13/01605/OUT

Land at Leckhampton

Representations

Batch 3
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 plans look inadequate. The increase in traffic will cripple South Cheltenham and cause ridiculous bottlenecks on Shurdington Rd.
Air quality is already a problem... this will worsen with this silly plan.
The timing of the application is poor: it should be considered after the GC is Coined.

Name: [Blacked Out]
Address: 24 Church Road, GL53 0PR

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)

Material objections

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Kidnappers Lane into Church Rd to be closed.

An additional (ext. 1000) vehicles will use existing Stourton Rd.

Another developer has already described this road network as 'broken'. It is over capacity. The argument being used is that the network can't cope or needs replanning. This is incorrect as practically £7m has been spent on the Eastleach roundabout and a traffic modelling for Leckhampton before the application goes to committee.

Air pollution levels already breach EC limits in winter months on Church Rd & the A46. The whole of Cheltenham had been made a 'low polluting' area in response to the problem.

Name: 6 CHARDENWOOD RD CHELTENHAM
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

I have yet to see a full IMPACT ASSESSMENT using clear, open, unbiased (independent) evidence in relation to the following environmental aspects:

PLANNING - run off to surrounding fields & dwellings;

TRAFFIC - increase on current levels on A46 Leckhampton

AIR QUALITY - already above EU levels along A46 at fisthow

SECONDARY SCHOOLS - Bournside - full, both full.

WILDLIFE - reduce rare bird species, destroy more leaeges.

Name [Redacted]
Address

GL53 0PU

Date 23 OCT 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

Brown field sites must be used

Estimates of housing needs must be backed by verified statistics

There is not the infrastructure to support new houses in this area

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

- Extra vehicles all exiting onto Swindonington Rd.
- Woodlands Rd becoming a 'rat run'
- Insufficient senior school places

BUT

Reed 23 OCT 2013

ENVIR

Name
Address 25 Woodlands Road CHELTENHAM

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

Dear Sir,

Apologies for the late dispatch of this card...

I would like to say that I am pretty disgusted with the Lib Dems' behaviour in this matter, and although I have supported you quoted for years, I can no longer do so. The roads around the area are already too busy at peak times, and the schools, I fear, are already full.

Name

Address 63, LECKHAMPTON ROAD

GLOUCESTERSHIRE

Date 23 OCT 2013

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

ENVIRONA
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 are opposed to this development for the following reasons:

Traffic: The roads are already congested in the area at peak times and increase in car (~1100) resulting from the development would be intolerable.

Education: Although providing a much-needed primary school, any use resident would fail to compensate secondary education.

Environment: Additional houses would affect air pollution, flood risk and visual impact.

Infrastructure: The way the development would link to existing facilities in Cheltenham has not been thoroughly considered so the benefit to Cheltenham is not demonstrated.

Name: ____________________________
Address: 6 LARGE RISE, CHELTENHAM, GL53 0PY

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 The application should not be considered until the TS for the area has been finalized. This to include transport, environment and the full infrastructure to support such a development has been considered.

② The 650 house would “produce” c.1000 additional car which would gridlock the area.

Name

Address: Cheltenham GL53 0XX

Date: 23 Oct 2013

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

I understand we must build more houses for an increasing population, but this amount of housing on one site seems disproportionate - the roads, local traders, schools, hospital/doctor etc (and drainage) will not cope, and the loss of the current green field site will be a considerable blow. I understand some new amenities are proposed, but this relies on people to staff them (teachers, nurses, doctors) who are already stretched in many areas. The kind of opposition risks the erosion of 'then' and an estate as the edge of town. A smaller number of houses would seem far easier to assimilate into a single community.
THE BUILDING OF ABOVE WILL VIRTUALLY MAKE US PRISONERS - MY HUSBAND IS WHEELCHAIR BOUND. SLOWLY DISABLED AND IT WILL BE HARDER TO GET TO HOSPITAL OR FOR AMBULANCE TO REACH US. IF CHURCH ROAD, SHIRWELLINGTON Rd, ARE CLOSED THE DEVELOPERS WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ACCIDENT HAPPENING TO US. IT WILL BE VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO GET SHOPPING INTO THE KITCHEN, SO TO THE DOCTOR AND DENTIST. THIS IS MADNESS - NETWORK WILL NOT BE WORTH IT UNTIL WE CAN CEASE AND DESIST.

Name: [REDACTED]
Address: CRIPPETTS LANE, LECKHAMPTON GL51 4XT
I object to this due to environmental pressures, congestion and loss of green belt.
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The land between the Sheepcote Lane, Cheltenham Road and Sun Lane is a very precious space for the whole area south of Cheltenham. The small holdings are vital and should be

in use now. Not developed once land is developed, it is lost of gaining food, recreation and agriculture here. These houses W I N T N O

be built. Infrastructure also cannot support the burden of so many people in an already

deserved developed area. The natural space must be kept.

