13/01605/OUT

Land at Leckhampton

Representations

Batch 2
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

* The amount of traffic generated will be unacceptable and have a serious negative impact on an already busy and dangerous 'rush hour' - morning and evening.

* The schools in the area (primary and secondary) are already oversubscribed; the medical facilities in the area are limited. Serious disarray of the local bus services will have to change and therefore have an impact on the air pollution - together with the extra cars the proposed 650 houses will generate.

* Will add to an already oversubscribed and oversessed area - adding another proposed GP surgery, offices, care home, primary school etc will only add to the problem.

Name: Anon, Ref: 13/01605/OUT
Address: Leckhampton
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The A46 is the only way out of Highwood Ave. We have lived here nine
1974 on 2 counts - traffic volume & air pollution - been
at capacity all year capacity or peak homes for years. The
situation is now critical on both counts. It would be
unreasonable to think of making the situation worse with
further development.

Name
Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

3rd 18 OCT 2013

[Signature]
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Affordable housing is badly needed in this area, and so I wholeheartedly support the building proposals. Likewise the local primary schools are oversubscribed, so the inclusion of a new one in the plans is most welcome.

BUILT
End 18 OCT 2013
ENVIRONMENT

Name
Address 38 Moorend St GL52 0EH
Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Yes...It would be nice to have more houses with shops, G.P. surgery, a care home and a primary school. I think that this could be a real community, because here in Cheltenham, there is no real community. It would be a good idea that there should be a real community in Cheltenham in the future. The old surgery, next door to Waterford Court, will be closed (I have been told by your council), and will move to the new one in Leckhampton Green Fields.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 47 Waterford Court, Moor End Park Road, Cheltenham, Glos. GL53 OLA
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Please do not build on our precious green spaces - they will be gone FOREVER. These areas do much more than just improve our quality of life. These green spaces improve our air quality. The A4119 is already overcrowded with traffic at stands still during peak times. There are already not enough second school places for children in the area. To build more houses would put an impossible strain on poor resources.

Name [Redacted]
Address 67, Windmill Park Rd., Chevening, GL5 0LG
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I object to this application because:

1. The increase in traffic would gridlock roads.
2. The loss of open green space would be detrimental to wildlife.
3. These fields are used by many for recreation.
4. Once built on, this green open space would be lost forever.
5. Almost no local people want this development to go ahead. If it does, all faith in local democracy will be destroyed. Why bother to vote?

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 67 Mousetail Park Rd, Cheltenham, GL53 0LG
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The transport/traffic model needs to be available before a decision can be made – but factors used for the model have been vastly overestimated.

Name: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Read 18 OCT 2013

ENVIRONMENT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

This application appears to affect Green Belt land, and
also Special Areas, so it is also productive land.

Air pollution levels are already high in the area and this will
worsen to them.

Bus service to this area is poor with an infrequent
daytime service and nothing at evening. The traffic
in Leckhampton is excessive and (will) not be able to cope
with the extra traffic.

BUILT

Ref. 10 OCT 2013

ENVIROMENT

Name

Address 2AC MOOREND ROAD, LECKHAMPTON

CULFORD HR 053 OHD

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLICATIONS ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

[Handwritten text]

Totally disproportionate.
Congestion already on Shurdington Rd every morning is terrible.
We need the greenbelt around this heavily populated area.
Who is going to live in these homes?

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 2, Kereton Grdns, GL5 3 OJW.

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Leckhampton does not have the infrastructure for 650 houses. Shurdington Rd is a very busy road and extra cars would make it far worse. Church Rd is not made for any extra traffic. Public transport would be needed for people to go to a surgery or school, and this will add to traffic problems. There is a lawn for wildlife and should be kept this way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>5/9 Leckhampton Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILT

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

READ 18 OCT 2013

ENVIRONMENT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Apart from the loss of green land -
A development of this size would submerge the local area to the detriment of parks and other facilities.

BUILT
Read: 18 OCT 2013

ENVIRONMENT

Name
Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
BUILDINGS ON GREEN BELT LAND SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED BY ANY PARTY.
THERE IS QUITE OF BROWN SITES MY ADDRESS IS MOOREND PK ED (RAT RUN)
DON'T ADD TO THE PROBLEM

Name
Address
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- Current roads would be unable to cope with the increase in traffic. What are current pollution levels? Would these be exceeded?
- More traffic = more accidents.
- Where are the jobs for these people? The schools - secondary as well as primary.
- What figure as used to predict population increase?

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 8 S. Church Rd
I went to a meeting yesterday from my home on Leckhampton Rd, down Shurdington Rd, to Golden Valley. The traffic was gridlocked from the roundabout near Morrisons, Hatherley, all the way to
Norwood Ave Roundabout, at 08:30 am.
I dread to think how much worse this would be on the
650 houses nearby. No doubt many would be travelling a 15 min
route at this time.
With a daughter at Bourne Hill and another @ Duxton Park, I worry
about school capacity too. This needs careful consideration.

Name [Redacted]
Address 69 Leckhampton Rd, Cheltenham
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

With reference to Planning application (Ref. 13/01605/OUT)

We would like to make the following points:

- With the closure of Kidnappers Lane many more vehicles will exit onto the Shurdington Rd.
- The road network needs careful revision & traffic modelling.
- Air pollution levels are too high.
- There are problems with senior school places.
- No plans for expansion for Balcarres + Bourne side.
- All planning for transport, the environment and

population should be verified by TSW, this application is

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 16 Fairfield Park Rd
Cheltenham GL53 7PQ
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Too many houses for infrastructure and using too much greenspace.

Figures change - why are numbers three times higher than 2011 Census?

BUILT
Ref. 18 OCT 2013
ENVIROMENT

Name

Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The main concerns:

1. Loss of open space in the South West of Leckhampton
   (Strategic open space). A pond appears in a strange
   position, can this be incorporated into the plan?

2. Traffic flow along Kidnappers Lane. Farm causes a bottleneck
   Lane. My worry is that current plans are too restrictive.
   We live in a village and would have problems accessing
   Moredon for example.

Name
Address
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

B.C...is...rushing...this...through...!...The...majority...of...local...people...do...not...want
to...lose...these...well...used...&...loved...spaces...;...Local...roads...have...already
been...described...as...'over...capacity'...-...the...extra...vehicles...from...the...proposed
development...will...make...things...even...worse...than...they...are...&...our...pollution
levels...that...already...break...EU...levels...in...winter...ex...my...road...will...increase.
We...are...in...an...Air...Quality...Management...Area...-...it...should...not...be...allowed...to
get...worse!...A...route...I...regularly...use...-...kidnappers...Lane...v...Church...rd
will...be...closed...&...approx...1000...extra...vehicles...will...exit...off...Church...rd...This...application...is...premature!...It...should...not...go...before...the
Planning...Committee...before...the...ICS...is...finalised...All...aspects...of
planning...transport...environment...&...population...estimation...in...the...housing
Ref...13/01605/OUT

Name [REDACTED]
Address 79 Church Rd, GL53 0EF
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- Building on this land is redundant
- There are insufficient secondary school places already
- Traffic is already over capacity on Stoneyford Road and pollutes above EU levels
- This is valuable green belt land, its loss is irreparable
- Increased rate of flooding - no long consultation has finished or incomplete
- We don't need any new houses, it will have a negative effect on housing prices

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 11 Highwood Avenue

R13/01605/OUT
Ref 18 OCT 2013
ENVIRONMENT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I am very concerned about this proposal. As it stands I cannot enjoy the use of my garden which is parallel to Mornington Supermarket due to the noise pollution from traffic. This proposal will inevitably mean more traffic and I am concerned about the strain on the local schools, doctors and other facilities.

