT and my objections to the planning application are as follows:

Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been resolved.

The traffic congestion created by this development together with other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in the peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the grave traffic problems.

The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as Moorend Park Road.

Are the council aware of the traffic problems we are already experiencing on the Shurdington Road during rush hour? It is not uncommon to see huge tailbacks up and down this road both in the mornings and in the evenings and the provision of additional homes will only add to this problem making an untenable situation even worse. The amount of traffic that will be created will either cause complete gridlock of this road or, if diverted, will create an increased risk to our families on roads not designed for this level of congestion.

My family and I are deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.

My family and I greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. We strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill. Our family have lived in Warden Hill for over fifty years and the attraction of the area originally was the open space that could be enjoyed by our family. We have all benefitted from the local footpaths, landscape and history that the Leckhampton fields provide and do still to this day. We believe that our house prices in Warden Hill and Leckhampton reflect the outdoor space available to us and our property prices would be gravely affected should the development be given permission to proceed.

Warden Hill and Hatherley have seen major developments over the last thirty years. During my time here I can remember the development on the edge of the Weavers Field and then the huge development from Farmfield Road edging back creating countless houses, a shopping estate, doctors surgery etc. We have surely seen our fair share of development and ask that our strong

feelings towards the Leckhampton fields for recreation be taken as seriously as any other point made. We cannot begin to explain the value we put on the green space that is under threat and would class it as a grave loss for future generations not to be able to enjoy the wildlife, history and landscape as we have been able to.

In accordance with the NPPF, the JCS must objectively estimate the housing need for Cheltenham and not exaggerate it. Where there is uncertainty the JCS must use the lower figure and keep land in reserve to respond flexibly if the housing need should turn out to be larger. The JCS must not risk allowing building on the green belt and the Leckhampton fields and then find out too late that this building was not necessary to meet the actual housing need.

In accordance with the NPPF, the JCS must promote sustainable transport. The housing developments currently proposed in south Cheltenham would have a devastating impact on the traffic and completely break the transport system. This is utterly unacceptable.

My husband and I recently married and plan to have children in the future however with the increased pressure on the local schooling we are deeply concerned over the danger the proposed developments which will leave our children without local schools. We understand that the new development includes the provision of a new primary school but this will not be built until a later stage leaving no primary provision for three hundred or so homes. The secondary schools are also already oversubscribed - the plans supplied give no answer to these major problems.

Living in Warden Hill we are extremely concerned regarding flooding. The floods of 2007 showed existing major flaws in the flood prevention plans which have since been rectified however with the development of further properties we can only worry about flooding in the future once the plans are found not to work and our homes at the bottom of Warden Hill are under water. We are advised that flood prevention has been taken into account with the plans for this development however it must be strongly noted that these plans cannot be guaranteed. The developers are suggesting that flood prevention has been taken into account however as long term residents of the Warden Hill community (our family has lived in the area for nearly forty years) we are deeply concerned for our properties. Does the requirement for developers profits outweigh the objections of the existing residents of the area?

In summary, we cannot stress enough how catastrophic we would see the granting of the proposed development on the Leckhampton fields. We are very worried about the level of increased traffic it would create both for our neighbourhood but also for our families. We have enjoyed a relatively quiet and accident free environment and believe that the granting of this application would not only de-value our property as the increased properties would devour the greenery in which our community has been built around but the increased risk to our families cannot have a price placed on it.

We have not had an assured guarantee that flooding in Warden Hill would not be increased due to this development and if 2007 is remembered then the results of this were costly enough. We DO NOT want to re-live this situation or have any question marks hanging over us as to when this may happen again. The risk of flooding cannot be guaranteed and we must therefore stress our strong objection to the plans.

The area has already been developed over the last thirty years and we do not see the requirement to take away our green space for the unnecessary building of these extra houses.

We believe that as long standing residents of Warden Hill the authorities should take note of our objections and not be pushed into a corner by the developers. Are you aware that at a recent survey conducted by LWWH that over 94% of people were opposed or strongly opposed to the proposed development. Developers cannot force this housing on us and we urge the council and the authorities to take our pleas seriously.

47 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BT

Comments: 11th November 2013

Please accept this email as a formal objection to the above mentioned planning application (13/01605/OUT). This objection comes from (*name withheld*) of 47 Salisbury Avenue, Warden Hill, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL51 3BT and my objections to the planning application are as follows:

Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been resolved.

The traffic congestion created by this development together with other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in the peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the grave traffic problems.

The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as Moorend Park Road.

Are the council aware of the traffic problems we are already experiencing on the Shurdington Road during rush hour? It is not uncommon to see huge tailbacks up and down this road both in the mornings and in the evenings and the provision of additional homes will only add to this problem making an untenable situation even worse. The amount of traffic that will be created will either cause complete gridlock of this road or, if diverted, will create an increased risk to our families on roads not designed for this level of congestion.

My family and I are deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.

My family and I greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. We strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill. Our family have lived in Warden Hill for over fifty years and the attraction of the area originally was the open space that could be enjoyed by our family. We have all benefitted from the local footpaths, landscape and history that the Leckhampton fields provide and do still to this day. We believe that our house prices in Warden Hill and Leckhampton reflect the outdoor space available to us and our property prices would be gravely affected should the development be given permission to proceed.

Warden Hill and Hatherley have seen major developments over the last thirty years. During my time here I can remember the development on the edge of the Weavers Field and then the huge development from Farmfield Road edging back creating countless houses, a shopping estate, doctors surgery etc. We have surely seen our fair share of development and ask that our strong feelings towards the Leckhampton fields for recreation be taken as seriously as any other point made. We cannot begin to explain the value we put on the green space that is under threat and would class it as a grave loss for future generations not to be able to enjoy the wildlife, history and landscape as we have been able to.

In accordance with the NPPF, the JCS must objectively estimate the housing need for Cheltenham and not exaggerate it. Where there is uncertainty the JCS must use the lower figure and keep land in reserve to respond flexibly if the housing need should turn out to be larger. The

JCS must not risk allowing building on the green belt and the Leckhampton fields and then find out too late that this building was not necessary to meet the actual housing need.

In accordance with the NPPF, the JCS must promote sustainable transport. The housing developments currently proposed in south Cheltenham would have a devastating impact on the traffic and completely break the transport system. This is utterly unacceptable.

My daughter and son in law recently married and plan to have children in the future however with the increased pressure on the local schooling we are deeply concerned over the danger the proposed developments which will leave our children without local schools. We understand that the new development includes the provision of a new primary school but this will not be built until a later stage leaving no primary provision for three hundred or so homes. The secondary schools are also already oversubscribed - the plans supplied give no answer to these major problems.

Living in Warden Hill we are extremely concerned regarding flooding. The floods of 2007 showed existing major flaws in the flood prevention plans which have since been rectified however with the development of further properties we can only worry about flooding in the future once the plans are found not to work and our homes at the bottom of Warden Hill are under water. We are advised that flood prevention has been taken into account with the plans for this development however it must be strongly noted that these plans cannot be guaranteed. The developers are suggesting that flood prevention has been taken into account however as long term residents of the Warden Hill community (our family has lived in the area for nearly fifty years) we are deeply concerned for our properties. Does the requirement for developers profits outweigh the objections of the existing residents of the area?

In summary, we cannot stress enough how catastrophic we would see the granting of the proposed development on the Leckhampton fields. We are very worried about the level of increased traffic it would create both for our neighbourhood but also for our families. We have enjoyed a relatively quiet and accident free environment and believe that the granting of this application would not only de-value our property as the increased properties would devour the greenery in which our community has been built around but the increased risk to our families cannot have a price placed on it.

We have not had an assured guarantee that flooding in Warden Hill would not be increased due to this development and if 2007 is remembered then the results of this were costly enough. We DO NOT want to re-live this situation or have any question marks hanging over us as to when this may happen again. The risk of flooding cannot be guaranteed and we must therefore stress our strong objection to the plans.

The area has already been developed over the last thirty years and we do not see the requirement to take away our green space for the unnecessary building of these extra houses.

We believe that as long standing residents of Warden Hill the authorities should take note of our objections and not be pushed into a corner by the developers. Are you aware that at a recent survey conducted by LWWH that over 94% of people were opposed or strongly opposed to the proposed development. Developers cannot force this housing on us and we urge the council and the authorities to take our pleas seriously.

48 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 14th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

48 Lichfield Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DR

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

49 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

49 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

49 Salisbury Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BT

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

5 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HG

Comments: 18th October 2013

I wish to comment on the above ref, an application for 650 dwellings between Kidnapper's Lane and Shurdington Road, Leckhampton.

I object to this application on the following grounds:

Traffic. This development would generate unacceptable amounts of traffic onto Shurdington Road, which is already overloaded at peak times. Local roads cannot absorb this extra load. I believe that Shurdington Road already fails to meet EU standards for air quality, which would only get worse. As for Bath Road, the logical route into Cheltenham centre, this would become completely blocked.

Schools: insufficient spaces, especially in secondary schools.

The numbers of houses planned would swamp our Leckhampton community, destroying its village atmosphere and turning it into a dormitory area.

The development would ruin the quality of the local landscape, spoiling views both to and from Leckhampton hill.

This application is only a forerunner for the thousands of houses which developers wish to build in our area. I believe it to be a cynical attempt by developers to "get in under the wire" while the current changes to the planning system are being bedded in. As such, it should not be allowed, until a more comprehensive strategy has emerged.

5 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

5 Blackthorn End
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QB

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

5 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

5 David French Court
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BQ

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

5 Halland Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DJ

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

5 Hampton Close
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DZ

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

5 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 14th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

5 Merlin Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NF

Comments: 6th December 2013

I refer to the Planning Application as mentioned above, and wish to object in the strongest possible terms to this development.

I am a resident of Leckhampton, and whilst not being directly affected by it, I am of the opinion that this development will be disastrous not just for Leckhampton, but for Cheltenham as a whole. I list below:

1) The irresponsibility of adding even more traffic chaos and pollution risk on the Shurdington Road, Moorend Road, Church Road and Bath Road. My young neighbour risks an accident every day, as she teaches at Birdlip School, and rather than try to make the journey via the Shurdington Road which she finds impossible, travels via Leckhampton Hill onto the 417/9 where she has to take the disastrous right turn off to Birdlip and Stroud. To even think of increasing traffic on the Shurdington Road is unbelievable.

We must accept that 650 houses will mean minimum of 1,000 vehicles. However we must also add a Doctors' surgery. The present surgery which will close on Moorend Road has vehicles in and out all day. Because of its present location - in the middle of dense housing, where many patients are able to walk to the Surgery. If however it moves to Farm Lane there will be greater need for patients to travel by car along the Shurdington Road a huge amount of traffic. A mini market - more traffic. Primary School - more traffic, and other small business units - more traffic.

The result of this gross irresponsibility will be utterly disastrous to Church Road - where even the developers admit they have no solution.

2) The very real risk of flooding which may well ensue with dangers of such flooding in Warden Hill.

3) The lack of infrastructure, i.e. Schools, particularly Secondary.

4) The loss of amenity/green areas for families and particularly young children to enjoy. This area is well used by families/walkers - this at a time when organisations such as the National

Trust and CPRE are emphasising the importance of such amenities for young people. Once lost to Cheltenham, it can never be returned.

5) Cheltenham has been described as the Jewel of the Cotswolds, and the entrance to it from the A46 presently helps to add credence to this title - long may that remain.

5 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LS

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

5 Naunton Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7BQ

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

5 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 4th November 2013
I would like to submit my objection to 13/01605/OUT - 650 Houses on Leckhampton Fields because:

Approximately an additional 1000 vehicle increase exiting onto Shurdington Road. The A46 Shurdington Road is already very busy and often grid locked during rush hours and Church Road leading to Leckhampton and Cheltenham is difficult and dangerous at the best of times. Both roads already break the EU levels of Air Pollution in the winter months, increased volume of traffic make only increase this. Local schools are already oversubscribed and neither of the local senior schools intend to expand. Cheltenham doctors, dentists and hospitals will also be put under more pressure. Lack of viable public transport possibilities. The area already is susceptible to flooding.

5 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 4th November 2013
I would like to submit my objection to 13/01605/OUT - 650 Houses on Leckhampton Fields because:

Approximately an additional 1000 vehicle increase exiting onto Shurdington Road. The A46 Shurdington Road is already very busy and often grid locked during rush hours and Church Road leading to Leckhampton and Cheltenham is difficult and dangerous at the best of times. Both roads already break the EU levels of Air Pollution in the winter months, increased volume of

traffic make only increase this. Local schools are already oversubscribed and neither of the local senior schools intend to expand. Cheltenham doctors, dentists and hospitals will also be put under more pressure. Lack of viable public transport possibilities. The area already is susceptible to flooding.