Name: [redacted]
Address: 28 Sun Lane, GL53 0PS

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

I do appreciate that housing is needed, but the road infrastructure is never going to be sufficient for absorbing so intensive a development off the A46.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 28 Moor End Park Rd, Cheltenham GL53 0JY
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. Greenbelt guideline premises is first hit, why is being disregarded?

2. This is not the best area for development for how long can we keep green covering our green field, not buildings.

3. All the plans make no sense to the public, who seem to be disregarded.

Name

Address

1/2400

ENVIROM1 Ref 13/01605/OUT

BUIL

23.10.13
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

- Green field sites should be sacrosanct.
- Already many new houses have been built (and are being built) in the Cheltenham area.
- I can't believe that the population is scheduled to expand so rapidly.

(PS. I'd also hate to close Bath–Cirencester traffic)

Name: [REDacted]
Address: 81 Arthur Bliss Gardens

Send 24 OCT 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

Traffic already far too busy.
Far too congested at the rest of times. The proposed development would break the road network.

Once our countryside is destroyed, it is too late. Don't let this happen.

Name [Redacted]
Address 8 BRITISH LANE LECKHAMPTON GL53 0UG
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 number of houses is not needed. Our beautiful countryside should be protected and not even more of it ruined by greedy developers.

At peak hours, the Church Street Road is already at its peak capacity. The development would mean a huge increase in traffic, posing a massive problem, not to mention the safety aspects.

This development should not go ahead!

Name: [Redacted]
Address: B. Silvercote, Cheltenham
GC53 ONG
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 am concerned about the narrowness of the lane, it needs to be widened.

What will happen to the farm land? And the livelihood to those who run the farm?

Name
Address

44 Westbury Rd Ellesmere

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

I oppose the Planning Application

I believe it will significantly affect the area

Date: 24 Oct 2013

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Name

Address

ST. TH. P., CHELTENHAM, GL50 2SA
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 do not think this development is appropriate on the site proposed. The roads in this area, particularly Leckhampton Lane, are already congested and the development would exacerbate this problem. The streets around Leckhampton Primary School are already very dangerous. There is significant publicly-owned land that could be released to meet any real needs in the area without using green belt land. What a legacy for the next generation!!

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

AREA IMMEDIATELY OUTSIDE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

WHAT PRESENT REALISTIC PROJECTIONS ARE THERE REGARDING INCREASED TRAFFIC FLOW (PARTICULARLY ON SHURDINGTON ROAD, ENTERING AND LEAVING THE ESTATE). AIR QUALITY AND ACOUSTICS.

AREA WITHIN THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

CONSIDERING THE VICINITY, IS IT NECESSARY TO HAVE 3 STOREY BUILDINGS, SHOWN IN THE LOCAL CENTRE?

WHAT SPECIFIC PROVISION IS MADE FOR GYPSY TRAVELLERS & TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 20 Haweswood Rd, THE WOODLANDS

BUILT: [Redacted]
Ref: 13/01605/OUT

24 OCT 2013
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

[Handwritten text]

Name: [Handwritten, redacted]
Address: [Handwritten, 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

I am very concerned about the extra cars on
Leckhampton Green which is already problematic.

Also another school would have to be
built in Leckhampton area as Bathgate &
Bournside are already overcrowded.

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

1. I use these fields almost every day, and the loss to hortens will unreasonably damage my life, which depends on use of these fields.

2. I am an asthmatic, and these exercise in clear air maintain my health to which these fields contribute.

3. The increase in housing will increase traffic and I fear will adversely affect my health and quality of life.

4. Choice of address I work closely on round

Name [obscured]
Address 13 Hawksworth Road

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 is a long idea driven by short term political expediency. How many times have we put to build in Leckhampton been denied? So what has happened to make it suddenly a good thing? Leckhampton's roads are already clogged with traffic. You won't make it worse.

The infrastructure doesn't exist to support a proposed influx of people. Where will these people come from with nowhere to go to?

The estimate of the number of people expected to move into the area are suggested, and how these green fields have their own value. Houses need to be connected to nature, how green fields will

Name [Redacted]
Address 1 JASHN WAY, GL51 3H2

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

Please do not build on our green fields on the edge of our town which is used so much for recreation by all Cheltenham residents - they are our green lungs. The A364 is already choked with traffic and any more traffic will make life intolerable and make air quality even worse.

Build on Brownfield sites not our precious green belt. We do not need this additional of houses.

Name
Address

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

I try avoid the government encouraging small families by promoting immigration instead of accepting increasing population. I think about the wildlife living in Kidnappers Lane area. No one seems to care.

Instead there'll be more sewage fields, hedgerows and bracken patches. As a cyclist I dread this. Kidnappers Lane will be like a hedgerow, Galgate Road Park and Shurdington Road like the Tewkesbury Road. What a dreadful thought.

Name

Address: 562 Old Bath Road, 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

Insufficient transport network to accommodate the new development, roads, and rail.