Obviously there is the other important issue of this development spoiling the beauty of Up Hartley. I bought my house which has views of the fields believing that these fields have been set aside to be preserved. I am very saddened and cannot see this proposal as necessary or sensible.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 27 The Greenings
CHELTENHAM

Ref: 13/01605/OUT
Rev: 18 OCT 2013
BUILT
ENVIRONMENT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

What worries me is all the traffic coming through Bath rd. The Council has made a bottleneck there and it often ends up faroming over back way and very rude drivers. Who are these houses for enough in enough people move to the coventry only to find the town follows them. Immigrants will end up in these homes on the rest of us have no say we do not count. But Tewkesbury Council builds on there... Extend there town Cheltenham a Gloucester will meet a not a green field in sight (Disturbing)

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Recd 18 OCT 2013

Name
Myrtle Cottage, C岬ft. St.
Address

ENVIRONMENT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- Insufficient senior school places at both Balcornas and
  Broadmore have no plans to expand, but catchment areas
  may have to change to accommodate new development.
- Extra large number of vehicles on Shurdington Road
  causing an already severely congested route to worsen.
- Loss of much loved green spaces, this area will
  change forever and we have chosen to live here.

BUILT

Name

Address 5 Merlin Way

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Please consider:

- Wait for the parish designation
- for Local green space status
- Don’t lose our heritage
- Consider the road network around
- this site. It is already failing
- Secondary school spaces

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
NOT RECORDED - ADDRESS NOT FOUND

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

To consider building on Leckhampton's green fields is utterly ridiculous. The existing traffic problems, infrastructure and congestion would be reduced.

Name [REDACTED]
Address LYNMEAD, CHURCH RD

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Leckhampton is the last green space outside can already over crowded town. The fields provide a local authority for dog walking, allotments and the pleasure of open green space a respite from the stresses of our urban existence. This is apart from the wealth of wildlife which is not inconsiderable. Rare and threatened species of birds are resident there as well as bats and hares. The very real threat of sterilizing which move land under concrete would raise must be a serious consideration as well. What advantage could there be apart from gain for the developers?

Name [redacted]
Address Brooke Cottage, Cruppotts Lane, Leckhampton, GL51 4UT

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The application is premature since many of the planning assumptions in the FS are unfounded and cannot be supported by credible data or evidence at this time.

Additionally, the local road network, especially Church Road and Glafington Road, is already heavily congested and no viable means of expanding capacity or reducing traffic volumes is being considered in this application. Furthermore, the green fields are home to numerous species of flora and fauna, including bats, several of which are considered protected species. We strongly oppose this application.

Name [REDACTED]
Address 11 VIERIES CLOSE, LECKHAMPTON, GL53 0HU

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

> Application is premature
> Should wait until JCS has been finalised
> All aspects of planning, transport, environment & population estimates contained in the housing targets have been verified

Name

Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLICATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Too many houses, need to keep some Green Space

Roads cannot cope with estimated additional vehicles

Risk of flooding

Name

Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I continue to express my disapproval of the local infrastructure as inadequate to cope with this volume of houses, and yet another tract of countryside agricultural land (which is likely to be much needed in the future) will disappear.

I understand the projections of population increase may be unrealistic (exaggerated).

Name

Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLICATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER - (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- Church Road is far too busy already. We find it hard getting out our drive
- Many residents, including us, walk their dogs or walk daily on these fields
- Many people use these fields to run and play in the winter with their children
- Removing the fields in Leckhampton removes the desire to live in Leckhampton.
- Re-development desired. Sites First Green should be led.
- What demand is there for these houses and why?

Name [REDACTED]
Address 65, Church Road GL530TF
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

NON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, WHERE ARE ALL THE JOBS FOR THESE PEOPLE, MOST WILL BE AT KINGSDITCH T/A SO BUILD ON THE TETRESBURY ROAD NEAR BY.

SHURDINGTON CANNOT TAKE ANY MORE TRAFFIC.

FIGURES USED FOR POPULATION INCREASE ARE FLAWED AND OVERSTATE POPULATION INCREASE.

Name
Address NAMBOUR, FARM LANE, LECKHAMPTON.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

1. The application should not go before the Planning Committee until the Joint Core Strategy has been finalised.

2. Shurdington Road already has too much traffic and does not have the capacity for the extra 1,200 vehicles likely to be using it.

3. Air quality is already breaking EU levels - will deteriorate further.

Name
Address 23 Hickford Avenue, GL53 0J5
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

When the Green Field principle and legislation was introduced all these years ago it was highly praised by the majority. Before there is any move to encroach on Green Fields there is a lot of Arvon Field areas not yet developed. Get if clearing them up should not be a barriers to sorting out such problems.

Name
Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

1. The additional traffic cannot be safely accommodated and will create a dysfunctional, over-used road network, and add significantly and dangerously to the high air pollution levels (which already break UK levels in Church Rd and A46). The estimated additional 1000 cars will exit onto A46, which does not have capacity.

2. Insufficient senior school and other local productive.

3. The small holdings are a wonderful green space which can never be replaced once gone. The whole area is an excellent green resource for local people of all ages. It maintains a space between housing which cannot be recycled.

4. I object strongly to this application, which is premature and should not be considered until the JCS is finalised and until other forecasts have been validated.

Name
Address
87 Church Rd, Leckhampton GL53 0PF
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The additional traffic from the proposed development on the above green fields will be disastrous. Already vehicles are regularly “nose to tail” travelling at a snail’s pace.

BUILT
Ref: 47 Oct 2013
ENVIRONMENT

Name...........................................
Address........................................

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

15.10.2013
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I need some houses built for my nieces and nephews in their twenties. Plenty of room on the Leckhampton Hills.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Since moving to this area six years ago, I have seen a huge increase in traffic along Shurdington Rd & Church Rd. Nearly every day cars, vans & lorries have to mount the pavement - one day a pedestrian (probably a schoolchild) will be injured.

Making the air pollution problem worse on these 2 roads is already breaking EU limits - to deliberately increase this seems criminal.

More thought needs to go towards these problems.

Name

Address  GARRAN...HAUSEN
          KIDNAPPERS LANE
          CHELTENHAM. GL53 ONX

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Is something amiss somewhere these days? Building on Green Belt 
...and will change the whole atmosphere of this beautiful area...

...provocative, surely...councillors...obviously...surprising...What has... 
...happened to democracy? It used to be expected to believe our... 
...councillors...who we elected...Our wonders where all these people 
...will work...and shopping...longer...our already overcrowded roads... 
...and already pollute the air...we breathe...It seems we no longer 
...live in a democracy...[

Name: [REDACTED]
Address: Leckhampton Farm Court
Oxted, Surrey
TQ8 6ET

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

This application must be declined for the following reasons:

1. The preservation of existing Green belt is critical for the continuing quality of life for current residents and the wildlife that live in it.

2. Current infrastructure, particularly road networks, is not adequate to support housing expansion.

3. Services in the area are full and further pressure on existing road services will mean less availability for all.

Name

Address
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Roads & Infrastructure unright to code.

It’s a disgrace. I do not agree with using green land when there are areas in towns that need redeveloping and can take houses.

Cars will have no where to go. Jams.

Chelecham - guys are applying already.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Is this what the Lib-Dems promised? We have already allowed too much intrusion into our green spaces. You have allowed too much building in Leckhampton. There are few amenities left, and only one game to cause more traffic noise. Do not expect us to vote for you again.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION WINDAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I OBJECT TO THE PLANNING APPLICATION (ABOVE)

- DURING PEAK BUSY HOURS ROADS AROUND SHURLINGTON ROAD, CANE
  
  ESPECIALLY TO THE A40/GLOUCESTER ROAD/ WATHERLEY LANE ROUNDABOUT ARE 'MAXED OUT' CHAOS WITH TOO MANY CARS WHICH ONLY GET WORSE

- WILL ALL THE EXTRA SECONDARY SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN GO TO SCHOOL? INSUFFICIENT SPACES WHICH WILL CAUSE PROBLEMS

- THE APPLICATION IS PREMATURE YOU SHOULD WAIT UNTIL THE JOINT CORE STRATEGY FOR THE AREA HAS BEEN FINALISED. YOU ALSO NEED TO VERIFY ALL ASPECT OF PLANNING TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT & POPULATION ESTIMATES CONTAINED IN THE HOUSING TARGETS HAVE BEEN

Name .......................................................... Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Address ..........................................................
    7 HIODCOTE AVE
    GL51 3FD
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Traffic:...Sturdigrum Rd is an ever-busy road...already...One small holdup - i.e. repairing a small pothole - produces massive tailbacks and delays...I knew...because I use the road every day...It is a small road...wooded.