5 Pickering Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LE

Comments: 10th November 2013

I object to this planning proposal on the following grounds:

- I am unconvinced that Cheltenham needs these houses. Whilst it is true that there is a housing shortage in Cheltenham, we should be meeting this need by building first on any available brownfield sites and then reassess whether any further housing is needed. This has not been done and, until it is, any planning proposal on greenfield sites such as this should be rejected.
- These houses are being built in an area which already has severe traffic problems. Every weekday, the traffic queues in every direction around the Shurdington Road/Moorend Park Road crossroads become extensive, particularly in the mornings for people travelling in to Cheltenham when the tailbacks can easily exceed half a mile. This is a serious issue for local residents (noise; pollution which exceeds EU limits; difficulty driving anywhere), commuters into Cheltenham (delays; fuel consumption) and local businesses (harder to recruit; late and stressed employees). This plan will make these conditions even worse and so should be rejected.
- This area is prone to flooding and the fields help to protect existing houses from flash-floods. It seems rather foolish to build houses where the new owners can expect to have their ground floor go under water during heavy rains, and increase the risk to nearby residents. I also cannot imagine any sensible purchasers would want to live in such a risky area if they understood what could happen.
- There is strong local opposition to the proposed development. If the council is there to represent the people of Cheltenham, as it surely should be, then the strength of opinion against the proposal should mean that it is immediately rejected.
- These fields are much-loved by the local residents and there is an application in progress for designation as a Local Green Space of Special Community Value. Even if this application is unsuccessful, it is clear that the fields are well-used for recreation and significantly enhance the views from the Leckhampton Hill Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The benefits of outdoor activity to people's health and wellbeing is well-recognised, so this proposal is effectively being made at the expense of the people who already live here.

Should this proposal go ahead (and I do not believe it should), I believe that there are important enhancements and constraints that should be applied:

- The green spaces which are shown in the outline plan should be rigorously enforced. The amount of green space shown in the plan is commendable, but I am concerned that these have been put in as a cynical way to make the plans more attractive and that they will be gradually reduced as the development process proceeds. The council must be robust and vigilant to ensure that the green spaces are protected and that any reduction which the developers propose is not allowed to happen.

- The plans should be changed to incorporate more green space within the proposed housing. A good arrangement would be to have communal squares and similar focal areas, with easy pedestrian access between them. The current proposed arrangement of housing is a typical, socially-isolating and uniform modern estate with rows of houses along a road edge. Embedded open spaces would surely be preferable to the proposed arrangement, where the communal orchard and play areas are pushed beyond the day-to-day routes of the residents.
- The existing streams should form central features in the estate which everyone sees every day. This is important because watercourses which are out-of-sight can easily become sad dumping grounds for rubbish: the only sustainable way to avoid this is to make the residents proud of them by making them visible. It will also make the estate more attractive to live in and help people remember what it used to be like.
- The architecture should be very varied and reflect Leckhampton. Bland built-off-plan housing estates are unpleasant, and once they take hold, the whole character of an area becomes just another commuter suburb. Leckhampton is full of varied and interesting houses: please add to the local character and enhance it, rather than begin its homogenisation. This will require robust oversight from the council, as most modern housing estates are very similar to one another and the developers will not do something different unless it is forced upon them.
- The new estate should be surrounded by thick hedgerows, so that the edges of the existing roads outside of the proposed estate remain wild and attractive. Hedgerows are mentioned in the supporting documentation, but it would be very easy for the council to modify the plans to make these a key part of the proposed development which cannot be compromised during the development process.
- The mitigations for the impact on local wildlife should be improved. The documentation which accompanies the plans makes much of the way that bat-boxes will be installed and the existing badger sett will not be disturbed, but this rather misses the point: a good wildlife habitat requires plenty of supporting food and foraging area to thrive.
- The green spaces should be landscaped to include wild areas and water. The current plan is in danger of containing plain, open grassy spaces with very little interest: this benefits nobody.
- Ensure that any road names are truly interesting and reflect the local area. Nauseating bland names such as Harmony Drive really should be avoided.
- Incorporate better water management, as promoted by organisations such as the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust and the RSPB in their document Sustainable drainage systems: maximising the potential for wildlife and people.

5 Rosehip Court
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WN

Comments: 11th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 1 (3rd - 11th October)

5 Southcourt Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

5 Southfield Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LH

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

5 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

5 Westside Park
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RT

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

5 Westside Park
The Reddings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6RT

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

50 Hall Road
Cheltenham
GL53 0HE

Comments: 21st October 2013
My comments on the application are,

Leckhampton parish council application for local green space has not been considered properly.

There are insufficient secondary schools to support these houses

The road network will not support the extra vehicles and pollution levels are already in breach of EU levels.

The joint core strategy has not been finalised so this application should not be considered until it has been finalised.

50 Hall Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
GL53 0HE

Comments: 21st October 2013

I am totally against the plan for development off Kidnappers Lane and the small holdings area for 650 houses.

1. Destroying a natural eco-system:

The area is the most stunning greenbelt land retaining some original fields in an area heavily built on heavily already.

The area is a wildlife haven of tranquillity and beauty and if houses were built here the original land would be gone forever.

2. Over-loading the small roads with high volumes of traffic:

As residents of Leckhampton we already find the heavy volume of traffic around the small roads dangerous.

Our street is a rat run with motorists driving too fast and carelessly we have two near misses with children walking on the streets and motorists driving carelessly.

Hall Road would be used even more as a cut through if Kidnappers Lane was shut off.

Additionally I would have to drive through town to get to my place of work instead of using Kidnappers Lane as a traffic que free route.

3. Crime:

The crime rate with burglary/theft around the local community is already very high.

The additional volume of people will exacerbate this problem.

4. Land for food-production:

The land should be used for the surrounding community to grow their own produce.

Please do not allow the destruction of such a special area.

50 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BE

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I am in full agreement with the issues raised by Leckhampton Green Land Action Group (LEGLAG) with respect to the development of housing around Kidnappers Lane.

We have concerns relating to; traffic congestion, infrastructure and public services which would all be stretched beyond their existing capability. Once green land is taken for development and there is no possibility of returning this open space to agricultural or public use and it would be a loss for future generations.

Therefore this application is premature until the Joint Core Strategy is finalised.

50 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 29th October 2013

I am writing to voice my objections to the plans for 650 new houses in Leckhampton fields. We believe that these additional houses would lead to significant degradation of the area of Cheltenham, needlessly taking up valuable greenspace and leading to significant increases in traffic congestion in an area that is already at bursting point.

If these homes are built it is estimated that an extra 1000 vehicles a day will enter onto Shurdington Road. This is surely going to cause considerable problems in the area for a road that is already heavily congested during rush hour times. Any suggestion that the majority of the residents of the new area will use public transport as opposed to driving is unrealistic. Air pollution levels already break EU regulations on the A46 and Church road during winter months. Any increase in the number of vehicles and in waiting times will only further compound this issue. With this development the character and setting of this whole area of Cheltenham would be irrevocably changed for the worse. Valuable farming land and open green space would be lost and it would also lead to a loss of biodiversity and potential archaeological sites. This development would impact negatively on the residents of South West Cheltenham as the balance between the urban and rural, which is such an important positive feature of Cheltenham as a whole, would be lost.

Also parts of the planned development are prone to flooding and building would surely exacerbate this, possibly leading to problems for neighbouring pre-existing properties. A specific example was the flooding in 2007 of more than 40 properties in Warden Hill, which is downhill from the proposed development site.

We hope you will take account of the extremely strong local opposition to this proposal.

50 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 29th October 2013

I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons:

The existing road network around this proposed development is already over capacity, the numbers of extra cars generated by this development would be make the A46 and Church Road even more over congested. Currently Church Road is dangerous for children walking to school, this will only get worse. Also air pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Church Road and the A46.

Already there are insufficient secondary school places at Bournside and Balcarras, this will be made worse but this development as there are no plans for expansion at either of these schools.

The application could create a precedent for other planning applications in this area which would destroy the amenity value and quality of life for residents currently living in Leckhampton.

Also I believe that this application is premature and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised. There are more appropriate sites on the Tewkesbury/Cheltenham boarder that would better suited for development and could support a new infrastructure these should seriously be considered.

51 Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HN

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

52 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

52 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

53 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 13th October 2013
I would like to register my objection to the above Planning Application and wish to make the following comments.

Design

The design of the development as implied in the public exhibition boards is dull and uninspired. More information should be provided on the proposed quality of the design and materials and minimum space standards. The stated densities and development heights are meaningless without a statement of habitable rooms, beds, sqft per acres etc and space standards. Without these the application should not be considered.

Highways

An additional estimated 1000 extra vehicles will all exit onto the Shurdington Road. As a cyclist who uses Church Street, Leckhampton Lane and Shurdington Road to commute to work, the existing road network is becoming more congested and dangerous for vulnerable and sustainable

road users. While the additional traffic may reduce the speed of vehicles my personal experience is that increases in the volume of traffic will make cycling more dangerous. It is premature to consider this application without the JCS transport plan in place and traffic modelling in place.

Environmental Impact

Air pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Church Road and the A46. Additional traffic and housing will only increase the levels of pollution. A reduction in fields and planting the 'green lung' will further exacerbate the issues of Air Pollution. Areas of Leckhampton and Shurdington Road are prone to flooding. Removing a large area of natural attenuation is not a sustainable solution

Amenity

The loss of green land will directly impact on the amenity of neighbouring and general residents of Cheltenham. The loss of amenity and countryside will have a negative impact on the social and psychological well-being of residents. The scale and location of the proposed development has not been adequately considered in relation to the AONB or green belt. Any impact on the AONB will be a permanent legacy or a premature planning decision Leckhampton has an insufficient number of senior school places and primary places are over prescribed. Any proposed development of this scale will overburden the existing education infrastructure.

Employment

There are currently no developments or identified land for employment in the Shurdington / Leckhampton Areas. In practise employment land is being lost in favour of residential development. Without corresponding development for employment all new residents will need to travel to their jobs. This is not sustainable development.

Comments: 12th May 2014

I wish to object to the proposals. They are ill considered and do not improve or enhance the character or appearance of the site or the larger area.

Highway safety / Traffic

The REVISED MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS PARAMETER PLAN and the masterplan show different building configurations (namely the primary school).

The proposed highways strategy is short sighted and will add to already congested and dangerous roads with an increase in traffic and pollution from vehicles and a detrimental impact on residents health. The additional traffic created along Shurdington Road will push more traffic on to Leckhampton Lane and Church Street which is already at dangerous levels especially around local schools.

The alleged CHURCH ROAD IMPROVEMENTS seem like a hollow gesture that will not solve any of the traffic issues created by the proposals.

Layout and density of building

There is insufficient information to comment on the proposals. Given the sensitivity of the site the sheer magnitude of dwellings is inappropriate. The layouts shown are unimaginative are poorly conceived.

Design, appearance and materials

Given the size of the proposed development and sensitivity of the significantly more information should be provided on the proposed quality and design intent. If given permission for all or (hopefully) a significantly reduced number of dwellings it is hard to see how the information in the submission gives any security on the quality of the proposals.

Cheltenham is a world renowned regency town with an exceptional architectural heritage. The scale and nature of the proposed development will, like so many other developments, create a non-descript and soulless development on a major access route to town.

Nature conservation

The proposed site is a vital oasis for nature and provides an essential local amenity for residents to enjoy the countryside. Green spaces are not being afforded the protection they deserve or given the recognition of their importance in providing space for residents health and wellbeing.

Flooding

The recent heavy rains caused nearby gardens to flood that have not flooded in known history. The proposals appear to have missed the potential levels of rainfall and the potential impact of the proposed level of development.

54 Caernarvon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3JP

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

54 Caernarvon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3JP

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

54 Caernarvon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3JP

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

54 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HD

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

55 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

55 Pilley Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ES

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I write to state my strong objection to planning application 13/01605/OUT for the erection of 650 houses on land around Kidnappers Lane in Leckhampton.

Yet again we are faced with what is in essence the same proposal as before, to build on and spoil forever a very large slice of Leckhampton's green fields. It was unacceptable before and it is unacceptable now. The various reasons for objection all still apply.

I strongly object to these proposals to build houses in Leckhampton and Shurdington. I consider that such construction would cause severe and permanent damage to the environment of these places. Valuable landscape (the AONB and Leckhampton Hill) would be damaged. It would adversely affect the outstanding views, from, and towards, the Cotswold escarpment

I do not think that landscaping can possibly obscure the damage, which would be clearly visible from the high ground for miles around. It seems to me that building as proposed would be a significant step towards joining Cheltenham and Gloucester, so that a single urban area would result. The site is in the Green Belt, which is intended to prevent coalescence between Cheltenham and Gloucester.