Insufficient employment local to the area.

The population estimates are potentially flawed.

Existing road network is insufficient for the current traffic levels.

The proposal is entirely inconsistent with the needs of the local population.

The proposal will ruin an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Name [Redacted]

Address 44a Moorend Street, Cheltenham, Glos.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- The current road infrastructure is already over capacity - adding to the overall traffic load. By developing 650 homes and associated developments, it will make a bad situation worse.
- The additional load will also further add to the established problem of air quality on Church Rd & the A417.
- The area has senior school places to accommodate the increase brought through the development of the 650 new houses.

Name: [Redacted]  Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Address: [Redacted]
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

Ref: 13/01605/OUT

I am writing to object to the proposed to build 650 houses, a junior school, a dentist surgery, and a GP hospital on the site of the stables at Shurdington Road.

This is unique land of great beauty with a valuable network of footpaths crossing it and with high grade agricultural land which has been strip farmed since.

This application is very premature. We have no transport JCS or pollution conclusions yet in place. We have no formal plans to address the long standing problem of the A417 at Balloon dangerous junction. There can be no justification for such an early application.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 127 Church Road, Leckhampton GL53 0WY
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 object to the proposed housing development on the following grounds:

- Traffic flow through Shurdington will increase causing more congestion also on roads across town.
- I like the green space to the east of the A46 and this will be ruined. This should remain green belt.
- Catchment areas for secondary schools are already established, a strategy for schooling has not been properly established.
- Church Lane traffic calming proposals are not defined, most likely this will involve speed humps along the length of this road.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 22 Brizen Lane GL53 ONG
Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Handwritten 18/10/13
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

LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE ESPECIALLY PLACES IN SCHOOLS
DOCTOR SAVENES AND TRAFFIC VOLUMES ARE
ALREADY UNDER STRAIN

BUILT

Name

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Address

2 MOUNTING A M. GL52 0HD
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

MASSIVE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS
AJENT MASSES OVER 300 cars
FROM 6:30 AM TILL MORNING AS JUNE AND JULY REMOV 8-9 AM

THIS WOULD BE WORSE

SCHOOL PLACES ARE ALREADY UNDER

Name: [REDACTED]
Address: 22 THE LUNES, LECKHAMPTON

BUILT
Ref. 13/01605/OUT
22 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

This is going to totally ruin the character of the area, which people like to live in because of the easy access to and walks in local fields. The roads, particularly Church Rd and the A46, won't be able to cope.

BUILT

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 316 Mooreend Rd, Cheltenham GL53 0HD

ENVIRONMENT

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Read 22 OCT 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

- We strongly object to the above planning application, as local residents.

- 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.

- All aspects of planning, transport, environment and population estimates included in the housing target must be reached first.

- This application would have a hugely negative impact on the local community if granted.

Name [Redacted]
Address 22 Moor End Green, Leckhampton, Cheltenham
How many more houses do you... councillors... want to... build in... Leckhampton?... We... pay your wages... and the... people of... Leckhampton... don't want... these houses... The roads... can't take... any more traffic... the schools... are full... where are... the new jobs... in Cheltenham... to... justify... these houses...
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 proposal is bound to lead to problems, our population is one (leading to the objections list). There have been problems in the past over no. 9 vehicle access in existing roads.

Not only will vehicles exit by the Shurdington Road but back to Leckhampton also which has a 'bottle neck' at times by the local coop supermarket - I agree with all the objections and would like you to rethink again.

Name [Redacted] Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Address Old Bith Rd.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

- Cheltenham Road is already over congested.
- Estimated 1000 extra vehicles will compound problem.
- Air pollution levels breach EU levels in winter months. This will only get worse.
- Being a local cyclist this will make my daily commute more dangerous and unpleasant.
- As soon to be first time parent we are very concerned over school places.
- Senior schools are already over subscribed with no plan to expand.

Name
Address 8 PEREGRINE ROAD, GL53 0LR

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

No Coherent argument has been forwarded as to why a greenfield site is proposed rather than a brownfield site.

This plan is contrary to the Lib Dem manifesto which claimed to protect the proposed sites.

The additional traffic will spoil the peace, why not buy a house in this area in the first place?

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

I would like to see the Batsford Estate building so many houses in a relatively
small area Town. The chaos that
will cause to an already very
congested development. Sandtonge. I know
cannot be underestimated. I take
this route every day and at Rush
Hour. This is a very busy road. Local
I am concerned about the ability of seven
Schools to take Children in.

Name [Redacted]
Address 2, Sun, Mead, St. Horse (close school I hope
Extremely)
Initiate the land surrender
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The cost to the environment from an extra 650 houses would be enormous. The roads in this area are already extremely busy, could not sustain the extra vehicles the extra houses would bring. The pollution levels in winter are already above legal levels. There are no senior schools in the area to accommodate the new development. The fields are a place of beauty that contain much wildlife and are widely used by local walkers, myself included.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I am writing to OBJECT to this application.