Housing:...Building more houses...means...they have to be filled...bringing more people...to Cheltenham...folly...we have not got...enough good secondary schools; swimming pools; adequate road systems...etc...Our fibre has had to be closed at night because it can't cope with the number of people on ready here...how do we propose to deal with this great influx?...And what about all the unsold properties in Cheltenham?...The open spaces...of Cheltenham...is...its beauty...especially our surrounding areas...If we are going to turn our lovely countryside...it will be reduced to just another urban area...with nothing special to attack tourists (part of our revenue)

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Name
Address
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

---

1. Green Belt land is valued, valuable and should be preserved
2. The A46 is overused already
3. The Bath Road cannot take any more traffic
4. Doctor's lists are full
5. Schools are full
6. Air pollution is critical
7. No sources of jobs in Cheltenham
8. Danger of flooding

---

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 34 CAMPION PARK, UP HATHERLEY GL51 3WA

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION - HIGNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I write to object to the development of this area. The Application is premature and should not proceed until the outcome of the Town Plan Strategy has been finalized. Also, all aspects of planning, transport, environment, issues and population estimates must be verified.

This area...support low...function development...Shirompton Rd and...Road...area...already...congested...peak...and additional traffic will create gridlock. This will add to the air pollution which is already breaking our quality levels.

The senior schools are already overloaded; further...are working over capacity.

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 2 Angela Drive, GL51 3EA
Date: 15/10/13
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION
KRONAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Against - we agree as Cheltenham doesn't have the infrastructure to support its rapidly expanding population increase and green areas will be lost forever.

Name: Edward Wilson
Address: GLO 2LP
Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION, KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- The roads near the development would be overloaded; Sharphamton Road, because that is the only entrance/exit, and Leckhampton Lane - Church Road, because vehicles passing through would be avoiding Sharphamton Road.
- The added traffic would add to the already excessive levels of air pollution.
- There are insufficient senior school places to accommodate the likely number of pupils. Bussing them to more distant schools would be inefficient and inconvenient to parents & would add to pollution.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 110 Adam End Rise

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I disagree with building these houses because a thousand extra vehicles will all exit onto Shurdington Rd.

Air pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Church Rd. and A416.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: FAIRLEIGH, FAIRFIELD RD, GL 53 7 RD

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

This development would be totally unsuitable.

As a frequent user of Stourton Road

It is obvious that it cannot accommodate

such an enormous increase in traffic.

If a development would bring

Also, the existing senior school in the area

are already over-subscribed, the mass of numbers

involved makes little or no allowance for this.

Name

Address

5 Haugton Way
CHELTENHAM
GL53 78Q

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Cheltenham is rapidly becoming a dormitory town, lack of work at present, with little here for the future is causing over education of the area. Firstly, check foreign people allocated council property, restricting these to young people who have grown up in the district/area.

The land south and southwest of Kidnappers Lane should not now, or anytime in the future be built on, destroying the larger slopes of Leckhampton Escarpment. Likewise the area between Amberley Lane/Motherley Way should be kept open. If you are hell-bent on this then I suggest you build three houses in Pittville Park, Sandford Park & Montpellier Gardens. I wonder what the public would think of that.

Name .................................................................
Address .................................................................

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Brownfield sites should be developed before any green land is gobbled up.

Traffic will be a nightmare.

Weekly there are pages & pages of homes to sale!!

Ecologically, development will be a disaster.

Natural woodland habitat is already disappearing at an alarming rate.

Name

Address, Launcott Cottage, GL5 3 OQ
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

SHAME AND UTTER MADNESS. TAKING AWAY THE GREEN BELT AND BUILDING HOUSES UP AGAINST AN ALREADY OVER BURDENS STROUDGTON RD AND BATH RD IS UTTER STUPIDITY AND GOOD ON BEHALF OF TENNESSEES BORO COUNCIL AND DEVELOPERS.

EVEN THE LIB DUSHS NEED THEIR ARSES KICKED WE WILL FIGHT THIS DEVELOPMENT TOOTH & CLAW.

Name

Address GORDON RD, LECKHAMPTON

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Rcvd 15 OCT 2013
ENVIRONMENT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

MY OBSERVATIONS ARE THAT THE LIB DEMS ARE TRYING TO RUSH THIS THROUGH WITHOUT HAVING MADE SURE THAT ALL THE CRITICAL CHECKS HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, I.E. BROWNFIELD FIRST POLICY, SHMA REPORT, VERIFICATION OF THE ICS POPULATION PROJECTION, THE INFRASTRUCTURE & ROADS CAN NOT HANDLE THE EFFECTS OF THIS PROPOSAL.

Name
Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Address 35 WESTBURY RD
CHELTENHAM GL53 9EN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

TRAFFIC

The traffic created by 'Endsutch' is bad

Morning & Evening

Traffic entering town turns left at the

Shurdington Rd. roundabout. Traffic from

Huntspill Rd. will avoid BATH Rd. (Junction with

Leckhampton Rd. Roundabout) with 4 or 5 lane

road. 2 pedestrian crossings + safety lights at

the junction. It then 'races down the park

with scant regard for 30 limit & junction with

Glamorgan Way Park Place + bus route

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

School children!

It can only become worse!

"Worse since parking allowed in Park Place"
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

This application, 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. Also that all aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the Housing targets have been verified.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I am completely against their proposal which would move vital green space, traffic which is already overloaded down Shurdington Rd, would be unbearable. Not at all already insufficient to sustain such places. Not at all for better. The new home development plan should not be drawn by the developer desirous to maximise their profit. As theExcellent Our people (who have lived here) and the people that would buy their houses and be content in the subsequent years.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 12 Moorwood Rd G15 1DU
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Building this number of houses on Leckhampton Green Fields would make a mockery of any green belt. It would be utterly dishonest to catalogue more homes when present educational, medical or other facilities are stretched to the limit whereby and job vacancies have fostered dramatically apart from permanent overloading of the present need, usage or facilities.

Whatever solution one found to need of transport problems, more green land is built on it has gone forever and alike to be used for food production — how you succeeded in making concrete forts for rice, providing food? Therefore would you survive?

Name [REDACTED]
Address 25 St. Peter's Rd, Cheltenham
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

1. The plans do not yet satisfy the requirement to demonstrate the feasibility of a transport strategy. Roads around Moorend, Marsh Road and Hall Road are already used as 'rat runs' for traffic. The new houses must not make the situation worse.

2. The effect on existing secondary schools must be considered and planned for.

Signed

Date 15 OCT 2013

Name
Address 17 Moorend Grove, GL53 6E2
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

We wholeheartedly agree with and support the views of LEGAL LAGS issued in various documents over past years. It is most disappointing to us to realise that 'authorities', which are elected to represent our wishes continually ignore them. The case against proposed significant development of housing by LEGAL LAGS is balanced objective and totally justified.

There can be no reason why all the matter raised should not be considered in detail before any action is taken for further housing and related developments in the Leckhampton area.