I consider that the additional traffic which such a scheme would generate would have a major adverse impact upon Leckhampton and the surrounding area.

The effect on Cheltenham will be incredibly undesirable, with a larger population, more traffic, more congestion and more shops, and the negatives effects on the natural environment and local wildlife will be horrific. Flooding in the area is already a difficulty which the development seems likely to exacerbate.

We live in transient times, and I accept that change must happen but I strongly believe this should only be the case if the change is for the better these proposals seem purely motivated by money and not in the interests of the current or future population.

I would question how you have come to the ridiculous figure of 33,000 houses to be built in the Cheltenham and it's local areas, this seems to be a gross over estimation of requirement unless you are actually intent on encouraging a vast population inhabiting the region from other areas of the country and from abroad?

Having grown up in the area, these fields were my playground, as they were for many children in the community and continue to be so. A safe haven from pollution and traffic, with an abundance of wildlife on our doorstep. Yet you actively seek to deny future generations this healthy lifestyle, in a time when childhood obesity is ever encroaching on our nation, this is totally ridiculous.

It is about time that politicians started to listen to the people of this nation before they abandon it completely. It would be a grave mistake to proceed with the scheme.

55 Pilley Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ES

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I write to state my strong objection to planning application 08/01443/OUT for the erection of 650 houses on land around Kidnappers Lane in Leckhampton.

Yet again we are faced with what is in essence the same proposal as before, to build on and spoil forever a very large slice of Leckhampton's green fields. It was unacceptable before and it is unacceptable now. The various reasons for objection all still apply.

I strongly object to these proposals to build houses in Leckhampton and Shurdington. I consider that such construction would cause severe and permanent damage to the environment of these places. Valuable landscape (the AONB and Leckhampton Hill) would be damaged. It would adversely affect the outstanding views, from, and towards, the Cotswold escarpment

I do not think that landscaping can possibly obscure the damage, which would be clearly visible from the high ground for miles around. It seems to me that building as proposed would be a significant step towards joining Cheltenham and Gloucester, so that a single urban area would result. The site is in the Green Belt, which is intended to prevent coalescence between Cheltenham and Gloucester.

I consider that the additional traffic which such a scheme would generate would have a major adverse impact upon Leckhampton and the surrounding area.

The effect on Cheltenham will be incredibly undesirable, with a larger population, more traffic, more congestion and more shops, and the negatives effects on the natural environment and local wildlife will be horrific. Flooding in the area is already a difficulty which the development seems likely to exacerbate.

We live in transient times, and I accept that change must happen but I strongly believe this should only be the case if the change is for the better these proposals seem purely motivated by money and not in the interests of the current or future population.

I would question how you have come to the ridiculous figure of 33,000 houses to be built in the Cheltenham and it's local areas, this seems to be a gross over estimation of requirement unless you are actually intent on encouraging a vast population inhabiting the region from other areas of the country and from abroad?

Having grown up in the area, these fields were my playground, as they were for many children in the community and continue to be so. A safe haven from pollution and traffic, with an abundance of wildlife on our doorstep. Yet you actively seek to deny future generations this healthy lifestyle, in a time when childhood obesity is ever encroaching on our nation, this is totally ridiculous.

It is about time that politicians started to listen to the people of this nation before they abandon it completely. It would be a grave mistake to proceed with the scheme.

56 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 22nd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

57 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

57 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

57 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PA

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

57 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SA

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

58 Alma Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3NB

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

58 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

59 Moorend Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EJ

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

59 Upper Norwood Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DU

Comments: 22nd November 2013
I assume any proposed housing developments would not even be tabled until draft JCS has been fully and logically analysed. In the event the above proposal is considered, the potential traffic flow must take the highest priority. At peak times - and when surrounding roads are closed due to roadworks, weather conditions or RTAs (such as Crickley Hill recently) - Shurdington Road is often snarled up, sometimes along its whole length. This also applies to its arteries, such as Leckhampton Lane, Church Road, Moorend Road, etc. Also, consideration must be given to increased pollution, flood risk, pressure on public transport and amenities, and loss of popular and well-used green spaces.

6 Charnwood Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HJ

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

6 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PR

Comments: 23rd October 2013
I am writing to object to the above planning application in the Leckhampton, Kidnappers Lane area for some 650 houses plus commercial units, Surgery and school, care home and offices.

My main areas of objection are:

1) traffic congestion and air quality for existing residents.

As a resident of Church Road and frequent user of the A46 Shurdington Road, it is clear that both of these roads are currently operating over capacity. The air quality on Church Road is already above recommended EU levels. The increase in traffic that this development would bring would be catastrophic for both roads. As a parent at Leckhampton primary school, it is already incredibly difficult to make the short journey to/from school each day, due to the existing congestion. An increase in traffic will make this even more difficult, and I fear that the frustration of being stuck in traffic along church road will lead to rash driving decisions and more accidents involving school children.

2) secondary school places.

There is already a shortage of secondary school places in the town, this being a particular issue for existing residents in the Leckhampton area. There is no plan as to where incoming children will go or how this will affect existing families. Also, tying in with my first point above, if we don't know where children will be travelling to for secondary education, how can the traffic models be considered accurate?

3) loss of green space

The area of the proposed development makes up part of the last remaining green areas within the town. Once it is gone, it will be lost forever. I believe this will fundamentally and detrimentally change the nature of the area in an irreversible way.

Finally, as a resident living very close to the proposed development and being aware that should it be approved my day to day life will be affected, I am surprised that I have not received any notice of the application from the council. I have only been made aware by legLag.

Please take the views of the local residents into account when considering this application.

6 Collum End Rise
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PB

Comments: 31st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

6 Fairfield Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PN

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

6 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 15th November 2013

As long terms residents of Leckhampton we wish to register our significant concerns / objections to the above planned development.

Our grounds for this include:

- The high likelihood of significant traffic congestion in the area as a whole, and in particular Church Road, Shurdington Road, Moorend Pak Road.
- The increase in traffic pollution arising from the above, and increased risk of traffic related accidents / incidents
- Longer travel / commuting times into Cheltenham which may well impact local shops and employment
- Loss of amenity value of the Leckhampton fields

We'd be grateful if these could be taken into full account in considering the development.

6 Jasmin Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HZ

Comments: 16th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

6 Larch Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PY

Comments: 23rd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

6 Merlin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LT

Comments: 6th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

6 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

6 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

6 St Albans Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DW

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

6 St Stephens Manor
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3GF

Comments: 16th October 2013
Cheltenham needs more housing of all sizes. If land must be developed to meet this need, then the site proposed is ideal. Visually it is not attractive. It is contiguous to the town and existing Kidnappers Lane housing which is preferable to isolated developments which would increase commute distances to multiple services such as secondary schools, hospitals, main shops etc. Residents can make use of the excellent bus services that run along Shurdington Lane.

I support the application

6 Station Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AB

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

6 Undercliff Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AB

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

6 Vineries Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NU

Comments: 19th October 2013

I currently work as an Urban Design Director for a Large Planning Consultancy and therefore do not object to development and can understand the reasoning behind the promotion of this site.

General Comments

I would though like to see this scheme promoted as a good example of current urban design and architecture. Although appearance is reserved i am uninspired by this unimaginative scheme. The current proposal has no mechanisms to ensure a distinctive and memorable PLACE. Para 59 of the NPPF recommends 'Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes' and i think this would help with this scheme if approved. Design reviews and Building for Life Assessments are also other mechanisms that should be used as part of this outline planning process.

Specific Comments

The school currently proposed is 1.7ha and i would conclude that this is a 1 Form Entry Primary School (210 places). Therefore there is no room for the school to expand in the future and it would soon see increased pressure for school places as seen in the current capacity for the area (Leckhampton Primary School at 423 pupils and demand high). For a scheme this size this land take is too small and a min of 2.1ha should be provided to allow for a 2FE school (420 pupils as seen in current schools) or larger that can allow for school building expansion in the future and be adaptable to changes. This is also a more efficient use of land.

Is the Density specific to the scheme? I notice the main spine road is included within the 15.4ha resi land area and not netted out from the developable area. The proposed 'tree lined routes' are also not allowed for in an average 40dph layout. If room and land take is not allowed for at this stage for tree planting etc then it will be near impossible at reserved matters. The density is also very 'current thinking' and i have no problem with a crude DPH calculation but would like to see more thought in the proposed character areas and how the landscape character can also be evident within the scheme. Currently it looks like a few balancing ponds and mown or unmown grass creating pos.

An informal greenspace to the west side of kidnappers lane should be introduced to setback development and respect the existing context. Surely houses up against this hedgerow would create a more urban character than anticipated.

The allotments are currently proposed in an area where it will be difficult to create new vehicular access and outside of an appropriate walking distance from the new development that it should serve. The allotments would be better placed to the northern side of Lotts Meadow to allow for vehicular access from the new junction. This would limit the new breaks in the existing hedgerow. Sports pitches although important recreational spaces would destroy the character of Lotts Meadow and should not be promoted, it is only a 400m walking to the existing pitches to the east and these could benefit with upgrading instead. Maybe dual use of the primary school playing field should be allowed.

61 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DY

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

62 Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HF

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

62 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

63 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

63 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BS

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

63 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JG

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

64 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

64 Westbury Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EW

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

65 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

65A Moorend Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EW

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

66 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

67 Merestones Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SU

Comments: 1st October 2013

With reference to the above planning application, I strongly oppose the proposed development based on a number of concerns as detailed below.

Firstly having created an account on your website as advised on your letter dated 20th September 2013, I am still unable to leave feedback on it which suggests that others may have the same problem and therefore you may not receive all of the necessary feedback objecting to the proposed development. I would also be interested to know how many local households received the letter and why we were not aware of the plans earlier despite your website indicating that there has been community engagement.

The increased volume of traffic associated with 650 new dwellings will have a major impact on the whole area and particularly the Shurdington Road and it's junction with Moorend Park Road. The report on your website already acknowledges the acceptance of existing congestion and as our garden borders the Shurdington Road I strongly oppose any significant increase in traffic and the associated increase in pollution levels.

I also strongly object to a new priority junction and separate bus exit being built just across the road from our rear gate due to major concerns regarding traffic noise and pollution. There is a significant difference in noise and pollution between vehicles travelling at a steady speed as now and the start / stop driving at a major junction. Your proposals indicate that the principal means of access are not reserved and I strongly suggest that, should this development go ahead, any new major junctions are made further south on the Shurdington Road where there are no houses directly opposite.

In addition to the increased disturbance from the additional traffic, there will also be significant noise and disturbance from the new development and its' inhabitants, which again I am opposed to.

At present our property is not overlooked from the Shurdington Road, however new dwellings will probably have a view in to our private garden, patio area, kitchen and two bedrooms at the rear of the property. I object very strongly to this as it will invade our privacy greatly.

The plans on the website indicate that the new dwellings will have a significant visual impact and block our view of Leckhampton Hill and the surrounding countryside which again I am strongly opposed to as we are in a bungalow.

Flooding is another area of great concern and although the 279 page published report on the website addresses many factors, the conclusions are not definitive but refer to using commonly used modelling methods and best practice. Having seen the result of the floods in July 2007 I would strongly suggest that any additional building in the area and in close proximity to the two streams that run either side of Merestones Drive will only increase the possibility of flooding in the area due to the loss of natural drainage. This is another reason for me to object to the proposals.

The loss of the nearby countryside will be a great loss to us and our children and I would like to draw your attention to the report made by Jeremy Doe on behalf of the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust on the north-west side of the A46 at SO939205, on 30/4/12. In this report a number of rare species of plants were found and the grass verge in question was then made a conservation road verge (CRV). Having walked frequently on the proposed site, I am sure that these species also exist on the proposed area for development and this should be fully investigated before final plans are made.

In summary, the whole development will have a major impact on the quality of life of local people and will also negatively impact house prices in the area as well as local residents having to endure years of noise, dust and building traffic.

Cheltenham is a great town to live in and the open green areas are one of the reasons why it is different and better than other towns. There must be many other sites outside of the town where the proposed impact of such a huge development would be far less.

I and many others will strongly oppose this development and I hope that another solution is found. I would be happy to discuss my concerns with you if required.

67 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LG

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

67 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LG

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

67 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LG

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

67 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LG

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

67 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LG

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

68 St Stephens Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AE

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

69 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BS

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: i n documents BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

7 Charnwood Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HL

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

7 Chestnut Place
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QE

Comments: 6th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

7 Edward Wilson Villas
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2LP

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

7 Greenhills Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EY

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

7 Hidcote Avenue
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3FB

Comments: 16th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

7 Kenelm Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JW

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

7 Pilford Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9HA

Comments: 16th November 2013

This development will add significant congestion to the area including the A46. There is also a shortage of primary and secondary school places which will only be made more of an issue with this development.