650 houses is going to create too much extra traffic on Chedworth Rd., Church Road and Bath Rd., particularly during the rush hour.

It will destroy beautiful fields with a lovely view up to the hill and getting down. You will see just tied posts and terraced roads and street lights.

There are not sufficient places at secondary schools in this area. This development could mean 400 extra children. Totally unsustainable!

Name: [redacted]
Address: BATH ROAD, LECKHAMPTON

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

I am very concerned by this outline planning application. This number of houses, retail units and other buildings are not appropriate on these green fields and in this setting so close to an AONB. These particular fields are so separate from the town that over 1000 more cars will take to the nearby roads, adding to the frequent stationary traffic on Shipdington Rd and congestion on Church Road. Air pollution, speeding etc will also be an added problem for Church Road which already experiences these problems.

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

Please do not create such an ugly settlement on such a beautiful site.

What is driving this?
PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION

13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18th OCTOBER  (BUT probably to January 2014)

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

I am not happy with the outline planning application

because it interferes with the already strong wind exposure

in the Leckhampton area will be made to cope with traffic volumes

in particular at peak times

Order part of the environment and a public will be

irrefutably destroyed.


Name  
Address  43 Moorend Rd GL53 0HB

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

My principal objection is that granting this application will ruin a beautiful area of countryside or be irresponsible. Whatever infrastructure arrangements are made, they will not cater for the increase in traffic problem on the Stinchcombe Road, a situation which is due as it is at present.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 187, LECKHAMPTON RD
CHELTENHAM GL 53 0RD

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 A38 (STURBRIDGE ROAD) IS A NIGHTMARE ALREADY AT "RUSH HOUR". THERE'S NO INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT THIS AND NO SECONDARY SCHOOL PLACES.

THIS HASN'T BEEN THOUGHT THROUGH

Name
Address
36 Newnham St
GLOUCESTER

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

To develop this area benefits only those with a financial interest in doing so. Beautiful, peaceful semi-rural area which is clearly important to the people of Cirencester. Harceley is now just little green urban sprawl with poorly maintained roads - vital that Leckhampton does not go the same way. To increase on any more semi-rural areas is totally unnecessary and unacceptable and shows prejudice against those who wish to live there.

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

EXTRA homes will be bringing a lot more traffic through Leckhampton which it hardly cope with already. School's will be affected - where are the new places coming from - as more new ones being built!!!
Doctors will have far more patients - difficult to get appointments now.
No facilities at Emergency Dept in Cheltenham as all being closed.

Name:  
Address:  

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

Building more houses in an area populated area is folly. A new school for primary children should be a priority. Also secondary schools are needed to accommodate children already living in Leckhampton and the surrounding area.

Name

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

1) This development is unnecessary as the area has no current plans for development.

2) There is no proved need for this volume of building.

3) This is green belt land enjoyed by locals and visiting tourists/walkers who contribute to the local economy.

4) The flood risks in this area are very real and one at a precarious level already (my own house flooded several times in Hall Road).

5) Traffic in Church Road is already overloaded.

6) Local schools are full!!!

Name [Redacted]
Address 5 Church Rd, GL53 0PS

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

More open countryside and Greenbelt land used for housing - I object strongly to this.

Name
Address 6 Merleco Ave. GLS 7PN

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

Building 650 houses on Leckhampton Green Fields will spoil this beautiful area forever. As a resident living in Church Road, I am only too aware of the congestion on this road as well as Shurdington Road. There has already been development on this side of town, with properties recently built on the old Dalrancey site and Cold Red Lane. More building will have a devastating effect on the wildlife as well as increasing flood risks to the area, not to mention air pollution. How can Cheltenham cope with such an increase in population?

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 63 Church Road, GL53 0PF

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 proposal will have an adverse, significant, and permanent visual impact on local landscape, resulting in a loss of green fields, habitat connectivity, and local community identity. The existing senior schools will not be able to accommodate the increase in pupils from the proposed development and as the local senior schools are already under pressure with existing pupil forecasts regarding new yearly intakes, any further increase will be significantly detrimental, resulting in potential adverse changes to the existing catchment areas and -

Name [REDACTED]
Address 30 hall road, GL53 0HE

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

- causing pupils to have to travel to schools outside the locality.
On Cooper's edge at Brockworth, there are very many houses built recently and still not sold. I don't believe we need the houses proposed for Leckhampton at all.

The roads are in a dreadful condition all over Cheltenham, why hasn't there been attention to it?

Name
Address

Leckhampton Cheltenham GL53 9EW

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

To the Plan for 67,000 homes in somny - is this feasible?

At the Strategic Development Plan, greenfields rrea is a highly sensitive area and not even necessary.

According to recent reports, the VDL should be complete in all its stages before the planning application is considered.