Names: [Redacted]
Address: 89 Moorend Rd, LECKHAMPTON GL1 53 OHE
12/10/2013
Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

1. TOO MANY HOUSES ALREADY WITH NO ADDITIONAL FACILITIES - SCHOOLS - SPORTS PLAYFIELDS DOCTORS ETC.

2. CHELTENHAM COUNCIL ALREADY DO NOT ATTEND TO THE CURRENT ADD TO ESTATES THEIR REQUIREMENT - WOULDN'T MENTION COUNCIL DOES ONE END OF ROSEHIP COURT - CHELTENHAM COUNCIL DOES NOTHING AT THE OTHER OR LOTS OF OTHER AREAS JUST ON THIS ESTATE - THAT'S JUST ONE THING

Name: P DAVIES
Address: 2 ROSEHIP COURT, GL51 3WN

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The infrastructure will not cope with all these houses + school, retail outlets etc. If there is an accident on the main road, the traffic is redirected down Shurdington Road and it becomes gridlocked the same as on race days.

There is the strong possibility of increased flooding, where I live adjacent to the Shurdington Rd. Properties already flood, especially in heavy rain. What will happen when there is a concrete jungle over the road? The drainage system will not cope.

Wildlife is being lost - deer, bats, rare butterflies, badgers etc all live in these fields.

It appears Joes has followed inaccurate population/economic growth predictions - up to date figures submitted by independent consultants. We only have one sewage plant for Cheltenham, how is this going to cope?

What is this 'affordable housing' going to cost? The developers can't tell us who is going to afford this housing in these days of recession, when homes are being repossessed.

We have enough houses empty in Chelt. Now we don't need these, 1

Name
[Redacted]
Address 21 Hawkwood Road, Cheltenham
We don't need the houses or the extra traffic, noise and pollution generated from them.

Also flooding is a concern for those living towards the Hurstdown/woodend/park area.

We need more green fields, open space, quiet and conservation of our precious countryside.

Recycle inner city wasted space first.

Name [redacted]
Address 51 Highwood Avenue GL53 0JJ
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

TRAFFIC PROBLEMS
BAD ROAD CONGESTION
BAD ROAD CAR PARK IN CIDER MILL AT TIMES NOW

BUILT

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Name
TASMIN WAY

Address
VA KATHERLEY
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

None of the infrastructure is in place, or built in place, by this application. The proposals would bring misery to current residents in the area and would not be a happy place to live for insurers either.

The road system, schools, jobs, a the environment are all under resourced for the proposed influx of people.

The application should delay until the TCS is in place.

Name: [redacted]
Address: NO.6, C4530PB 13/01605/OUT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

My concern is primarily about the extra traffic on the
Roads - Shurdington Road, Church Lane & Gravel Field Green
Quite often the roads are congested now and we have
had to wait for road surfaces to be repaired.

Parking at Supermarkets, such as Morrisons is also at
Capacity at weekends and I am concerned that additional
cars will have a bigger impact than has been
mentioned.

I would also say that we should be encouraging people
to use buses from time to time, where possible - this will be more

Name [Redacted]
Address 23 Arwood Road

BURL Ref. 13/01605/OUT

ENVIRONMENT

Ref. 14 OCT 2013
An outrageous proposal which will soon
turn an already over-trafficked area into
a London exit road at peak hours.
Church Road is already a rat run
from the A41 to Cheltenham and
beyond. Kidnappers Lane is hardly
maintainable as it is and the impact
of increased traffic on the increased
pedestrian population is a true drain
for more road

Name [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

IN TOTAL AGREEMENT WITH ALL LEGAL AGES

OBSTRUCTIONS TO JCS BUILDING PLAN

FOR LECKHAMPTON

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Think about this now, before you do it! You can replace green/soft once it's gone.

There's risk of flood, lack of water supply & Leckhampton Hill. Insure against flash flood. If we can't get it, let it go.

Think about draining water, sewage, sewerage...we often have hay fever.

Traffic, High noise levels, Hard to walk, no space, lack of privacy.


Hill, Safety, noise, high fields. What about wind, which.

In that case, once the grass there, there...there are thousands of Hayers and the noise...say go to any estate agent...assum...will I...we need grass. Should we plant or keep what is give? I know if you plant you can't plant here...

Name

Address 23...Hanvis...Woodlands.

Ref: 13/01605/OUT
Rec: 14 OCT 2013

ENVIRONMENT
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE
13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

We have lived on this side of Cheltenham for 30 years and seen a great deal of development involving the loss of a vast amount of green open space in that time. This scheme seems designed to deprive us of most of what we have left. Where is the supposed preference for redeveloping greenfield sites? Consultation is a sham if in the end, no notice is taken of the views of existing residents. Our local council is not permissive as well.

Name
Address
35 The Lock
Cheltenham

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Date 14 OCT 2013
Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Department

Municipal Offices

Promenade

Cheltenham GL50 9SA

I wish to make the following comments on the planning application 13/01605/OUT for 650 houses and other developments on Kidnappers Lane in the south of Cheltenham.

- The application is premature. It must be delayed until the acceptance of the JCS.
- The proposed new developments will put extra traffic onto the already full Shurdington Road. The outline illustrative master plan apparently closes access to Leckhampton Lane/Church Lane. This will funnel traffic onto Shurdington Road both from the new estate and the existing Brizen Estate. This will be in excess of 1000 cars per day. The access from the estate onto Shurdington Road will require a large junction (either a roundabout or a major traffic light complex). The position indicated on the indicative plan is too small and too near the existing Moorend Road traffic lights.
- Despite the lengthy consultant's report the application does not address the issue of flooding adequately. The consultant's report is based essentially on computer modelling and uses little or no data based on measurements on the site. It also takes little or no account of resident's observations. The 2007 flooding caused one metre deep water to run across Church Road onto the proposed estate and three metre deep flooding at Brook Cottage. The balancing ponds shown on the plans and virtually surrounding Brook Cottage are designed to accommodate the extra surface water runoff from the proposed new estate. They will be inadequate to cope with a repeat of the 2007 flood where large volumes of water flowed onto and across the area. The position of the balancing ponds is quite unacceptable so near to Brook Cottage.
- There are number of significant differences within the Planning Application Documents. For example the access onto Farm Lane and Leckhampton Lane is quite different in the Illustrative Master Plan and the South of Cheltenham Access and Movement Plan. The whole Planning Application Document clearly needs editing to remove these contradictions.

Yours sincerely
I wish to make the following comments on the planning application 13/01605/OUT for 650 houses off Kidnappers Lane in the south of Cheltenham.

- I am concerned about the implications for additional secondary school numbers. The local schools at Bourne Side and Balcarras are already seriously oversubscribed.
- Traffic on the Shurdington Road is already at saturation point, the additional houses and road closures will make the situation much worse. Access from the new estate onto Shurdington road will require a major new junction. The indicative junction shown in the indicative plans in much too small and near the Moorend Road traffic lights. It will be taking the traffic both from the new estate and the Brizen Estate which currently exits from Kidnappers Lane and Farm Lane/Church Road.
- The concept of a cottage hospital has to be a joke in the present situation regarding NHS services in Cheltenham. I note the outline does not include a doctor’s surgery.
Dear Mr Hemphill

Re 13/01605/OUT

30 Sept 2013

Please accept this letter as our objection to the planning application for housing to be built on the farm & small holding land adjacent to Farm Lane/ Kidnappers Lane.

As you are aware this is only part of the development originally proposed and the plans are indicating this as only the first phase, with the others phases linking into this proposal but are these outside of the Cheltenham BC jurisdiction which would mean that those developments could be approved with Cheltenham BC having no control.

There is also the issue of the developments being forwarded for Brizen Farm and the opposite side of the Shurdington Road. Having attended the exhibitions it has become clear that when talking to those holding the displays the developers have in reality only been considering their own schemes. They show reduced numbers of houses but implied that they would be building larger houses so numbers of people, traffic etc would not be reduced as they claim.

Traffic is already reaching unacceptable levels, single housing plots within the area have already been rejected on the grounds of introducing more traffic so how can large scale development be considered bringing more, traffic on to these already congested roads.