7 Pilley Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EX

Comments: 28th October 2013

We are writing to voice our objections to the plans for 650 new houses in Leckhampton fields. We believe that these additional houses would lead to significant degradation of the area of Cheltenham, needlessly taking up valuable greenspace and leading to significant increases in traffic congestion and as a result pollution.

If these homes are built it is estimated that an extra 1000 vehicles a day will enter onto Shurdington Road. This is surely going to cause considerable problems in the area for a road that is already heavily congested during rush hour times. Any suggestion that the majority of the residents of the new area will use public transport as opposed to driving is unrealistic. Air pollution levels already break EU regulations on the A46 and Church road during winter months. Any increase in the number of vehicles and in waiting times will exacerbate this.

With this development the character and setting of this whole area of Cheltenham would be irrevocably changed for the worse. Valuable farming land and open green space would be lost and it would also lead to a loss of biodiversity and potential archaeological sites. This development would impact negatively on the residents of South West Cheltenham as the balance between the urban and rural, which is such an important positive feature of Cheltenham as a whole, would be lost.

The proposal includes a primary school but that still leaves the problem of how secondary school places will be able to accommodate families from this new development.

Finally, parts of the planned development are prone to flooding and building would surely exacerbate this, possibly leading to problems for neighbouring pre-existing properties. A specific example was the flooding in 2007 of more than 40 properties in Warden Hill, which is downhill from the proposed development site.

We hope you will take account of the extremely strong local opposition to this proposal.

7 Southcourt Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BU

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

7 Tayberry Grove
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WF

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

7 The Spindles
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QD

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

70 Farmfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RA

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

70 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 16th October 2013
I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons:

The existing road network around this proposed development is already over capacity, the numbers of extra cars generated by this development would be make the A46 and Church Road even more over congested. Currently Church Road is very dangerous for children walking to

school, this will only get worse. Also air pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Church Road and the A46.

Currently there are insufficient secondary school places at Bournside and Balcarras, this will be made worse but this development as there are no plans for expansion at either of these schools.

The application could create a precedent for other planning applications in this area which would destroy the amenity value and quality of life for residents currently living in Leckhampton.

Also I believe that this application is premature and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised.

Comments: 16th October 2013

I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons:

The existing road network around this proposed development is already over capacity, the numbers of extra cars generated by this development would be make the A46 and Church Road even more over congested. Currently Church Road is very dangerous for children walking to school, this will only get worse. Also air pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Church Road and the A46.

Currently there are insufficient secondary school places at Bournside and Balcarras, this will be made worse but this development as there are no plans for expansion at either of these schools.

The application could create a precedent for other planning applications in this area which would destroy the amenity value and quality of life for residents currently living in Leckhampton.

Also I believe that this application is premature and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised.

71 Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HN

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

71 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EX

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

71 St Michaels Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RP

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

76 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PD

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

76 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BL

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

78 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PD

Comments: 15th October 2013

I would like to stress our objections to the proposed development in the area. It is superfluous to current and future needs and the only people to gain from this are the developers. Those of us who live in the area already value highly what we have and what we will lose if this goes ahead. It has not been thought through because a sensible plan would:

- a) realise that the proposed development is far too large for the space dedicated to it (it is like adding a town the size of Winchcombe in an instant)
- b) deal explicitly with the existing problems of pollution and traffic, never mind the increase in them that will inevitably follow if this development goes ahead.

It is a flawed plan based on flawed methodology and presented meretriciously with tempting offers of schools and surgeries that are only required if the development goes ahead.

79 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

79 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

8 Arden Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HQ

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

8 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 13th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

8 Brizen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NG

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

8 Justicia Way
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3YH

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

8 Larch Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PY

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

8 Leckhampton Farm Court
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3GS

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

8 Peregrine Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LR

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

8 Rochester Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DJ

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

8 Station Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AB

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

8 The Spindles
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QD

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

8 Treelands Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

8 Westbury Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EW

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

80 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

81 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HB

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

83 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BS

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

83 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HB

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

85 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 15th October 2013

I completely and utterly disagree to this proposed application. The community can not cope with a development of this sort on any level. There are not enough places at the local secondary and no plans to build a new one. My children would have no place to attend secondary school. The main issue is traffic and environmental pollution and air pollution levels. Church Road where I live at times exceeds permitted levels of pollution according to the EU. I would be happy to write to the EU if any proposed development went ahead as our roads cannot cope with increased levels of traffic. Church Road is heavily congested in the mornings, at school pick-up and at rush hour. It is almost impossible to cross the road at these times and very dangerous living here with young children. Wing mirrors are constantly being broken from cars by passing traffic because there is barely enough room to pass in certain places. Any increase in traffic on this road would cause total chaos, danger and be socially irresponsible. A child was knocked down on Church Road not long ago. Diverting the traffic to Shurdington Road would not work as it is also already congested, often back to the roundabout near Morrison's. There is NO ROOM for development here. The local infrastructure would collapse under the strain.

85 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

86 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 29th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

87 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

87 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BS

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

87 Pilley Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ES

Comments: 21st October 2013

We have serious concerns regarding this application for the following reasons;

The surrounding infrastructure cannot cope with anymore traffic , at busy times of the day Church Road and Shurdington Road are at a standstill, air pollution is high and it is very difficult for children to travel safely to local schools. Building houses on Kidnappers Lane would significantly increase traffic to the roads and create serious problems along Church Road and Shurdington Road. No proposals address this issue. There is no provision for additional secondary school places when both local schools are already under strain and have no plans to expand. This is green belt land used by people from all over Cheltenham not just Leckhampton and once concreted over cannot be regained.

Please bear in mind these comments when considering these plans.

89 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PF

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

89 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HB

Comments: 14th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

9 Canterbury Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HQ

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

9 Century Court
Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XR

Comments: 22nd November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

9 Highwood Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JJ

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

9 Hillary Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9LB

Comments: 27th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 11 (14th - 20th December)

9 Hobby Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LP

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

9 Imperial Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1QB

Comments: 11th March 2014

I wish to register my opposition to the proposals from Curtin & Co (acting on behalf of Bovis and Miller Homes) for 650 new homes (plus additional facilities) on Leckhampton land between Shurdington Road, Church Road and Kidnappers Lane.

My concerns relate to the specific application (see below), but also to the way in which the Joint Core Strategy is now being used as a principal justification for developments of this kind. As you will know, the central driver for the Joint Core Strategy is the estimated need for a further 10,800 new homes between now and 2031, whereas the ONS has assessed the level of housing need at 6,070. There is a world of difference between these two estimates.

The proposal itself is so deeply flawed as to beggar belief, given the degree to which that number of new homes in that location will cause very significant knock-on problems, in the following respects:

[1] Congestion on the A46. I have seen the proposals to reduce congestion on the A46, and can hardly believe this is considered by the developers to be an adequate mitigation of the proposal. If the proposal to consent a further 1,500 homes in Brockworth is accepted, it would create a massive problem for all those who depend on the A46 as their principal artery in and out of Cheltenham.

[2] It's not just the congestion: it's all the emissions that all those additional vehicles will produce. As you will know, the EU is now intent on holding the UK much more rigorously to account for its continuing infractions against the EU's Air Quality Directive. This new development will make a bad situation in Cheltenham a great deal worse.

[3] It would appear that very little consideration has been given to the impact of this development on the provision of school places, not just (in the first instance) at Primary level, but at the Secondary level somewhat down the line. Surely there should be an agreed strategy for educational provision before any huge new housing developments of this kind are approved?

[4] On balance, it's hard to believe this proposal has been advanced in the spirit of the coalition government's Localism Act. As I understand it, there is now a proposal from the Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council that the Leckhampton Fields should be protected as a Local Green Space of special community value.

In the spirit of true localism, I sincerely hope that this proposal from the Leckhampton and Warden Hill Parish Council will be given proper consideration before consideration of the housing proposal is allowed to proceed.

9 Liddington Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AH

Comments: 28th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

9 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I'm writing to object wholeheartedly to the planning application 13/01605/OUT, and indeed to any application, which will destroy the natural open spaces in this locality that generations have enjoyed and which should be kept for future generations.

The flood risk in this area is already significant and occurs in parts where ground water rises from existing drains. The proposals will cause massive run-off and threaten both existing and new homes.

There are simply not enough secondary school places to cope with any more children. The local schools are already oversubscribed and local children already have to travel across town to other schools.

Shurdington Road, Church Road and Bath Road are already heavily congested at various times of the day and the estimated 1,000 extra cars (which will be used whatever public transport is available) at peak times of day will make the situation even more miserable and dangerous. Any slight traffic issue at the moment, such as temporary traffic lights or a minor accident, causes massive tailbacks. Traffic pollution on those roads is already above EU levels and Cheltenham has been made an Air Quality Management Area.

Overall, the application is premature and, as is obvious from the comments almost totally voicing strong objection, is not in the best interest of the residents.

The consideration of the application should be delayed until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised. Also, all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets should be verified first.

It really does seem ludicrous, in these austere times, that the Council is even considering this application before the essential data has been verified. This could be a huge waste of money.

The public must be reassured by hard facts that the JCS housing targets are objective, transparent and in accordance with the needs of the area and not simply a contrived Developer's Charter.

9 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

9 Nourse Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NQ

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

9 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AG

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

9 Pilford Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AG

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

9 Rochester Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3DJ

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

9 Sir Charles Irving Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2DS

Comments: 30th October 2013
I wish to register my objection to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development will utilise green space which is valuable for recreation for myself and my family and is part of the reason why we chose to live in this part of the country.
2. There are many brownfield sites around Cheltenham which should be considered for development well before sites such as those at Kidnapper's Lane.
3. The stress which this development and the resulting increase in population/traffic will impose on existing resources and infrastructure, such as schools, roads, healthcare has not been adequately considered and these stresses will have a detrimental impact on the quality of life in this area.

In summary, this application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets need to be verified.

9 Southern Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AW

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

9 Station Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AB

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

90 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EY

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

92 Farmfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3RA

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

95 Pilley Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ES

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Appledore
75 Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HB

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

April court
churchlane
badgeworth
GL51 4ul

Comments: 16th October 2013

looking at the plans I do object to the proposed. The main reason why people want to live in the area is because of its country views and open spaces. This is slowly beginning to change with developments becoming a constant. After the recent 'Bloor Homes' development also in the area ,there seems to be an ever increasing evaporation of open land.

Traffic and congestion will also cause further frustration in the area as Shurdington road is an already congested route. Plans to ease congestion around the Cheltenham area need to be looked at before this plan should even be considered.

I don't wish to focus on the negative effect of the finished development as I feel that it has already been stated by many in previous comments. I would like to put the construction phase forward also as the additional problems this will cause to the area.

Bella Vista
14 Greatfield Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9BU

Comments: 13th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

Berrynarbour
Leckhampton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9QG

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Brizen Lodge
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 14th October 2013

I have reviewed the documents associated with the above planning application and in general I OBJECT to this proposal believing it to be premature, ill considered and unsympathetic to the existing environment. The existing infrastructure in the area of the development will not be able to cope with the extra demands being placed upon it by this development. My detailed comments are as follows:

Relationship to Joint Core Strategy

This application has been submitted in advance of the finalisation of the joint core strategy. This makes the job of the public more difficult, having to review two related proposals in parallel leading to the possibility that not all relevant views and opinions are properly presented and

considered at the appropriate time. The advantage to the developer is that should this application and the JCS work in their favour they will be able to make some profit sooner, but clearly at the expense of the public for the above noted reason. It would be my preference for this application to be put on hold until the JCS has been finalised. Can you confirm that all the analysis of the impact (traffic, education, pollution, environment etc.) of this development takes into account all other proposed developments in the area such as the proposed Brizen Farm development, the development at the south east end of kidnappers lane and the proposed development within the triangle of land between Up Hatherley Way and Chargrove Lane?

Impact on existing housing stock

I can appreciate the developers have tried to be sympathetic to the existing housing stock by placing the lower density/lower height properties at the perimeter of the development. Even so this development will drastically change the character of the approach to the existing houses on Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane. Firstly, where there are lower density houses to be built off Kidnappers Lane near the A46 we will end up with new properties on the North side of the road and the existing bungalows on the South side. The new properties are described as lower density ie 25 to 33 dwellings per hectare, however this is not low density at all when compared to the existing houses which are approximately 10 dwellings per hectare. The new properties will also be 2 storeys as opposed to the existing single storey bungalows. Therefore the character of this part of the road will go from a semi rural aspect to a complete imbalance in property type and density. Secondly, the approach onto Kidnappers lane is being relocated Northward at the location of a new entrance to the site. This will mean that those wishing to access properties on Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane, will effectively have to drive through a new housing estate development to get to their properties. Making those properties (including mine) feel like they are part of the backend of a new estate as opposed to the semi rural approach that is currently enjoyed. It is for these two reasons that I feel the proposed development is unsympathetic to the existing housing stock and will completely change the character of the area. I am also concerned that because the design of the internal road layout is potentially subject to change the travel distance through the new estate from the A46 to Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane could lengthen even further, making the existing properties feel like they are even further back in the depths of an uncharacteristic new development. All of this could seriously effect the value of the existing properties.