Name
Address

18 OCT 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

...WE FULLY SUPPORT THE OBSERVATIONS AND OBJECTIONS REGARDING THE ABOVE PLANNING APPLICATION SET OUT BY THE LECKHAMPTON GREEN LAND ACTION GROUP...

WE ARE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE INCREASED TRAFFIC IN THAT AREA AND THE LOSS OF COUNTRY SIDE.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Name: [REDACTED]  Address: 2 GREATFORD DRIVE, CHELTENHAM GL53 9BU

Ref. 13/01605/OUT

2/1 OCT 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

The area cannot cope with such a development.
The roads are already full to the limit.
There's no secondary school capacity.

Leckhampton needs to keep the area "green" and undeveloped.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: Leckhampton Farm Court, Leckhampton GL51 3DS

Ref. 13/01605/OUT
This proposal is far too many houses. The infrastructure is not suitable and never will be. The roads cannot take any more traffic. Even with a new primary school there will not be enough places for the children.
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields

The existing roads will not cope with the increased traffic, e.g., 2 cars per house. There will have to be another access per group as existing access cannot cope. New buildings will need to be built. Builders only want to build 3-4 bedroom houses. 02 beds for young people are not built except social housing which is many cases in how the builders got permission. The linear field sites should be used as public areas should be used to develop some open green belt development.

Name
Address

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

I am writing to express again my objection in the planning application Kidnappers Lane

- 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 population estimates contained in the housing targets.

Name

Address 18 PEREGINE ROAD, LECKHAMPTON, CHELTENHAM, GL53 0LL
I am deeply concerned about the lack number of houses and amenities that the keeping proposed for Leckhampton. As a daily commuter, I know that the road could not cope with such traffic. During rush hour it comes to a standstill and even there are heavy rains it floods the road.

Name [Redacted]
Address 76, Leckhampton Ed.
Dear Sirs,

Outline Planning Application Ref: 13/01605/OUT
Kidnappers Lane and Small Holdings

1. 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 and accepted by the Inspector.

2. All aspects of planning, transport, environment and the population estimates contained in the housing targets must be verified before consideration of any application by the Planning Committee.

3. Various aspects of this planning application, are completely unacceptable:

   i)  650 houses alone, exiting onto the Shurdington Road will cause another 1,000 or so vehicles entering a road system that has already been described by another developer, as broken. Add to this the extra chaos which will be caused by all the traffic entering the area for the GP surgery, school, care home etc. Only a madman would even suggest it. This is why it would be totally irresponsible to consider this application prior to the traffic/transport modelling results being available.

   ii) Air pollution levels already break EU levels in the Winter months on Church Road, and the A46. The whole of Cheltenham has been made an Air Quality Management Area in response to the problem.

   iii) The open countryside of this area has immense value to wildlife, biodiversity and the people of Cheltenham demonstrate this as it is a favourite walking and recreation area for many of the Cheltenham people and many tourists to this area, will be found walking here, with a map hanging from chains around their necks.

For this reason, Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council,
has placed before the local Councils, a request for consideration of a Local Green Space area, all in compliance with the NPPF, for much of the area that the Developers now wish to build over. Full details of this proposal should be favourably considered, before agreeing to this Application.

iv) It is understood that if this Application were approved, the primary school would not be built until the second phase of the development was complete. In the meantime, where would the children go to school? I understand there are few if any, vacancies elsewhere. Also there are insufficient senior school places, in fact, the secondary school situation is already in crisis. There is a huge outcry about lack of facilities for those already living in the area, especially when Pates bring in children from Wales and push out children here already.

v) Much distress will be caused, particularly to older residents, by moving the Doctors’ surgery away from Moorend Park Road. There has already been uproar over the idea of it.

These are just a few of my objections to an ill considered planning application.

I reiterate, this application should be turned down as being premature, until the Joint Core Strategy has been thoroughly checked for accuracy and finalised and approval has been given by the Inspectorate. Also the Parish Council’s request for a Local Green Space, for this area should be favourably considered before granting any housing application around the area.

Please listen to the people who live locally, not the developers nor Government Ministers, who don’t even know the area and its special amenities.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sir/Madam

Re. Objection to outline planning application (Ref 13/01605/OUT) on Kidnappers Lane & The Small Holdings, Leckhampton

As a local resident and professional Ecologist, I object to the proposed development off Kidnappers Lane and the small holdings area, Leckhampton, Cheltenham, which amounts to approximately 33ha. Clearly the creation of 650 houses, retail units, offices, care home and a primary school will radically alter the rural character of Leckhampton, with the loss in quality of life for local people and a reduction in property values as the area becomes less desirable to live in with greatly reduced accessible greenspace, inflated traffic levels (estimated 1000 extra vehicles) leading to gridlocked roads (particularly Shurdington Road and Church Road) with associated raised levels of air pollution (which already break EU levels in Church Road and Shurdington Road) and over-use of public open spaces within Leckhampton by the inflated population.