Flooding issues raised and modelled against Government / EA data appear to be totally irrelevant as it is related to the rivers, whilst this area is away from rivers these fields and the fields proposed for development are the natural flood plains for the surrounding hills, and I would not consider the hills to be a small catchment area as has been implied. I would disagree with the statement that the fields do not flood or that they were never saturated and in the previously ill conceived development of The Lanes these fields had their dew ponds filled in by methods that would probably be considered illegal fly tipping in this day and age as may have been the case back then.

While you cannot accept personal property issues we suffer now as a direct result of the original Lanes development that development with our gardens constantly being flooded this was not the case before the development this is fact as I live in the house where I was born and grew up in Farm Lane, and if I recall flooding was one of the points raised in the original objections.

Leckhampton Hill is an area of outstanding natural beauty which will be totally destroyed by further development being imposed so close.
The area surrounding Leckhampton is unsustainable, no facilities exist to this area with all work areas and shopping developments being to the north of Cheltenham and that area abounds the motorway and major roads thus offering good access with less impact. The developers talk of a new doctor’s surgery and cottage hospital, the surgery will be a relocation of an existing surgery which would be detrimental to Leckhampton moving it further away from the village so introducing more traffic. The cottage hospital is only going to happen if the health service would take it on and at present they are cutting services, so this is liable to be land that will suddenly become available for housing.

Control is required to prevent this developer developing on their boarders which is exactly what has and is potentially happening to this area of Leckhampton leaving the locals then to overcome all the problems these developments caused, the truth being that the problems are not resolved only made worse, there are not the resources to cope today let alone tomorrow.

Please reject this application and any other subsequent applications to this area of Leckhampton, the land status over the years has already modified to suit outsider development needs not the needs of local people, there are other areas that can be developed without have such an impact on the life of the people and the surrounding environment. This particular development has been considerably reduced in scale but it suggests that this would be a development being built in stages so ultimately resembling the original scheme but probably in the long run just involve building houses as the Contractors profit considerably by building in Leckhampton as opposed to other areas. They talk of affordable housing but hat is not the case in this area both of my daughters have had to move out of the area as the same specification houses they now own were tens of thousands of pounds more in this area.

The scheme shows hedgerows being kept but this is not happened on the last two developments towards Hatherley with the existing roads being opened up that would have a tremendous negative visual impact if the developers go for subsequent amendments to do the same again if the scheme was unfortunately approved.

If this and the subsequent development applications around Farm Lane are unfortunately approved could it not be made a condition that all the new roads to the south & west of Farm Lane etc from the other developments are all brought out on to the main road at the existing roundabout on the A46 through this development and include a vehicular two way link into the existing Lanes development as was the original intention from the design of the Lanes and close any direct access to and from Farm Lane to this existing and any future developments, in this way if development takes place then it would have minimal impact on the residents of Farm Lane and the surrounding neighbourhood, and most important would probably be a great improvement on the safe access on to the main A46. This way the development could be seen to resolving issues but not at the expense of existing people. If somebody moves into this type of development then they know what to expect i.e. roads in place, but if these development are introduced and transport links put in to small country lanes i.e. Farm Lane as was the Lanes years ago then the local people have no options. Please protect what is left of Leckhampton as a village. Surely this is not what planning is all about imposing unforgiving situations to the local community which
could easily be overcome at an insignificant cost to the developers. Perhaps Farm and Kidnappers Lanes could be designated "quiet lanes" and by reducing present traffic levels to these two country lanes it could protect and reduce the damage to the village.

Please reject this application.

Yours sincerely
Willow Green
Leckhampton Lane
Shurdington
Cheltenham
Glos
GL51 4XW

15/10/13

Land at Leckhampton, Shurdington Road, Cheltenham. 13/01605/OUT

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1] The A46 is a busy and dangerous road and struggles to cope with all the traffic, if this housing goes ahead chaos will ensue. An environmental statement lodged by Hunter Page a while ago admits that the highway was found to be operating near to capacity.

2] I believe that emergency services will be affected by the increase in traffic during peak times.

3] No provision for an extra Secondary School has been provided when local schools are over subscribed.

4] This land in the past has been used as prime horticultural land and supported many smallholdings, the land has only got into its present state by the threat of building.

5] This area should be used as a green buffer zone, helping to prevent the merging of Cheltenham and Shurdington and to keep and protect the outlook over Cheltenham.

6] This open space must help to act as a lung to the area, with all the pollution caused by the amount of traffic already on the A46, more housing means, more traffic, more pollution.

7] The amount of housing has not been based on the Office For National Statistics projection but on short term interim figures, the amount of houses should I believe be based on what housing is really needed and on solid facts.

8] A clear Brownfield policy should be put in place before the JCS is finalised, this application is premature.

9] I don’t believe our hospitals will cope with all these extra people, and that there are enough jobs available locally.

10] Cheltenham is the centre of the Cotswolds attracting tourists, do tourists want to see a mass of sprawling houses blocking the views from and to the hills.
11] If this application is allowed to go ahead it could be only the beginning, with phase 2 or 3, allowing further development on the Newbridge Construction owned land up to Leckhampton Lane, which is already dangerous and is getting like a race track, being used as a rat run with no one taking any notice of the speed limits, the whole surrounding area cannot sustain any developments.

Yours sincerely
Cheltenham Borough Council Planning
Municipal Offices
Cheltenham
Glos
GL50 9SA

With ref. to Planning Application 13/01605/OUT

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1/ The loss of valuable horticultural land said by some to be the finest in the county. It formally supported successful businesses of many smallholders but has been allowed to deteriorate in the face of builders options on the land.

2/ Lack of local infrastructure. There is no provision for an extra Secondary School education when local schools are mostly oversubscribed. The application only vaguely mentions ‘potential’ other infrastructure that should be considered essential in a locality poor in such amenities.

3/ The A46 is a very busy and dangerous road and currently struggles to cope with existing traffic at peak times. Upwards of 1000 extra vehicle movements and road chaos could be generated by this plan as lack of local employment opportunities will lead to the need to travel distances not covered by bus services.

4/ This large development will ruin the Cheltenham ‘green lung buffer’ helping to prevent the coalescence of Cheltenham and Shurdington. It will spoil the outlook over Cheltenham from the surrounding hills designated as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Due regard should be given to the important need to protect the character and appearance of the rural landscape.

5/ This application is premature as it comes ahead of public consultation of the Joint Core Strategy and consideration of real housing local structure needs. The Local Authorities and public should have the opportunity to have an input before any serious planning application is considered.

Yours sincerely
Drs J and J Pringle  
111A Charlton Lane, Cheltenham, GL53 9EE

CBC Planning  
Municipal Offices  
Cheltenham  
GL50 9SA

Ref. 13/0106/OUT

Dear Sir/Madam

We write in relation to (a) the proposed growth in housing of 33,000 houses to 2031 in the Joint Core Strategy and (b) the 650 house applications on Leckhampton Green Fields. There appears to be some doubt concerning the figures used for population growth and anticipated housing needs. It seems highly likely that these needs have been exaggerated. Quite apart from this, we are alarmed at the proposition for a number of reasons:

1. The use of green field sites would irreversibly alter the area we live in. The natural appeal of this area both for residents and visitors alike depends entirely upon these green spaces, so it would be an act of short-sightedness and irresponsibility not to utilize brown field sites first, as we have already requested.

2. Cheltenham’s infrastructure, in particular roads, schools and health services are already under pressure and would not cope with this level of housing growth. The road system is already under huge strain and the last thing that is needed is the injection of hundreds of additional vehicles onto these roads every day.

3. The huge increase in traffic, particularly along Shurdington Road, would make life for both local residents and motorists pretty miserable and stressful, not to mention the increased air pollution that would result. The closure of Kidnappers Lane would compound matters. These results may not be quantifiable but would dramatically alter the quality of life of those of us affected.

We would be grateful if you would register our strong objection to this proposal and give serious consideration to alternative propositions made by Leckhampton and Warden Hill Parish Council.