Phasing and Timing

I note from one of the documents the developers expect it to take 8 years to complete the development. The appears to me to be an extraordinary length of time but leaves me concerned that something, like a change in market conditions, could occur in that time frame such that we end up with a partially complete development that does not get finished for many more years. What guarantees do we as existing residents have that the developers will be committed to finishing individual phases or the entire development. Or that the individual phases do work as standalone development that would comply with the NPPF. To have a half finished development on the door step will effect the value of the existing properties as would the constant disruption caused by the continuous construction work over such an extended time frame. Also, are the road closures identified on the plan justified by the existence of this application alone or are they required as part of the wider development? At what point of the development would this road closure be put into force?

Traffic

As noted above it is not clear to me whether or not the transport assessment takes into account all other planned developments in the area. Sections 1.2.3 of the Transport Assessment states that discussions are ongoing with the County Council and the Highways Agency are ongoing and these discussions will result in a change to the Transport Assessment. This is further evidence that suggest this application is premature. The Transport Assessment also makes reference to the junction of Shurdington Rd and Leckhampton Lane. The reports descriptions of this junction do not align with my own experiences of this road during the evening rush hour. I travel home from work northwards on the A46 from the A417 to Kidnappers lane and most evenings around 6

pm the A46 is stop start traffic all the way from the A417 roundabout to the junction with Leckhampton Lane, a distance of approximately 2.6km. I cannot see how this development and the other planned developments in the area wouldnt further exacerbate this unacceptable situation. All this extra traffic is going to further reduce the air quality in the area. The drive to support minimisation of the use of car journeys by residents and non-residents into and out of the estate is laudable but unlikely to yield the benefits identified in the travel plans. In particular the use of cycles would not greatly increase as there are no cycle ways to Cheltenham or local centres that dont involve sharing roads with cars etc.

Other Concerns

The residents of the properties in-between the road closures on Kidnappers Lane will have to drive through the new housing estate to access their properties. I have driven around many new housing estates and given there is generally insufficient car parking for the new properties, the residents will park along all the main estate roads potentially making it very difficult for emergency vehicles to access the properties within and beyond. If I lived in-between the road closures on Kidnappers Lane I think I would feel a little vulnerable. I dont believe that there are sufficient secondary school places within the area. The construction of this development will only put more pressure on an already strained secondary school system. A lot of the graphics in the Design and Access Statement are not readable. I appreciate they may be copies of graphics from other supplied documents, but it shouldnt be the commenters responsibility to find them. Please provide a Design and Access Statement that is of a professional standard.

Brizen Lodge
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 17th October 2013

I have reviewed the numerous documents associated with the above planning application and in general I OBJECT to this proposal believing it to be premature, ill considered and unsympathetic to the existing environment. The existing infrastructure in the area of the development will not be able to cope with the extra demands being placed upon it by this development. My detailed comments are as follows:

Relationship to Joint Core Strategy

This application has been submitted in advance of the finalisation of the joint core strategy. This makes the job of the public more difficult, having to review two related proposals in parallel leading to the possibility that not all relevant views and opinions are properly presented and considered at the appropriate time. The advantage to the developer is that should this application and the JCS work in their favour they will be able to make some profit sooner, but clearly at the expense of the public for the above noted reason. It would be my preference for this application to be put on hold until the JCS has been finalised.

It is not apparent to me that all the analysis of the impact (traffic, education, pollution, environment etc.) of this development takes into account all other proposed developments in the area such as the proposed Brizen Farm development, the development at the south east end of kidnappers lane and the proposed development within the triangle of land between Up Hatherley Way and Chargrove Lane. This seems to be a salami slicing exercise on the developers part in order to ensure each part of the development will be looked at more favourably by planners. Can you confirm this will not be the case?

I would also like some assurance that the planning decisions will be independent of the government subsidies available to councils for every new house that is built. If this is not the case then effectively there is no independence to this process and it is in the councils interest to build regardless of public opinion.

Privacy

This development will mean there will be houses across the road from me where currently there are none and I am concerned about my privacy. Particularly as some of these will be 2.5 and 3 storey houses meaning they may be able to see into my house from theirs.

Impact on existing housing stock

This development will drastically change the character of the approach to the existing houses on Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane.

Firstly, where there are lower density houses to be built off Kidnappers Lane near the A46 we will end up with new properties on the North side of the road and the existing bungalows on the South side. The new properties are described as lower density i.e. 25 to 33 dwellings per hectare, however this is not low density at all when compared to the existing houses which are approximately 10 dwellings per hectare. The new properties will also be 2 storeys as opposed to the existing single storey bungalows. Therefore the character of this part of the road will go from a semi rural aspect to a complete imbalance in property type and density. There are also likely to be 3 storey houses behind these, giving an even more cramped appearance. Considering there are currently no 2.5 or 3 storey houses in the area this will be a drastic change to the feel of this part of Leckhampton.

Secondly, the approach onto Kidnappers lane is being relocated Northward at the location of a new entrance to the site. This will mean that those wishing to access properties on Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane, will effectively have to drive through a new housing estate development to get to their properties. Making those properties (including mine) feel like they are part of the back end of a new estate as opposed to the semi rural approach that is currently enjoyed.

It is for these reasons that I feel the proposed development is unsympathetic to the existing housing stock and will completely change the character of the area.

I am also concerned that because the design of the internal road layout is potentially subject to change the travel distance through the new estate from the A46 to Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane could lengthen even further, making the existing properties feel like they are even further back in the depths of an uncharacteristic new development. All of this could seriously effect the value of the existing properties. I moved to this part of Leckhampton from a development such as the one proposed in order to enjoy the space and low density buildings. This would ruin that for me.

Noise and Disturbance

I note from one of the documents the developers expect it to take 8 years to complete the development. This appears to me to be an extraordinary length of time but leaves me concerned that something, like a change in market conditions, could occur in that time frame such that we end up with a partially complete development that does not get finished for many more years. What guarantees do we as existing residents have that the developers will be committed to finishing individual phases or the entire development. Or that the individual phases do work as standalone development that would comply with the NPPF. To have a half finished development on the door step will effect not only the value of the existing properties as would the constant disruption caused by the continuous construction work over such an extended time frame, but would also encourage crime into the area.

Are the road closures identified on the plan justified by the existence of this application alone or are they required as part of the wider development? At what point of the development would this road closure be put into force? I can currently drive to Nursery Rhymes childcare facility in no time at all and am concerned these road closures may mean having to drive all the way out onto the A46 for what should be a two minute journey.

Traffic and pollution/air quality

It is not clear to me whether or not the transport assessment takes into account all other planned developments in the area.

Sections 1.2.3 of the Transport Assessment states that discussions are ongoing with the County Council and the Highways Agency are ongoing and these discussions will result in a change to the Transport Assessment. This is further evidence that suggest this application is premature.

The Transport Assessment also makes reference to the junction of Shurdington Rd and Leckhampton Lane. The reports descriptions of this junction do not align with my own experiences of this road during the evening rush hour. I know the road northwards on the A46 from the A417 to Kidnappers lane most evenings around 6 pm is stop start traffic all the way from the A417 roundabout to the junction with Leckhampton Lane, a distance of approximately 2.6km. There is also stop start traffic often from the Morrisons main roundabout to Bath Road. I cannot see how this development and the other planned developments in the area wouldn't further exacerbate this unacceptable situation. This development alone would see an additional 1300 cars on the road assuming 2 cars per household. Although planning assumptions may use 1.4 cars per household, this would be for mixed average usage. However, this development is marketed towards families where 2 to 3 car households are not uncommon.

I walk to work every morning and find the current level of pollution and air quality along the A46 is pretty poor. Indeed the last few surveys of air quality undertaken in this area would all agree with me. In fact the levels of acceptable air quality is already twice that recommended by WHO and the levels measured along this road are higher. All this extra traffic is going to further reduce the air quality in the area.

This development seems to imply it would try to be environmentally friendly by encouraging bus and cycle use. However, the use of cycles would not greatly increase as there is no cycle way along the A46 and this is a particularly hazardous road with large vehicles and often fast traffic. This is likely to encourage cyclists onto the pavement which is mainly single file and would make it more hazardous for pedestrians such as myself. There are no cycle ways to Cheltenham or local centres that don't involve sharing roads with cars etc. I see there are no plans to improve or widen the A46 with cycle paths or extra lanes so do not believe the traffic plans have been properly thought out.

Other Concerns

The residents of the properties in-between the road closures on Kidnappers Lane will have to drive through the new housing estate to access their properties. I have driven around many new housing estates and given there is generally insufficient car parking for the new properties, the residents will park along all the main estate roads potentially making it very difficult for emergency vehicles to access the properties within and beyond. If I lived in-between the road closures on Kidnappers Lane I think I would feel a little vulnerable. I also believe that these new residents will park along both Kidnappers lane and Farm Lane again changing the character of the area and making it more hazardous to cross the road as there will be more cars than parking spaces in the development. It is also well know that people rarely park in garages so even where these have been provided, they should not be counted as a parking space. There is also no mention of visitors car parking spaces in the development.

Although a primary school is likely to be built as part of this development I don't believe that there are sufficient secondary school places within the area and neither of the current schools have expansion plans. The construction of this development will only put more pressure on an already strained secondary school system. There are also not enough jobs in Cheltenham to sustain such an influx of people. We already know much of the people that will move into this development will be migrating from outside of Cheltenham. This will mean they need jobs, healthcare and infrastructure to support them that Cheltenham simply does not have. The hospital has recently closed its A&E department for evenings and weekends, the maternity unit is now only midwife led and there is already a shortage of NHS doctors and dentists in the area.

A lot of the graphics in the Design and Access Statement are not readable. I appreciate they may be copies of graphics from other supplied documents, but it shouldn't be the commenter's responsibility to find them. Please provide a Design and Access Statement that is of a professional standard.

There are a number of documents submitted as part of this application, many without clear executive summaries and conclusions. I feel insufficient time has been given to review these.

I look forward to hearing from the planning department resolving the issues identified above.

Broadclyst
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 1st November 2013

I am writing to express my objections to the above outline planning application on a number of grounds: The application is premature, when the JCS is out for discussion; Four planning inspectors have previously stated that the area on the Leckhampton/Shurdington border cannot accommodate any large-scale developments; Traffic along the Shurdington Road is already nose-to-tail most mornings and evenings, so the extra 650 dwellings, with their associated vehicles, would exacerbate an already intolerable state of affairs; Church Road is struggling to cope with existing traffic levels; every morning sees near accidents and very frayed tempers amongst drivers; The area may not be in the Green Belt or AONB but it is a fantastic spot for wildlife, with a huge range of species; The area is also used as a leisure facility by large numbers of people, not just those living immediately adjacent to the site; The land is used for food production purposes, both in Lott Meadow and the smallholdings; with the threat of development lifted and longer leases it could be even more productive.

To summarise, I believe that the proposed development would result in a poor quality of life for the new residents and those who already live in the south of Cheltenham.

Brook Cottage
Crippetts Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
GL51 4XT

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Brookfields
111A Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EE

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Brynhyfyd
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 13th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Byways
Church Road
Cheltenham
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 21st October 2013

I am writing to object most strongly to the above application on grounds of the huge impact on Leckhampton and its adjacent communities. There are many issues, but I will only detail what I see as the three most important here.

Traffic. The peak hour traffic in this area is a misery. Leckhampton Lane and Church Road already form part of 'the Cheltenham South Circular'. I live on Church Road and know for a fact that the daily number of vehicles rose by 30% when the Brockworth bypass opened. Did the traffic modelling predict this? The proposed closure of Kidnappers Lane will make no difference to solving the problem; it will probably make matters worse. Traffic onto A46 will be increased at the busiest times as commuting and school run vehicles from this development are added. And cars are getting larger! When Church Road was widened from a country lane in the late 1950's, an adequate road width was based on the dimensions of the Ford Anglia and hardly anyone parked a car on the road. Today cars at the urban end of Church Road are half parked on the pavement, and even then moving traffic struggles to pass. With all this comes issues of personal safety and air pollution. The whole experience is horrible for cyclists and for parents who do walk their children to school.

Landscape. In 2003 a report was commissioned entitled 'Land at Farm Lane / Church Road Leckhampton, Cheltenham - Landscape and Visual Appraisal'. The report concluded that the landscape value at Leckhampton was extremely important, as it complements and enhances the setting and natural beauty of the AONB (generally acknowledged to be one of England's finest) and it should not be subject to large scale development. Areas nearby are considered precious enough to be included in greenbelt, with the crucial function of preventing urban sprawl and coalescence between Cheltenham and Gloucester. Furthermore, the land is much valued as wildlife habitat and by humans for recreation.