Specific documented support for retaining the green fields around Leckhampton as greenspace comes from the Entec Greenbelt Review (May 2011), which recommended that the farmland south of Farm Lane be included in the Greenbelt and marked RED – no development. The AMEC Joint Core Strategy Green Belt Assessment (September 2011) reinforced this view by assessing land to the south-west of Leckhampton (west/south-west and east/south-east of Farm Lane) as having the strongest case for inclusion in green belt.

Further support comes from the National Planning Policy Framework's new 'Local Green Space' designation, for which the fields south of Leckhampton provide a perfect fit. The Green Areas Designation gives local people an opportunity to protect green spaces that have significant importance to their local communities. Further reference to this is made in the Government's Natural Environmental White Paper. The Natural Choice: Securing the value of nature (2011)¹. With this in mind a Leckhampton with

¹ Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special
Warden Hill Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning NPPF Concept Plan & Local Green Space Application\(^2\) has been completed and submitted to the Council. A summary of the greenspace application is provided as an appendix to this letter as it is of direct relevance to the objection against the development and I hope it will be given thorough consideration by the planning officers.

In relation to the loss of greenspace, recent research demonstrates the health benefits to people who live near areas of green space (e.g. Natural England’s Natural Health Service initiative of 2009; The White Paper ‘The Natural choice: securing the value of nature’, presented to Parliament in June 2011 and outlining governmental aims). These aims have been incorporated into Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGST) which provides a series of benchmarks for ensuring access to natural green spaces near to where people live.

The green fields south of Leckhampton fulfil the ANGST criteria and provide communities that are some distance from Leckhampton Hill some much needed green space which is easy to access and walk across (in contrast to the steeper slopes of Leckhampton Hill) for less able-bodied members of the community, such as the physically disabled, the elderly and parents with young children. (The green fields around Leckhampton also reduce visitor pressure/disturbance on the Leckhampton Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest.)

In addition to the aforementioned issues, the development will inevitably have a detrimental impact on local wildlife and habitats that support them. The area proposed for development comprises a collection of semi-improved grassland meadows, several traditional orchards and small holdings bordered by numerous species-rich hedgerows and trees composed of native species (many of which are mature), with two streams traversing the area. As such these habitats provide a refuge for a variety of wildlife, many of which include species such as hedgehog and toad (both UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority species), grass snake, slow worm, a variety of bat species, the latter three being protected under UK and/or European Wildlife legislation. Reptile surveys revealed there to be a medium population of slow worm in the area (Hankinson Duckett Associates 2011, E. Pimley, pers. comm.) and bat surveys revealed roosts for common pipistrelle, noctule and Natterer’s bats, as well as use of the site by these species (as well as soprano pipistrelle) for foraging and commuting (Hankinson Duckett Associates 2011, LEGLAG 2011, 2012).

The development proposals will result in the loss of several old orchards (a UK BAP habitat) and the associated species assemblage of plants and wildlife that has developed over the years. The site contains numerous species-rich hedgerows, some of are important under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and some of these will be lost due to the development. These hedgerows provide important commuting/oraging routes for bats as well as shelter for a variety of small mammals and amphibians.

Several species of birds of conservation concern listed under the RSPB Red List including skylark, song thrush, house sparrow and linnet, as well as 11 species listed under the RSPB Amber List were recorded on the site during various bird surveys over the years (Hankinson Duckett Associates 2011, T. & F. Meredith, pers. comm.). The loss of the orchards and hedgerows will reduce the available habitat for song thrush, house sparrow and linnet; while the loss of the semi-improved fields will result in a loss of habitat for skylark which require large areas of open space to nest thereby preventing further use of the fields by breeding skylark. While two breeding pairs were recorded within the site (Hankinson Duckett Associates 2011), as progressively more grassland fields are built on across the county and the UK, the available habitat for this declining species is diminishing with negative consequences for their long-term survival. Hence the pressing need to preserve areas of natural green open space such as the fields south of Leckhampton in order for the long-term survival of this species.

In summary, my main objections to the development relate to the huge increase in traffic which the area cannot accommodate and associated rise in air pollution to detrimental levels, the loss of much easily accessible open space for the Leckhampton communities not to mention the loss of valuable wildlife habitat and its negative impact on the rural character of the area. In my opinion it is essential that the application should not be given further consideration by the planning committee until the Joint Core Strategy for the Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury area has been finalised and accurate traffic/population growth estimates have been verified. In addition, the development proposals should be reviewed in the light of the recently created Local Greenspace Application in accordance with National planning guidance in the form of the NPPF^3.

Should you require further information regarding any of the points I have raised in this letter, please let me know.

Yours sincerely

---

^3 National Planning Policy Framework published on 27th March 2012

Executive Summary

In 2012, Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council (LWWH PC) and Shurdington Parish Council set up a joint neighbourhood forum (JNF) for the purpose of developing a neighbourhood plan for the area covered by the two parishes. This submission, which has been led by LWWH PC with support from Shurdington Parish Council, is the first output from the work of the JNF.