Yours faithfully,
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS ON 650 HOUSE APPLICATION ON LECKHAMPTON GREEN FIELDS

Name
Address

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Your Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Tracy Crews, Head of Planning,
Cheltenham Borough Council.

Dear Tracy Crews,

4 Vineries Close,
Leckhampton,
Cheltenham,
GL53 0NU.

16th October 2013.

Residential and Associated development of land
at Leckhampton. - OBJECTION

This proposed development will bring chaos to an
already chaotic area. Transport access in Leckhampton is
already at breaking point, and until the Council solves the
current situation that exists in Leckhampton Lane/
Church Road and on the A46 between Shurdington and
Cheltenham, then no further development should take
place.

Should further development be required and I do
not accept your figures, then it should be done in
areas with easy access to the M5 motorway. Building
an access at Combe Hill M5 junction for traffic
going south, and for leaving the motorway for traffic
travelling north would help solve much of Cheltenhams
traffic problems.
Accidents are going to happen on Church Road with the current situation – most likely at school times. The situation can only get worse with additional residential development in Heckhampton.

Sincerely,

REDACTED

BUILT
Read 16 OCT 2013
ENVIRONMENT
8 Leckhampton Farm Court
Farm Lane
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Glos.
GL51 3GS

14th October 2013

Mr. Craig Hemphill
CBC Planning
Municipal Offices
Cheltenham
GL50 9SA

Dear Mr. Hemphill,

**OBJECTION: Outline Planning Application Ref: 13/01605/OUT**

I object to the above proposal to build 650 houses, a supermarket and other retail units, primary school, community centre, business premises, car parks, and care home on a 33 hectare site in Leckhampton. There are ongoing and significant problems associated with housing development in this area to the south of Cheltenham. These have been detailed in numerous letters by numerous objectors on numerous occasions and which include:

**Traffic**

1) This Application seeks to turn Kidnappers Lane into a cul-de-sac in a simplistic attempt to prevent the estimated 1,000 vehicles that will be generated by the proposed 650 houses and co-located businesses from reaching the sensitive Church Road area. The local road network is today heavily utilised. But any attempt to channel the extra loading caused by the proposed development towards Shurdington Road, which itself is already congested, will simply result in the overloading of Shurdington Road (and by extension Bath Road); it will then become a second Church Road, with all the attendant social problems.

2) It is only correct that developers should provide additional resources to cope with the increased demands created by their developments; however in this case the Application will achieve quite the opposite and destroy local resources (by turning Kidnappers Lane into a cul-de-sac).

I am therefore very concerned about the negative impact from this huge increase in traffic passing through Church Road, Shurdington Road, Farm Lane, Kidnappers Lane and Leckhampton Lane daily, and feeding into Leckhampton Road, Bath Road and other local roads.

**Air Pollution**

3) Air pollution levels already break EU levels in the winter months on Church Road and the A46, and are likely to break it all year round after the EU reduces the recommended level. The current scale of the problem means that the whole of Cheltenham has been made an Air Quality Management Area, and this proposed development would just make a bad situation worse.

**Employment**

4) Employment opportunities on the south side of Cheltenham are severely restricted which means that new developments (such as this) located south of Cheltenham will force inhabitants to commute elsewhere causing considerably higher traffic flow particularly during peak times. The developers have made a token attempt to co-locate some small businesses with the housing, but these commercial enterprises are very small and will employ an insignificant number of the inhabitants - it is nothing but a fig leaf. The fact remains that the vast majority of the people on such a development would have to commute elsewhere in Cheltenham/Gloucestershire – by car, and the national requirement to drastically cut carbon emissions means that it is no longer acceptable for developments to be dependent on commuting long distances.
Providing schooling infrastructure to support the development
5) This application does not consider where any residents would attend secondary school. All local schools, both primary and secondary, are currently oversubscribed. The nearest secondary school (Cheltenham Bournside) is an Academy and cannot therefore be required to expand further. Children would have to travel to Brockworth or Chosen Hill if spaces were available, or to schools on the opposite side of Cheltenham.

Infrastructure
6) The JCS is still awaiting modelling work that will consider (and presumably specify) the potential impacts of proposed developments, and any mitigation required. The JCS also maintains that it is working with the necessary providers to develop the infrastructure required.

But until the JCS knows what the impacts will be and what mitigation is needed (or even if it is possible), I fail to see how the JCS can meaningfully work to develop the infrastructure required. (In summary, since it is impossible to understand the impacts of the JCS “preferred plan”, how can anyone say they prefer it?).

Conclusions
• The above Application is inappropriate for its proposed location and should be rejected.
• Any further Applications should not go before the Planning Committee until the JCS plan for the area of Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City has been finalised.
• The public deserves to know that the housing targets contained in the JCS are objective, transparent and in accordance with the needs of the area and NOT a contrived Developer’s Charter. This means that —
• All traffic and infrastructure modelling that the JCS needs to do, must be completed before any ‘preferred plan’ can be considered.
• The population estimates contained in the JCS housing targets need to be verified with the ONS.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Development on land at Lockhampton
Shurdington Road, Cheltenham

I wish to object to this development in the strongest possible terms for the following reasons:

(1) It will destroy the countryside nature of this area and the quiet beauty of Lockhampton for ever.

(2) The additional traffic that this development will generate will largely affect Lockhampton Road and Shurdington Road both of which are already very busy, particularly at peak times.

(3) I do not think that there is a need for the number of houses that has been quoted.

I hope that the Cheltenham Borough Council will carefully consider the points I have made and refuse the development application.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
C B C Planning  
Municipal offices  
Promenade  
Cheltenham  
GL50 9SA  

Outline Planning Application (Ref.13/01605/OUT)  

14 October 2013  

Dear Sir or Madam  

I would like to register my views and comments, as follows:  

1) My main objection is to the building of extra dwellings on the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or on land near to it.  

2) I object to building on top grade agricultural land, land on the flood plain and on land which suffers flooding regularly. Warden Hill could suffer from flooding caused by building on the land in question.  

3) If we need more affordable housing, it should be within the present built-up area, particularly on brownfield sites.  

4) Because of the narrow roads in the Leckhampton area, there would be an increase in the already high levels of traffic congestion and resultant pollution. I understand that Kidnappers Lane into Church Road and Shurdington Road will be closed. It is estimated that a further 1000 vehicles will all exit on to Shurdington Road thus causing more traffic congestion on the already over capacity road network. There MUST BE a JCS transport plan and traffic modelling before this application goes to Planning Committee.  

5) Air pollution levels already break EU levels in winter months on Church Road and the A46. Cheltenham has been made an Air Quality Management Area in response to the problem.  

6) There are insufficient secondary school places to cope with the increased demand this development would generate.  

Before any planning application is considered, The Joint Core Strategy for the area of Cheltenham, Gloucester City and Tewkesbury should be finalised and all aspects of planning, transport, environment and population estimates contained in the housing targets should be verified.  

We, the public, deserve to be sure that the housing targets contained in the JCS are in accordance with the needs of the area.
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C B C Planning
Municipal offices
Promenade
Cheltenham
GL50 9SA
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14 October 2013

Dear Sir or Madam

I would like to register my views and comments, as follows:
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The Planning Department
Cheltenham Borough Council
PO Box 12
Municipal Offices
Promenade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1PP

Attention Mr Craig Hemphill (Planning Officer)

13 October 2013

Dear Sir

**Strong Opposition to - Planning Application No 13/01605/OUT**
At Leckhampton/Shurdington Road, Cheltenham.

1. We send this letter to register our **Formal Objection** to the above Planning Application.

2. Firstly however we cannot understand how this Planning Application is being formally considered at this date in October 2013, as the Consultation Process of the recently announced Joint Core Strategy (JCS) is still underway – especially as the location of this actual planning application is right at the very heart of the JCS.