Joint Core Strategy. This location has been identified in the draft JCS as a strategic site and is shown as such on the map recently published in the Echo. The application is therefore premature and should not go before the planning committee until the JCS has been finalised. Consultation has only just begun on this: population estimates, environmental and flooding assessments are

not completed; and the traffic modelling will not be available until January 2014, which, frankly, is a travesty. This is a prime example of developers trying to get in 'under the wire' and is not to be tolerated. What is at stake is of the utmost importance and is the reason local people have fought against inappropriate and unsustainable development for so long.

Byways
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 21st October 2013

I am writing to express my shock and utter disbelief on seeing the extent of the proposed development. I am sure other members of the community do not realise the sheer scale of this proposal and, if they do, you will be inundated with letters of criticism. EIGHTY acres of development will affect everyone adversely.

I have no objection at all to the building of new and appropriate much needed housing but not if it is in the wrong place. As you are well aware houses in the wrong place blight people's lives as long as they live there. In what way blighted - you may well ask. Traffic is the blight I and others often refer to.

It is a known fact that Shurdington Road is already having to handle more traffic than it can cope with. Static traffic on numerous occasions throughout the working week not only adds to the stresses of modern life but also adds to the wastefulness of our society spewing all sorts of particulates into the atmosphere of Cheltenham. Frustration and impatience leads to accidents and these will surely increase.

The land in question has not been 'utilised' as best it could over the past few years because it has been in a type of 'limbo' where numerous builders have 'options' on development. Martin Horwood (MP) has suggested that much of the land to the south of Shurdington Road be designated as Country Park. Taking this option would finalise the status of this land thereby saving much wasted time haggling over its future. The Victorians were generous enough to create many areas of parkland for public use, realising that quality of life was as important as money. Have our values really been changed so radically by the pursuit of the fast buck

The JCS seems to suggest the need for 32,000 homes at a time when the county's population is flatlining. Amazing! If true squeezing one thousand homes in here and another one thousand homes there merely detracts from the quality of thirty two different places. That does not seem to be very clever. THIRTY TWO THOUSAND NEW HOMES SUGGESTS A NEW TOWN with roads designed to handle all of the traffic all of the time. We'd have a safer and much more pleasant environment for all certainly.

Byways
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 21st October 2013

I am writing to object to the above application for the following reasons.

650 houses is going to create too much extra traffic on Shurdington Road, Church Road and down Bath Road. These roads are already at capacity in the rush hour. There will be more accidents.

It will destroy the lovely view looking up to Leckhampton Hill, and also the view from the top of the hill, which I regularly walk.

Light pollution will increase, air pollution will increase.

It will increase the risk of flooding by tar-macing over the fields.

There are no places at Bournside and Balcarras.

We will lose important wildlife habitat which is right on our doorstep.

We will lose open space for walking and recreation.

Cadogan
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Cheltenham
GL51 4XW

Comments: 18th November 2013

I wish to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly and fully resolved.

The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the serious traffic problems.

The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they were to work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.

I am personally affected and deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.

My family and I greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. I strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill.

This application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified.

Cadogan
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Cheltenham
GL51 4XW

Comments: 18th November 2013

I wish to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly and fully resolved.

The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the serious traffic problems.

The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they were to work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.

I am personally affected and deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.

My family and I greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. I strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill.

This application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified.

Calves Close
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Cameron
11 Gordon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ES

Comments: 16th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Chartwell
Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 4WJ

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Cheltenham Liberal Democrats
16 Hewlett Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6AA

Comments: 23rd January 2014
Letter attached.

Clayfield
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 30th October 2013
The impact on traffic the area will be disastrous, the A46 is already a nightmare for anyone using in commuting hours. Clearly additional housing will impact this already overloaded route. There is no provision for additional Secondary schooling in the proposals. There are precious few spaces for children on this side of Cheltenham, without the additional impact of extra families from additional housing.

The whole proposal seems ill thought out from an infrastructure point of view

Coniston
98A Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Crippetts Farm
Crippetts Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XT

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

East Barn House
3 Leckhampton Farm Court
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3GS

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

East Barn House
3 Leckhampton Farm Court
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3GS

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Entran Ltd
12 Greenway Farm
Bath Road
Wick
Bristol
BS30 5RL

Comments: 24th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October – 1st November)
Commissioned by LEGLAG

Fairfield
11 The Lanes
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PU

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Fairleigh
Fairfield Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PD

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Fairways
62 Sandy Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DQ

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

First Floor Flat
162 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DH

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Flat 1
162 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DH

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Flat 1
St Kenelm House
Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Flat 4
Delamere
Wellington Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1XY

Comments: 4th March 2014
I am writing with regards to the current planning application to build new homes in Leckhampton.

I have a very young family and am looking to buy our first family home using the governments help-to-buy or shared ownership schemes. I am finding that there is a distinct shortage of new housing choice in Cheltenham, which has been highlighted in your core strategy.

My wife and her family has lived in Cheltenham most of their lives and I moved to the area around five years ago. We love Cheltenham and are proud residents and would therefore like to continue to live in the area which we call home and not be priced out!

As lovers of the countryside we understand peoples concerns about loss of green field land, however the needs of humans sometimes needs be a higher priority. There are still loads of amazing areas in Gloucestershire to enjoy the countryside.

I am therefore writing to show my wholehearted support for the plans to build new homes in Leckhampton and for other new-build proposals such as Elms Park.

Flat 6
87 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JQ

Comments: 30th October 2013

This application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified.

As residents of Shurdington Road we are very concerned about the negative impact the proposed developments will have on the traffic congestion in this area. The queues at the Shurdington Road and Moorend Park Road junction are already a problem. Traffic backs up as far as Kidnappers Lane at peak times and also round the Park.

I have already complained to the council about the lack of crossing priority given to pedestrians at the junction, which is used by a lot of adults and school children. Having lived here for over thirty years we have seen the traffic getting busier and busier and we dread to think just what effect the proposals will have if they succeed. The effects on Bath Road and the Park, the main routes in to town will be horrendous.

Foilfield House
Church Road
Leckhampton
Glos
GL53 0QT

Comments: 15th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Foxfield House
Church Road
Leckhampton
Glos
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 21st October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Foxgloves
Moorend Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EY

Comments: 22nd November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Glenaray
Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NJ

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

Gorran Haven
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NX

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 28th October 2013

I am writing to suggest that this application is premature and is being hurried through before all the relevant information has been obtained, particularly with respect to traffic on Church Road and Kidnappers lane which are already causing huge and dangerous problems on a daily basis. There also needs to be more info on population projections, secondary school available places, the recreational use of the green fields in this area. Nothing should be rushed through until the joint core strategy of Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury has been finalised. Once too many houses have been built the problems they will cause can not be undone so please let common sense prevail.

Green Acres
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NP

Comments: 13th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 10 (9th - 13th December)

Lufton and Associates
Chartered Planning Consultancy
4 Beechcroft Avenue
Stafford
ST16 1BJ

Comments: 28th October 2013

Letter attached.

Commissioned by LEGLAG

Greenacres
1 Crippetts Road
Leckhampton
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XT

Comments: 21st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Greenacres
1 Crippetts Road
Leckhampton
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XT

Comments: 28th October 2013

EXPLANATORY NOTE

I object to this application for the following reasons, which I will briefly outline below and am submitting today to meet the official "deadline" for comments on this application.

However, there has been insufficient time for me to read and consider the many documents that have only been made public in the last few weeks (since the application was made). For instance, the important AMEC report analysing the potential capacity and pros and cons of various possible "strategic urban extensions" has, as far as I am aware, only appeared on the evidence base very recently, despite having been prepared over a year ago! Therefore I reserve the right to amplify my outline objections in the next few weeks, on the understanding that the Cheltenham Planning Department will continue to consider my objections up to a reasonable time before the application goes to Planning Committee, even after the formal deadline today.

OBJECTION. I Object to this Application for the following ten reasons:

It is contrary to the existing Local Plan. The emerging Joint Structure Plan is still capable of being considerably modified in the light of the public consultation, and is indeed quite likely to be modified so as to exclude this development. Therefore granting Planning Permission at this time might well prejudice or make impossible the best choice for the final approved structure plan. Therefore this application is premature in relation to the Joint Core Strategy.

This proposal is not part of a comprehensive plan for the area, as had been suggested in the RSS process which has now - in a sense - become the JCS process. Thus it does not conform to the aims of the Joint Core Strategy.

This development is not needed at present to make up the small apparent shortfall in Cheltenham's five year land bank.

The development will cause considerable damage to the outstanding views across the Severn Plain from several well-known viewpoints in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The development will inevitably give rise to severe traffic congestion, delays, and air pollution along the A46, especially at the morning peak hour. No workable remedial measures seem feasible.

The area under development contributes to an important and attractive open space, very accessible to everyone, including children and old people, and providing for a wide variety of recreational uses by the adjacent and nearby urban population. The loss of even part of this open space should be avoided, especially as Cheltenham already has less than the recommended amount of open space. In the longer perspective, the preservation of large open spaces within or adjacent to expanding urban areas is - or at least should be - an important planning objective. Large cities like London managed to do this in the past, and the prospective Cheltenham/Gloucester/Tewkesbury conurbation should do the same!

The development will entail the loss of a considerable amount of good quality agricultural land (grade 3a and better). A degree of food self-sufficiency is -or at least should be - an important national objective in a future world where food shortages seem very likely, and so unnecessary loss of good agricultural land should be avoided.

The local Parish Council has put forward a proposal for a "Local Green Space" in the same area, in accordance with the "Localism Act". Therefore no planning permission should be granted until the merits of this proposal have been considered by the District Council.

The proposed development is likely to cause flooding risks downstream, which cannot be reliably mitigated by the proposed SUDS measures, because of the uncertainty that the local authority will be able to afford to undertake the necessary maintenance in an adequate manner. (think potholes!).

This concludes my preliminary objection statement.

Hazelwell
Undercliff Terrace
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AE

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Holly Lodge
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PS

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Kersey The Rear Bungalow
48 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JE

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Keswick
66 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

Lambertsweg 1
54617 Sevenig/Our
Germany

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Lantern Lodge
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Linden Lodge
265 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Little Gables
Well Place
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2PJ

Comments: 21st July 2014

I learned recently about a proposal to develop a large site in south cheltenham I comment as follows:

I am fundamentally opposed to any further development of any open land lying to the south east of Shurdington roadall the way to the A417. The reasons for this are two fold.

1. The open land provides a useful amenity and links the town with the surrounding hills.
2. The fertility of land lying below the foothills of the cotswolds is typically high as is evidenced by the number of horticultural establishments in the area. ...in fact I can think of several places I have visited around the world where land in similar locations is highly fertile if on a rather grander scale (foothills of the Tien Shan mountains in Kazakhstan or the Himalayas in India).

Sadly I have also seen areas where beautifully fertile land has been totally destroyed by construction (Ashton Moss in Greater Manchester disappeared under a motorway).

Whilst I do understand that there is a housing shortage there are ample opportunities to redevelop parts of Cheltenham that have already been urbanised and we do not need to irreversibly spoil this open and fertile land.

Long Acre
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NR

Comments: 27th December 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 11 (14th - 20th December)

Long Acre
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NR

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Long Acre
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NR

Comments: 1st November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Longney
10 Gordon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0ES

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Maplehurst
Sandy Lane Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9DE

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

Marlboro
Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NJ

Comments: 20th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Medley Green Farm
Crippetts Lane
Leckhampton
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XT

Comments: 23rd October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Melrose
6 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire

Comments: 15th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Middlemoor
6 Hall Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HE

Comments: 15th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Minchenden
24C Moorend Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0HD

Comments: 18th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Mirambeau
7 Peregrine Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LW

Comments: 6th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 9 (2nd - 6th December)

Mirambeau
Peregrine Road
Cheltenham

Comments: 5th November 2013

I am writing to express my concern about the subject planning application. This application is premature, and should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester has been finalised. Also all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets should be verified first.

I am strongly opposed to any development in the Leckhampton green spaces as it will severely impact the quality of life not only for the local residents, but everyone in Cheltenham. These green spaces are important to the natural beauty of the area, providing homes for wildlife, walking and hiking opportunities for people, play space for children, floodplain area for rainwater, and peace and quiet for us and for future generations. The roads in the area, especially Shurdington Road, are already crowded at 8am and 5pm, air quality is concerning, and primary schools are overcrowded. Additional development in this area could only be detrimental. I urge the council not to allow developers' greed to win over what is right and good.