Both parish councils have been greatly concerned by the proposals for large scale development on the Leckhampton Green Field Land. They have strongly and consistently opposed such development for reasons that are brought out in this submission: the amenity value of the land; its great importance to the view from Leckhampton Hill; the history of Leckhampton village, dating back over a 1000 years; the ecology and wildlife in the area; the problems of traffic congestion, flooding and the shortage of secondary school places. LWWH PC has made detailed submissions with strong evidence to the JCS and now fears that decisions could be imposed on the area that are very damaging not only to the parishes but to Cheltenham as a whole.

Accordingly, LWWH PC has assembled the expert evidence presented in this submission both of the value of the Leckhampton land and of the dangers facing local people and the Cheltenham area, particularly from the severe traffic problems that would result from development in Leckhampton. Expert summaries of the history of the area and of its ecology and wildlife are included in the submission in sections 3.1 and 3.2. Sadly, until the 1960s, scant importance was attached to preserving the UK’s historical heritage and many buildings and areas were destroyed. The cultural and economic value of historical areas is now much better understood and rightly protected. The ecological and wildlife survey prepared for the Council by three experts shows the rich diversity of habitats. Part of the aim for the Local Green Space is to enhance its value to Cheltenham as a wildlife area.

The Council has gathered the views of local residents about the future of the Leckhampton land. The survey showed overwhelming public opposition to development. Similar findings have come from polls conducted by Leglag.

The traffic surveys, model and analysis have involved considerable work by LWWH PC. The findings have been independently verified by traffic consultant Rob Williams, a director of Entrant Ltd and well respected by Mark Power of Gloucestershire Highways, from whom the Council has also received valuable advice. The traffic model allows various scenarios to be examined. It shows that development on the scale currently being proposed would cause the A46 traffic queue to extend to the A417 and potentially to the M5. The time it would take to commute into Cheltenham would imposing a great economic cost and would make it hard for people living south of the A417 to work in Cheltenham.

Even tighter constraints are imposed by two other factors discussed in Annex 2: the need, confirmed by Mark Power, to prevent any major increase in traffic levels on Church Road during the morning peak period, and secondly the pollution levels on the A46, particularly around the Moorend Park Road intersection, which exceed
permitted EU levels. These two factors leave little or no scope for sustainable
development on the Leckhampton Green Field Land, particularly when taken in
conjunction with the rise in general UK traffic levels from 2015-2025
now predicted by the Department of Transport. LWWH PC has also looked at possible
new employment sites around Cheltenham being considered by the JCS to check that
these do not materially alter this conclusion.

Under the NPPF a neighbourhood plan cannot be used to prevent sustainable
development. Having regard to this, LWWH PC has investigated various options for the
size and boundary of the Local Green Space, as described in Annex 2. For the reasons
explained in Annex 2, the Council resolved at its public meeting on 25 July 2013 to
include all of the Leckhampton Green Field Land in the LGS. This decision has been
supported by Shurdington Parish Council in a draft letter of endorsement which is
included at Annex 1 and which Shurdington Parish Council intends to formally ratify at
its next public meeting.

This submission seeks to make a positive input into the Joint Core Strategy on the current
strategic site allocation and to contribute to the process of updating the Cheltenham
Borough Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council local plans to be NPPF-compliant.
Dear Sirs,

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

I strongly object to the outline planning application, Ref 13/01605/OUT, as submitted by agents for Bovis Homes Limited and Miller Homes Limited.

Accordingly, I urge Cheltenham Borough Council to reject the application for the following reasons:-

1. **Traffic Congestion - Health Risks & Unsustainability**

   i. Traffic congestion on the A46 approach to Leckhampton is already a recognised problem and becomes very severe during peak hours. The high levels of traffic, on the A46 and Church Road, create a health risk through damage to air quality, which falls below acceptable levels in winter months, contributing to the designation of Cheltenham as an Air Quality Management Zone.

   NB. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), the cancer arm of the World Health Organisation, has officially classified air pollution from traffic as a definite cause of cancer. **IARC Scientific Publication 161 “Air Pollution and Cancer” - October 2013.**

   ii. Previous reports by HM Inspectors have acknowledged that there is little scope for mitigating the impact of additional traffic on the A46 Shurdington Road and/or Church Road, and have rejected earlier development proposals in the area on the grounds of the unsustainable impact of additional traffic from proposed sites.

   iii. The additional traffic generated by the proposed 650 dwellings (i.e. up to an additional 1,000 vehicles based on the existing cars per household ratio) would exacerbate the current problems, resulting in gridlock on the A46 at peak times and a further increase in air pollution levels.