3. There is so much we could say in detail about “our horror” should the application be approved, but we will do our best to keep our Objection Points in a clear and concise manner - we are willing to additionally discuss our major concerns if you wish.

4. At the end of this letter is a Schedule detailing the enclosed documentary evidence mentioned in this particular correspondence (Photos of traffic delays and a Pollution document), which we are confident will assist in your deliberations.

5. **The main reasons how this Application will have a serious and damaging impact on our life are:**

   (i) **The closeness and overpowering nature of the proposed hundreds of new homes to our home** - we are living in a small close, the majority of which are bungalows occupied by mature and elderly residents and our homes are only a matter of yards from this new building site for 650 homes plus other buildings.
(ii) **Overdevelopment**

We really hope the Application is Refused, but if the Application is approved, we would like the new development to be shielded from us from sight, noise and pollution by extending/moving the large green open space already on the plans to be right alongside our bungalows. This would mean the actual new houses would have to be at least 100 yards from our homes.

Likewise this would mean a re-siting of the 2 newly Proposed road junctions, which are also yards away from our home – see below.

(iii) **The proposed closeness to our homes of 2 new Traffic Controlled Junctions for buses and other motor vehicles.**

We feel it very important that we bring to your EARLY attention in this letter, that there is already a **VERY REAL EXAMPLE** available for closer analysis of the absolute chaos that has recently occurred due to road works on the A46 Shurdington Road in Cheltenham lasting for several days in April 2013 - **within yards of where the proposed 2 new Traffic Controls/Junctions will be located**.

In April 2013 Severn Trent in undertaking their necessary work had to place one set of temporary traffic lights controlling traffic movements at Shurdington Road in and out Cheltenham.

As we live within yards of this road works site, we can definitely confirm that even on the 2013 **current volume** of traffic, considerable traffic queues were caused throughout the day (not just the rush hour). **Bus time tables** were also totally disrupted often with 3 buses coming along together and **Emergency vehicles** were faced with having to overcome additional considerable delays.

Additional road safety dangers were also being experienced by motorists, pedal cyclists and pedestrians.

This matter was formally referred to my local councillor for appropriate contact to occur with the various **Local Authorities and Severn Trent**. These organisations will be able to confirm these traffic problems and in order to assist the Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Department further, we have also taken photos to confirm the lengthy traffic queues at various locations along this Shurdington Road at different days and times due to this particular road works/traffic lights control - **see our photos enclosed for your consideration**.)
The major point worthy of appreciation is that traffic chaos was caused with one set of traffic lights and with the current volume of traffic, so one has to ask - "what will be the serious impact with 2 Permanent Traffic controlled Road junctions almost at the same location on the Shurdington Road in Cheltenham - together with the additional cars, lorries, buses, cyclists and pedestrians associated with an extra 650 homes nearby".

This particular point should not be considered in isolation as far as this CBC Planning Application is concerned, as the increasing level of traffic on the main A46 Shurdington Road in and around Cheltenham will obviously be a major discussion issue within the ingredients of the overall JCS for Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester Planning Areas.

(iv) **The damaging and increased level of Air and Noise Pollution** - brought about by the extra homes and associated traffic in what is at present is an enjoyable rural environment.

The very nature of slow moving traffic/idling engines on the Shurdington Road brought about by these 2 new junctions will again seriously impact on our lives with a definite increase in Air and Noise Pollution – thereby damaging our health. The **closeness of the new Bus route** on this development will especially cause additional Pollution.

We also attach *an extract of a leaflet* distributed by the Green Political Party to the public at the time of the recent local election on 2 May 2013 - which clearly comments and shows a photo of the **Current high level of traffic and resultant pollution** on the A46 Shurdington Road. **Other Political Parties** have also consistently made very similar comments about any increase in traffic on the A46 Shurdington Road. This shows that it is of some serious concern in the wider community of Cheltenham area – it is not just "one or two" local residents making these comments.

We are sure that everyone will agree that **Air pollution** caused by heavy traffic has to be an **increasing major concern** and deserves to be **properly and professionally measured and considered** in making correct decisions on this planning application.

(v) **Additional traffic dangers on the Shurdington Road in Cheltenham.**

We have lived in our current bungalow home since 1981 (32 years) and have especially been aware of the problems of the increase in
traffic on this busy road (A46) in recent years. The road safety problems today are very real and we can confirm that collisions involving cars, lorries, buses, cyclists and pedestrians are at serious risk of happening every day.

Over the years we have had reasons to liaise with local authorities/councillors/MP and also to examine formal planning records of both the Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Borough Councils and can state that the 2 Councils have had policies to REFUSE planning applications, where it was intended that even a few new dwellings would be gaining access on to this same busy main road.

We recollect that the reasons put forward for their Refusals to Grant Planning Applications have largely related to the Dangers caused by the additional movements of traffic and pedestrians on this busy road. These comments were supported by the Gloucestershire County Council Highways department - as the A46 Shurdington Road was and still is a very busy main road.

The Volume of traffic today has to our knowledge definitely increased since the Planning Refusals mentioned in the above para and must surely now be at its maximum capacity already. Anyone travelling this road on a regular basis will be aware of the lengthy queues in and out of Cheltenham as a result of the current amount of traffic. In fact traffic is "at a stop" for lengthy periods in the day. There must be current County Highways Department Traffic Census records to prove these facts.

The traffic problems on the A46 are also nowadays made a lot worse by the regular use of this road as a detour or overflow following problems on the nearby A417 and M5 main roads. (Regularly broadcast on local and national radio).

6. This current Planning Application will also have major implications for other matters of serious concern:

a. Dwindling resources of local Police, Fire, Ambulance and NHS/Hospitals - in dealing with the anticipated increased level of accidents, injured persons, motoring offences and responding to other incidents over a 24 hour period.

b. Loss of the enjoyable Countryside and Wildlife.

c. Increased Flooding risk.

d. Extra Traffic/Pollution/Danger on local Country roads and lanes.
c. Will local Junior and Senior schools be able to take a large increase in pupil numbers?

7. Final Comments

Whilst there will be obvious major worries caused by the possible building of thousands of new homes within the criteria and parameters of the JCS - the proposed 650 new homes subject of this current Cheltenham Borough Council planning application are still a major problem "in their own right" for the many important reasons detailed above.

We trust you will carry out all the necessary research into this issue (some of which are mentioned in this letter) and also that you will give our views very careful consideration, as it is our strong wish that the Planning Application be REFUSED.

Yours faithfully

ENC
Schedule of documentary exhibits to OBJECT to Planning Application No 13/01605/OUT - at land at Leckhampton/Shurdington Road, Cheltenham.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo No</th>
<th>Day/Date/Time taken</th>
<th>Description of Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAH 6133</td>
<td>Frid 12.4.13 245pm</td>
<td>Shurdington Road near Highwood Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAH 6139</td>
<td>Frid 12.4.13 249pm</td>
<td>Shurdington Road/Moorend Park Rd TLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAH 6140</td>
<td>Frid 12.4.13 249pm</td>
<td>Shurdington Road/Moorend Park Rd TLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAH 6145</td>
<td>Frid 12.4.13 251pm</td>
<td>A Star Traffic Management van at Highwood Ave/Shurdington Rd near ST road works site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAH 6197</td>
<td>Mon 15.4.13 0818am</td>
<td>Shurdington Road near Kidnappers Lane junction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also enclosed is documentary exhibit no **MAH 1** - a copy of the Green Party political leaflet for the 2.5.2013 local election – referring to the heavy traffic problems and resultant air pollution on the Shurdington Road.

Dated 13 October 2013
TRAFFIC in TOWN

Did you know that...

Some areas of Cheltenham have such poor air quality that residents are forced to breathe air that falls below the minimum standards set by the World Health Organisation?

The main cause of this problem is traffic and it will take coordinated action and a change in the way we travel around the town if ill health problems caused by traffic pollution are to be a thing of the past.