Moat Cottage
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NR

Comments: 5th November 2013

I live at Moat Cottage Kidnappers Lane. I have not had any direct communication from you regarding this planning application. I believe that you should have provided such communication.

Besides the lack of communication, I object on the grounds of traffic and road capacity. Kidnappers lane has no pedestrian path and is not wide enough for two cars. The current plan would mean a lot of estate traffic on this road and the planned infrastructure could not safely deal with the volume.

Myrtle Cottage
Croft Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0EE

Comments: 18th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Nambour
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 17th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Nowhere
61 Painswick Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2EP

Comments: 23rd October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Old Meadow House
Crippetts Lane
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XT

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

Orchard House
338 Old Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AF

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Orchard House
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NL

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Orchard View
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NL

Comments: 30th October 2013

I am writing to express my concern at the Outline Planning Application under Reference for up to 600 buildings on Kidnappers Lane and the adjacent smallholdings. I do not understand how such an application can be considered at all before the Joint Core Strategy for Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury has been finalised. It should also await the verification of the population estimates in the housing targets and the resolution of all aspects of the transport, environment and planning details.

The site is an area where development was expressly to be avoided to prevent Gloucester and Cheltenham merging around the A 46.

Development in the area proposed would significantly increase traffic congestion on roads which are already overcrowded, especially at peak times. As a resident who uses the A 46, I already experience long delays when trying to come out of Kidnappers Lane onto the A 46 at busy times and suffer traffic noise from the increasing numbers of drivers who use Kidnappers Lane as a shortcut.

The site proposed for development is not close to schools, shops, dOctoberors, employment opportunities or leisure facilities. This would therefore exacerbate further the traffic problems already mentioned.

Development in this area would damage the special landscape in an area of outstanding natural beauty and adversely affect the views to and from the Cotswold escarpment. Just as we have enjoyed it, so it should be preserved for future generations and not despoiled for short term gain and to meet targets which are now thought to be based on faulty predictions.

I object to the proposals themselves, but I also object to the possibility of the application being considered before the necessary machinery and information is in place against which it could be fairly judged

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Orotava Brook Court
49 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SB

Comments: 11th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 1 (3rd - 11th October)

Ragstones
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NT

Comments: 14th October 2013

My key objections to this major planning application is that it should not be considered prior to any joint core strategy for the area being agreed and all the transport and environmental implications have been confirmed. This development will have a massive impact on the local area so for it to be even considered prior to the bigger picture being verified is madness.

There seems to be no consideration as to senior school places - Bournside and Balcarras have no plans to extend so where will local children be sent? They cannot be pushed to Pitville and have to walk and take 2 buses to school. We live on the corner of Church Rd and Kidnappers Lane and the traffic on both roads is already bad and in rush our Church Road is near standstill and a danger to local school children. In addition the green spaces in Kidnappers Lane are a delight and allow us to keep our children in touch with nature and their environment. There must be somewhere more appropriate to build than here.

Ragstones
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NT

Comments: 15th October 2013

I wish to STRONGLY OBJECT to the above planning application for 650 houses off Kidnappers Lane in Leckhampton for the following reasons:

The application is premature and not in the best interest of the residents. The application should not be considered before the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised. Also it is bad practice to proceed on information/data

(transport, environment, population estimates) before the data has been verified, and potentially wasteful, given the lack of resources available I'm surprised the Council would consider making decisions when all of the information is not present and potentially wasting vast sums of money.

Cheltenham is already incredibly car focused; as a cyclist the roads are already dangerously busy. I find it extraordinary that a small town with such poor air quality (which breaks EU levels in winter months) does not encourage greener modes of transport (cycling/public transport) but is intent on increasing car numbers. Shurdington Road and therefore Church Road are both very very busy roads during rush periods with a constant traffic flow outside of rush periods and further housing and reliance on cars will further deplete the air quality and increase congestion. Cars often turn onto Kidnappers Lane from Church Rd and excessively accelerate (possibly due to the frustration the driver has just experienced on church road and see a clear road and therefore accelerate) creating unnecessary danger to pedestrians, (a child was recently knocked over on Church Road) and creating noise and air pollution. I live on the corner of Kidnappers Lane and Church Road and I have nearly been hit whilst edging out of my drive by cars going too fast to stop.

Extra traffic will congest the roads further, especially as this is a residential area and not an area of employment, therefore people will be travelling during already busy times. If further housing is required why is it not closer to better access points and areas of employment (the railway station, the M5 north and south).

Secondary school places are already limited and Balcarras and Brounside are not increasing their intake therefore which close by established school will children of secondary school age go.

Removing further greenbelt will impact on the environment and wildlife. The impact on the environment could be pertinent given the areas propensity to flooding (removing natural water run offs and water protection). By removing footpaths and green spaces for people to explore the council are discourages walking (with obvious associated health risks).

Ranch House
2 Greatfield Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9BU

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Ranmoor
Kestrel Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LQ

Comments: 21st October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 3 (21st - 25th October)

Richmond House
59 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SA

Comments: 16th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Robinswood Cottage
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NP

Comments: 17th October 2013
I strongly object to the planning proposal.

As one of the worst-affected properties I make no apology for stating my personal objections.

I currently live in an open, quiet location surrounded by green fields and have a views across to Leckhampton Hill. This is why I have lived here for more than 18 years. My house is one of a pair of semi-detached single-storey properties, the attached bungalow being the only other building nearby. There is no through traffic.

According to the master plan the single-lane track, which currently serves as vehicle entry to only these two properties, will become an access point for traffic and will join a road, shown on the plan as a secondary route, which will be built immediately to the side and front of my house. The proposed closure of part of Kidnappers Lane will mean that not only will the road carry traffic going to and from the new development but will also become a rat run from Church Road through to Shurdington Road. The road layout means that all these vehicles will not just be passing around my house but will be stopping at the junction right next to my house. This is of great concern to me as I will be subjected to a huge increase in traffic noise and pollution and light pollution from streetlighting. As this road will be carrying the heavy construction traffic for phase 2 of the development there is also the potential for vibration damage. It will have a massive and detrimental effect on my living environment and property value.

On the master plan my property will be surrounded by medium-density housing. This may be up to 2.5 storeys high which will block my view, significantly diminish the natural light entering my home, greatly increase noise levels and reduce my privacy. The field opposite my house is subject to winter flooding (as are other areas) . My house, which has never been affected by this, is lower than the level of this ground so once the houses are built where will the run-off go?

The property attached to mine is shown on the master plan as being included in the proposed area for development. The shared water supply and drainage facilities serving both houses will be affected by the development but I have heard nothing from the building companies to say how they will guarantee that the integrity of my home and essential utilities would be maintained.

- a) The development will destroy a green amenity within walking distance for local people, rich in birds and other wildlife including slow-worms, hedgehogs and bats.
- b) The whole unique character of the area, cherished by many local people, will be completely lost and will become just another urban development. This not waste land; historically this part of old Leckhampton has been productive land. With the popularity of locally sourced food and 'grow your own' it seems perverse to cover it in houses.

- c) The traffic congestion and pollution problems in the area are well known. As far as I'm aware there are no new large employers moving into Cheltenham so the new development could become a commuter estate which will further increase traffic movements. If this sort of development is what Cheltenham needs it should be built closer to motorway links.
- d) The phased building programme could mean residents being subjected to prolonged periods of noise and disruption which will be miserable and will also affect the saleability of properties.
- e) The cycle route will carry cyclists to the A46 where they will join the main flow of traffic with no cycle lanes. I fail to see the point of this; it will not encourage people to choose bike over car.
- f) As I understand it there are not enough secondary school places in Cheltenham. Building a primary school to serve the new houses will not solve the problem.

I think this application is should be rejected in its entirety.

Incidentally it would be interesting to know how the Council decided to whom the Neighbour letter would be sent as I did not receive one even though I live in Kidnappers Lane; so much for community engagement.

Robinswood
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NP

Comments: 6th February 2014
Letter attached: BATCH 12

Sheepshead Row
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NR

Comments: 1st October 2013
Objection to Planning Application Ref 13/01605/OUT

I object most strongly to the above application on grounds of highway safety and convenience of road users, on the effect of the development on the characteristic of the neighbourhood, on the loss of amenity, on the loss of visual amenity and on grounds of nature conservation.

As noted in point 3.3.2 of the Residential Travel Plan the Eastern Length of Kidnappers Lane is a country lane in character with verges but no footways. It is currently an exceptionally dangerous road to use as a pedestrian because along this eastern section the carriageway is barely wide enough for 2 way traffic and pedestrians need to share the carriageway at this point. It poses a significant problem for local school children requiring a safe route to school. This applies to pupils at Leckhampton Primary School and those travelling to Bournside Secondary School. I believe that the developers feel that the closure of Kidnappers Lane, near to southern most vehicle access point to the site, will restrict drivers currently using the lane as a cut through. However, should any of the residents of the development wish to travel by car to local existing shops on Leckhampton Road, Leckhampton Primary School, St Peters Church, Leckhampton Village Hall or to head to Leckhampton Hill and on up to Birdlip, or to drive towards Charlton Kings to use the A40 then they will wish and need to drive along this eastern section of Kidnappers Lane.

Point 3.4.1, of the same plan, notes that Footways on one or both sides are provided on the majority of roads in the local area. This does not however apply to the Eastern Length of Kidnappers Lane.

Point 3.2.7 notes that parking on Church Road restricts carriageway width so that two way traffic movement is impeded. I believe that this will increase with the traffic exiting the development as detailed above. Air quality, as a result of this congestion, is noticeably poor especially in damp weather. This is a primary pedestrian route for local school children.

Contrary to the information in 3.2.8 there is no crossing patrol controlling traffic on Church Road at any time of the day. It is extremely dangerous for adults and children to cross. A child has been hit by a car within the last 12 months and it is a scenario that could easily be repeated. Even under current traffic conditions the Leckhampton School Policy states that pupils cannot ride their bicycles due to traffic congestion on local roads; this will worsen should the development go ahead.

Convenience of road users - if this applies to existing road users, then as a resident of Kidnappers Lane, existing vehicle access along Kidnappers Lane allows convenient access to the A46 to drive towards local supermarkets, the library, and to travel across to the West of Cheltenham. The closure of Kidnappers Lane will incur a detour through the development; a less direct and therefore less convenient route.

Traffic on the Shurdington Road is already at a standstill heading into Cheltenham during the morning rush hours. With some residents from the new development wishing to join this, then the congestion will only increase. The delays are so severe that the planners have been forced to consider a priority exit route for buses leaving the development so that traffic lights will halt traffic on the main road to allow the bus to join. Without stopping the traffic flow the bus would not be able to stick to timetable. The halting of traffic on this heavily congested road will certainly only increase congestion. I understand that the planners have used traffic modelling tools to predict the impact of the traffic on local main roads. This assumes that a given route will reach a point of saturation whereby drivers will abandon their usual route as a result of delays and congestion and choose an alternative. Should current users follow these predictions then the problem is only going to shift to other local roads. An alternative route would cause great inconvenience to many road users and I am hard pressed to come up with viable alternatives for some journeys.

The development will completely change the characteristics of the neighbourhood. As noted in the Residential Travel Plan R3.3.2, the eastern length of Kidnappers Lane is a country lane in character and serves periodic detached properties (two are listed) and market gardens. This has been the case for most of Leckhampton's history and once it becomes host to a vehicle exit from the development this will change considerably.

Lotts Meadow is currently an open space widely used by all sections of the community. Its present state of rough grazing with coppicing and seasonal pond provides a wealth of great outdoor activities for all residents. It is especially valued by local families and is used after school as well as at weekends. It provides a rare opportunity to witness local wildlife and flora in a safe environment and is enjoyed by many throughout day light hours. Creating an informal kick about area and numerous NEAP & LEAP areas will change its wild characteristics for ever and deprive local families of enjoying the countryside in their midst. The installation of NEAP & LEAP areas will also contribute to the loss of the visual amenity and detract greatly from the wild beauty of this open space. Should grazing cease in Lotts Meadow, as it will certainly also have to in the area closer to Shurdington Road currently used as smallholdings, then the very important amenity enabling food to be reared locally will be lost.

Allotments are proposed for an area currently home to a family of foxes, roe deer and wild orchids. We have also observed a host of birdlife including buzzards and kestrels catching their prey, hedgehogs, stoat, shrew and badgers and bats just in this small area earmarked for allotments. These allotments will require car parking; again really detracting from the

characteristics of the local area and causing more journeys to be made along the eastern section of Kidnappers Lane.

It is on these planning grounds that I object to the development of this land.

Smalley
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NL

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

Spring Hill
Crippetts Lane
Cheltenham
Glos
GL51 4XU

Comments: 9th December 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 12

Spring Hill
Crippetts Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XU

Comments: 18th October 2013

1. I have only today received information from Cheltenham Borough Council about the Joint Core Strategy for Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury. It apparently is only just now under public consultation for a draft to consider housing need and location, employment and lastly infrastructure for the next 30 years. This consultation ends on the 26th of November 2013 so it is premature to be proposing to build 650 homes off Kidnappers Lane when one does not know what the JCS will be.
2. The estimated 1,000 extra cars on the road from this development would cause gridlock. Already the Shurdington Road is jammed up into Cheltenham and beyond Kidnappers Lane every weekday. Any closure of the Farm Lane end onto Church Road would exacerbate that problem. Give us the transport/traffic modelling information for the County before this application can be considered.
3. Pollution levels already are high in the Church Road and Shurdington Road areas in the winter months. EU air pollution levels have been exceeded so Cheltenham is in an Air Quality Management Area. Explain how the pollution levels will go down with the estimated 1000 extra cars on the road from this development.
4. Flooding is an issue in this area.
5. There are few places for students at the local Secondary Schools in Cheltenham so this development will cause a lot of problems there too.
6. The population for the whole County is estimated to be an increase of 500 people a year according to the 2011 Census yet in the Core Strategy Plan it is identified that this number is

1500, an increase of 1000! Give us the true Office of National Statistics figure on population projections before this application can be considered.

7. Are there not brownfield sites and derelict buildings to build housing on/in before greenbelt?
8. Cheltenham has been losing jobs so what are all these people coming for work doing?
9. What about all the facilities (home helps, shops, community halls, gardens, doctors etc) which will be needed and the hospitals are already stretched. We are full up!
10. This area is in the Cotswold Escarpment so is an important place for wildlife and recreation and an asset to the community.
11. Give us the information on housing need from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment studies. Without this how can one possibly consider this application.
12. It is too early to consider this application without the needed information from all the studies in this County and completion of the Joint Core Strategy.

These are my views.

St Pauls Medical Centre
Swindon Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4BW

Comments: 21st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Suffolk House
166 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AA

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

The Bungalow
26B Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JY

Comments: 8th November 2013
Letter attached: Batch 5 (4th - 8th November)

The Cedars
Kenelm Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JR

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

The Coach House
Ryeford Road South
Kings Stanley
Gloucester

Comments: 28th October 2013
I am writing with my objection to this application. I believe it is premature and should not go before the planning committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the area of Tewkesbury, Cheltenham and Gloucester City has been finalised. Also, that all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified.

The Cottage On The Green
The Green
Badgeworth
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 4UL

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

The Gables
Leckhampton Lnæ
Shurdington
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XW

Comments: 7th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

The Gateways
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NN

Comments: 1st November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 4 (28th October - 1st November)

The Keep
Kidnappers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NL

Comments: 2nd October 2013

I wish to raise objections to the proposed development in Leckhampton under planning Reference 13/01605/OUT and wish to make the following comments.

I consider this vicinity to be an area of outstanding natural beauty, which also provides a picturesque entry to Cheltenham on the A46. Further development in this area would be disastrous. We should protect valuable countryside from land-grabs for inappropriate development in an area that should be protected as an Area Of Outstanding Beauty.

Building in Leckhampton will put a strain on local services; will add even more congestion and air pollution to our roads. The additional traffic brought about by this development would be intolerable. I view the traffic cues every day from my window and already have difficulty accessing the A46 from Kidnappers Lane and following congestion into the Bath Road.

Also, I have witnessed the drainage manhole covers blown off by the high pressure in heavy rainfall resulting in repair of the drainage manhole and re-tarmacing of the A46 outside my house. Being fearful of causing flooding to my property, I would suggest that the whole infrastructure in the area couldn't withstand this inappropriate development.

Notwithstanding my earlier comments I find the proposal of local amenities adjacent to existing low-density residential housing totally inconsiderate to existing residents.

This would provide the potential for all manner of nuisance including noise, vandalism parking and potential area for antisocial behaviour.

We already have ample provision of retail outlets in Salisbury Avenue, Morrisons, The Bath Road and more.

We already have doctors surgeries at Warden Hill Community Centre in Hubert Crescent and Moorend Park Road.

We already have dental practices in Leckhampton Road and Grasmere Road.

Comments: 28th October 2013

I wish to raise objections to the proposed development in Leckhampton under planning Reference 13/01605/OUT and wish to make the following comments.

I consider this vicinity to be an area of outstanding natural beauty, which also provides a picturesque entry to Cheltenham on the A46. Further development in this area would be disastrous. We should protect valuable countryside from land-grabs for inappropriate development in an area that should be protected as an Area Of Outstanding Beauty.

Building in Leckhampton will put a strain on local services; will add even more congestion and air pollution to our roads. The additional traffic brought about by this development would be intolerable. I view the traffic cues every day from my window and already have difficulty accessing the A46 from Kidnappers Lane and following congestion into the Bath Road.

Also, I have witnessed the drainage manhole covers blown off by the high pressure in heavy rainfall resulting in repair of the drainage manhole and re-tarmacing of the A46 outside my house.

Being fearful of causing flooding to my property, I would suggest that the whole infrastructure in the area couldn't withstand this inappropriate development.

Notwithstanding my earlier comments I find the proposal of local amenities adjacent to existing low-density residential housing totally inconsiderate to existing residents.

This would provide the potential for all manner of nuisance including noise, vandalism parking and potential area for antisocial behaviour.

We already have ample provision of retail outlets in Salisbury Avenue, Morrisons, The Bath Road and more.

We already have doctors surgeries at Warden Hill Community Centre in Hubert Crescent and Moorend Park Road.

We already have dental practices in Leckampton Road and Grasmere Road.

The Littlecroft
Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0NJ

Comments: 28th October 2013
Letter attached: in BATCH 4 (14th - 18th October)

The Moat
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 21st October 2013

I am writing to object to the above planning application in the Leckhampton, Kidnappers Lane area for some 650 houses plus commercial units, Surgery and school, care home and offices. This application should be turned down for several good reasons. All stated before, many times, but you appear to be doing nothing to take into account the locals views.

1. This is a premature application as the Joint Core Strategy has not been finalised. 2. This area has no infrastructure for so many houses. The road system alone cannot take any more traffic without further gridlock, especially at peak travel times. For this level of development, you would put over 1000 extra vehicles on the roads. 3. This would add to air pollution problems that already exceed EU levels around Church Rd and the A46. 4. Senior school places are already under pressure at Bournside and Balcarras. No mention of the answer to this in the plan. 5. It would ruin a green area, enjoyed by many for walking. Wildlife would certainly suffer. 6. There is no proof that I have seen, that this area needs all these houses. Where are the jobs? People will just commute in their cars.

Please refuse this application.

The Old Lodge
Church Road
Leckhampton Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 16th October 2013

I object to the proposed development on the grounds of the increase of traffic on roads that are already saturated.

The transport assessment is clearly flawed in many areas. One example of this is illustrated by ATTACHMENT 4 - 'Employment Trip Distribution' where no journeys are assumed to be made exiting to the South via the A417. By far the most convenient route with the current plan when heading South is to exit via Kidnappers Lane, Church Road and Leckhampton Road. The report states that the increase in traffic on Church Road will be negligible - this will clearly not be the case as it will be the main route on and off the development for traffic heading South. As the transport assessment assumes that there will be only a negligible increase in traffic it fails to address the issue of increased traffic in the Church Road area.

The traffic density during rush hour on Church Road is already very high because Church Road provides the only route around the South East side of Cheltenham and, via Kidnappers Lane, provides the only route around the south of Cheltenham to the A40 and Gloucester which avoids the build up of traffic on the Shurdington Road. Church Road is narrow. This causes an number of problems chiefly centred around high levels of congestion and pollution, coupled with the dense residential nature of Church Road to the East of Kidnappers Lane, the position of Leckhampton Primary School and the near complete absence of off road parking. Cars can pass in both directions but not easily and the traffic tends to flow in blocks, in one direction and then the other. There is serious danger to school children walking along the narrow pavements and crossing Church Road and Hall Road to Leckhampton Primary School, which is a large primary school with 420+ pupils. Therefore, it must be a key principle in considering any development in this area that the traffic on Church Road must not be increased. This has been stated by planning inspectors on several occasions. Just one of many examples is a 1998 appeal relating to the development of Church Farm (in the more rural part of Church Road), the Inspector recorded that the appellants in that case (whose team also included a highways expert) acknowledged that Church Road is operating beyond its physical and environmental capacity. The increase in traffic has been grounds for refusal of numerous planning applications relating to properties over the last 20 years.

Previous traffic reports relating to Church Road have stated that the Kidnappers Lane junction with Church Road is restricted to a width of 4 metres. Visibility from a point 4.5 metres back is about 67 metres to the north-east and about 15 metres to the south-west. The proposal contains no mention of this restricted visibility and like many of the problems with the proposed development, it is dismissed as something which can be sorted out after the development is complete.

The transport assessment states that there will be no increase in traffic on Shurdington Road outside what is already expected without the development as the housing targets for Cheltenham need to be met. This is clearly flawed logic as merely stating that the building of more houses is mandated so the roads will have to cope is not a sensible way to plan a safe and efficient transport system. The impact of each proposal would need to be assessed both in isolation and as part of an overall plan for the Cheltenham and Gloucester area. It is therefore essential that the JCS is produced before a development on this site is even considered. The proposed development will increase the traffic levels on Shurdington Road which, in 2003, had junctions assessed at running at 90-100% capacity and traffic density is widely understood to have increased since. Tailbacks on the A46 would then encourage some motorists to bypass the A46 by using the longer route into Cheltenham via Leckhampton Lane, Church Road and Leckhampton Road, thereby further increasing the traffic through Church Road.

There are many reasons why this proposal should not be granted planning permission but I believe that the increased traffic on local roads and specifically Church Road should alone be sufficient to justify rejection.

The Old Rectory
Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0QJ

Comments: 18th October 2013

I wish to strongly oppose the proposed development of land off kidnappers Lane for the following reasons;

1. Traffic conditions are already at a dangerous level. I use Church Road to take my children to school and they have to witness cars and drivers fighting for right of way in a threatening and abusive manner. This is all within a School Zone on the Church Road. Adding another possible 1000 cars to this chaos is incredibly naive before any traffic survey is completed.
2. Loss of amenity, after a stressful day we always have a walk in the fields. Walking around a housing estate will not have the same benefit. Dog walkers will lose their walks, local schools will lose their nature walks and so on. In terms of tourism; Cheltenham advertises wonderful green spaces for walks in the countryside. We can hardly advertise our housing estates as a wonderful rural asset.
3. The application is premature in 5 - 10 years time we will wonder why on earth this was allowed to go through, we will never regain this space. There is no evidence that we have a short fall of housing. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment has not been completed. According to a study carried out by The Halifax building society last year, 662,105 homes were unoccupied in the UK, this number increases by 12,000 on average each year. Is this figure taken into account when shortfalls are calculated.
4. I have 2 young children, who we are already having difficulties finding school places, swimming classes, Scout groups to join. This is not going to improve the situation, by moving a small town population into a parish the size of Leckhampton.

I hope you consider these objections. I have read local opinions in the Public comments, and as a local I agree it is madness. Unless you live in the area you cannot fully understand the impact on the environment. Without even mentioning the loss of important wildlife, the threat of 1000 extra vehicles on the road system is unfeasible.

The Orchards
15 The Park
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2SL

Comments: 15th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Tre Mair
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XW

Comments: 23rd October 2013

I email regarding the application 13/01605/OUT for 650 houses to be built in the Kidnappers Lane area. My wife and I are most concerned that the infrastructure will not stand up to the inevitable increase in traffic along the A46 and tributary roads. Services are not suitable to cope; for example there are insufficient secondary school places. We feel that the plan has not been looked at from the point of view of what is viable for the community and we urge a rethink on this crucial matter.

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Treetops
Leckhampton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9QG

Comments: 22nd November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Vaynor
102 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0BX

Comments: 7th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 5 (4th - 8th November)

West Barn House
Leckhampton Farm Court
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3GS

Comments: 15th October 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Whitebeam Cottage
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Gloucestershire
GL51 4XW

Comments: 20th November 2013

Letter attached: BATCH 7 (18th - 22nd November)

Willow Green
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Cheltenham
Glos
GL51 4XW

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Willow Green
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Cheltenham
Glos
GL51 4XW

Comments: 17th October 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 2 (14th - 18th October)

Wister
Hill House
Leckhampton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9QG

Comments: 13th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 6 (11th - 15th November)

Wyndways
104 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EA

Comments: 28th November 2013
Letter attached: BATCH 8 (25th - 29th November)

9 Imperial Square
Cheltenham
GL50 1QB

Comments: 3rd March 2014
Letter attached: BATCH 12