The endless delays in tackling this issue suggest this needs to be a top priority now!

"I will work to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality"

"Traffic must not dominate"

Below: Traffic build up on the Shurdington Road

PROTECT our GREEN SPACES

Does Leckhampton need a Country Park or more homes?

Most existing residents clearly favour the Country Park option. Greens know that it will take more than local opposition to developments to stop the relentless concreting over of the countryside.
Your chance for a **REAL CHOICE FOR CHANGE**

**IN THE UK? YES.......**
Caroline Lucas, Britain’s first Green MP-Voted MP of the Year 2011

**布尔根和胡佛议会** in Sussex already controlled by the Green Party

**THE MAIN OPPOSITION PARTY IN NORWICH CITY COUNCIL IS THE GREEN PARTY**

**WEST MIDLANDS? YES...**
12 Green Party councillors voted in on 7 councils

**IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE? YES...**
The Green party is already in a ‘rainbow’ coalition in Stroud, Gloucestershire

**GREEN PARTY COUNTY COUNCILLOR**

Vote Sarah Field

"If we do what we have done in the past again the future will be just the same as now. If you want real change and a better future vote for the **GREEN PARTY** on May 2nd."

"Fair is worth voting for."

ON MAY 2nd 2013 ..... VOTE for the **GREEN PARTY**
Reference 13/01605/007

October 13, 2013

Dear Sir,

I understand that yet again an outline planning application has been made in the area of Kidnappus Lane, Leckhampton under the above reference.

In the first instance, this application appears to be premature, and therefore assume that the application cannot go before the Planning Committee and any decision taken until the Joint Core Strategy for the area - Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester City - has been finalised, and I would like confirmation that my reasoning is incorrect.

With regard to potential development in the area, I would like to point out the following:
- Church Road + Shurdington Road already suffer from an excess of traffic in the morning/revenings. A further 650 homes will result in a further (minimum) 2,000 vehicles in the area, which will exacerbate an already unacceptable situation.

- Air pollution levels in Church Road exceed levels acceptable under EU regulations. This proposed development will result in further deterioration of air quality.

- Although there is a proposal for a new primary school within the application, this does nothing but further the shortage of senior school places in the area; with the resultant increase in public transport demands and further cross town traffic.

I believe the application 13/01605/OUT should be immediately rejected as it is premature, and post-adopt in of the Joint Core Strategy should be the application be dismissed.

Yours faithfully, [Signature]
RE: OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION 13/01605/OUT - SOUTH OF CHELTENHAM

Dear CBC Planning Department,

We are writing to strongly object to this application for the following reasons:

● This development will destroy precious wildlife and habitat, unique smallholdings and good quality pastoral land. This destruction by covering with housing, new lighting, roads and more vehicles would certainly add to the carbon footprint. Bearing in mind air pollution levels are already extremely high along the A46 and Church Road, exceeding EU levels in the winter.

● We cannot see how the existing road network will cope with the additional estimated 1,000+ vehicles using the A46 Shurdington Road which is already 'grid locked' at peak times. The impact on Church Road and Farm Lane will be detrimental as these roads will see more and more traffic with the closure of Kidnappers Lane making no difference. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE JCS TRANSPORT PLAN AND MODELLING FOR LECKHAMPTON BEFORE THIS APPLICATION GOES TO PLANNING.

● A new primary school is planned but there is no provision for secondary education. The existing senior schools are already full so where are the incoming pupils going to study?

● THIS OUTLINE APPLICATION IS PREMATURE. We feel that this application should NOT go before the planning committee until the JCS has been finalised. Are the growth estimates for population correct? Once again where is the transport plan?

● This development is planned on Green field sites and according to the NPPF Brown field sites should be considered first. Green fields and the Green Belt are precious and make living in Cheltenham attractive. We need more housing but we need to respect our landscape and consider the consequences of more urban sprawl.

PLEASE REJECT THIS APPLICATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 650 HOUSES.

Yours faithfully,
The Manager  
CBC Planning  
Joint Core Strategy Team  
Municipal Offices  
Cheltenham  
GL50 9SA  
Reference No 13/01605  

Dear Sir

I object strongly to the continuing applications for new housing on land off Kidnappers Lane, Leckampton, Cheltenham.

May I suggest that a survey of road congestion be carried out forthwith during a full week and not in school holidays.

It will prove that apart from many other counter points to the proposal that the road infrastructure is at present congested during peak periods on any business day and at weekends surrounding this area. (Shurdington Road, Leckampton Lane, Church Road and all converging on to Bath Road). Road widening cannot be considered.

The further loading of traffic arising from the proposed project would bring increased traffic movement to a standstill. You may not have considered the advent of shopping on line and deliveries by large vehicles to homes which would aggravate the situation.

The increased numbers in population will only come from areas outside of the Gloucester/Cheltenham conurbations.

The whole project is foolhardy and would only benefit the profits of the housebuilding fraternity who would then take no further part in the locality having achieved their aim.

There would be no benefit to the current or proposed increase in residents.

I fully support the counter action taken by the ‘Green Land Action Group’ in apposition to the proposals.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
The Manager  
CBC Planning  
Joint Core Strategy Team  
Municipal Offices  
Cheltenham  
GL50 9SA  
Reference No 13/01605  
Dear Sir

I object strongly to the continuing applications for new housing on land off Kidnappers Lane, Leckampton, Cheltenham.

May I suggest that a survey of road congestion be carried out forthwith during a full week and not in school holidays.

It will prove that apart from many other counter points to the proposal that the road infrastructure is at present congested during peak periods on any business day and at weekends surrounding this area (Shurdington Road, Leckampton Lane, Church Road and all converging on to Bath Road). Road widening cannot be considered.

The further loading of traffic arising from the proposed project would bring increased traffic movement to a standstill. You may not have considered the advent of shopping on line and deliveries by large vehicles to homes which would aggravate the situation.

The increased numbers in population will only come from areas outside of the Gloucester/Cheltenham conurbations.

The whole project is foolhardy and would only benefit the profits of the housebuilding fraternity who would then take no further part in the locality having achieved their aim.

There would be no benefit to the current or proposed increase in residents.

I fully support the counter action taken by the ‘Green Land Action Group’ in apposition to the proposals.

Yours faithfully
48 Collum End Rise
Cheltenham
GL53 0PB
10 October 2013

CBC Planning
Municipal Offices
Cheltenham
GL50 9SA

Dear Sir,

**Kidnappers Lane Planning Application**
*Your ref 13/01605/OUT*

It is extraordinary that, yet again, a planning application has been submitted to build on a significant portion of the green land between Leckhampton and Shurdington. How many times must the very serious objections be set out before it is realised that repeated applications do not make them go away?

The land in this case is vital for the protection of the Warden Hill estate from flooding by runoff from Leckhampton Hill. Much of the land is frequently waterlogged in wet weather, a fact that would not be clear from merely looking at a map. This kind of protection needs a large contiguous area left free from development, and building on even a small part of it, never mind this substantial area, makes all of the surrounding area vulnerable.

Congestion along the Shurdington Road is already severe at times and getting progressively worse without any new construction. I think the plans specify that all the traffic from the proposed development will go onto Shurdington Road, with no prospect of alleviation. Stationary queues from the Norwood to the Up Hatherley Way roundabout are the norm in the morning rush-hour. There is often a queue at the same time on Moorend Park Road waiting for the traffic lights; this would be made much worse if access from Leckhampton to Warden Hill via Kidnappers Lane were closed off.

Population and housing expansion cannot continue indefinitely. At some point the land will be full, and this must be well short of the point where it is all built on, for the sake of a healthy society. The land between Leckhampton/Warden Hill and Shurdington needs to be left alone for the sake of generations to come. Bovis Homes and Miller Homes and landowners in the area need to know for sure that housing, commercial or industrial development has no part in the future of this land.

Yours sincerely