2. **Flood Risk**

   i. Flooding severely impacted parts of Warden Hill during 2007 but, despite the building of only a minimal flood protection scheme, the area would still be at significant risk of further flooding if adjacent land was built on. We need the existing fields to act as a natural soak-away at times of heavy rainfall. It is now accepted that periods of extreme rainfall are becoming more frequent as a result of climate change.
3. **Shortfall in School Capacity**
   i. Local secondary schools have been oversubscribed for some time and do not have the capacity to provide for significant additional demand. For example, both Bourinside and Balcarras have indicated that they have no plans to expand despite operating close to full capacity now.

4. **Amenity Value**
   i. The proposed site currently provides a "green lung" on the edge of Cheltenham, comprising farm land, allotments and a number of well used footpaths. The land and boundary hedges are currently a haven for a wide range of wild life. The existing land usage delivers high natural landscape and amenity value for local residents to enjoy through their use of the footpaths and allotments.
   
   ii. Research has shown that the natural amenity value of green spaces provides both physical and mental health benefits for local residents. (e.g. Barton & Pretty 2010, Pretty et al 2005, Bird 2004).
   
   iii. This natural amenity value would be lost forever if the proposed development were approved.
   
   iv. In addition, the special character of Cheltenham would be diminished by more development along the currently attractive A46 approach.

5. **The Proposal is Premature**
   i. For the reasons set out above the proposal should be rejected now, but in any event it should not even be considered for approval in advance of the agreement of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) by participating Authorities.
   
   ii. The current draft of the JCS remains subject to further consultation and many questions. A number of key underlying statistics (e.g. traffic modelling & population estimates) require verification before the final plan can be produced.

Please reject the Outline Planning Application (REF. 13/01605/OUT).

Yours Sincerely
Objection to planning application

13/01605/OUT

Dear Sir/Madam,

May I please register my objection to any proposal or plans to build in Leckhampton.

My objections are as follows:

This site is continuous to and merges with the Leckhampton Hill landscape supporting the various species and bio diverse ecological niches of this AONB. Birds of prey are frequently seen in this site. Rare water shrews have been documented to live in the site. Regularly woodpeckers, Roe deer, pheasants, foxes, hares are spotted along with a huge variety of smaller mammals and birds and an extensive diversity of butterflies and insects. Farm animals like sheep, horses and pigs add to this very rural setting, which is very much appreciated not only by regular ramblers and visitors but also by the Leckhampton community.

The whole of the view of the Leckhampton Hill landscape would be irretrievably lost for future generations if this area were not protected.

Flooding of this site has been photographically confirmed and irrefutable. There was flooding onto Shurdington Road only recently.

The traffic problems along the Shurdington Road would only be exacerbated. As it is traffic is bumper to bumper and at a standstill at peak times. It is already impossible to turn right onto Shurdington Road from Kidnappers Lane most times of the day meaning that traffic has to go left down Shurdington Road to turn around at the roundabout and travel back up Shurdington Road in order to head to Cheltenham centre. Local residents do not want the situation to be made worse by building new houses.
The traffic congestion of the A46 is well documented and Church Lane serves as testimony to the previous over building locally.

It is a well known fact that the local primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed and unable to meet the present needs of the community.

Similarly local medical services are already over stretched. The proposed new GP Surgery does not represent the establishment of a new GP Practice but is in fact merely the relocation of a pre-existing practice from its current premises to the new building. There is no NHS dental provision in this area.

Similarly there is scarce employment in the areas. Residents have to travel to their places of employment, mostly by car. Likewise they need to travel to the shops, largely by car. The location is too far from shops to expect people to walk or cycle when doing shopping for a family.

There would be an increase in levels of pollutants and areas further down the Bath Road have been deemed to have unacceptable levels of pollution already. This has a detrimental effect on those with lung diseases.

Lack of green spaces has been linked to increased levels of mental illness.

There would be more noise pollution, more light pollution and more dwellings in proximity to high voltage electrical cables.

The construction of houses in the area would have a devastating effect on Leckhampton. It would lose its character and identity. The development would be seen as a concrete jungle undermining the identity of Leckhampton and destroying its rural setting.

For all these reasons I object to any plans to build on this land.

Yours faithfully,
Objection to planning application

13/01605/OUT

Dear Sir/Madam,

May I please register my objection to any proposal or plans to build in Leckhampton.

My objections are as follows:

This site is continuous to and merges with the Leckhampton Hill landscape supporting the various species and bio diverse ecological niches of this AONB. Birds of prey are frequently seen in this site. Rare water shrews have been documented to live in the site. Regularly woodpeckers, Roe deer, pheasants, foxes, hares are spotted along with a huge variety of smaller mammals and birds and an extensive diversity of butterflies and insects. Farm animals like sheep, horses and pigs add to this very rural setting, which is very much appreciated not only by regular ramblers and visitors but also by the Leckhampton community.

The whole of the view of the Leckhampton Hill landscape would be irretrievably lost for future generations if this area were not protected.

Flooding of this site has been photographically confirmed and irrefutable. There was flooding onto Shurdington Road only recently.

The traffic problems along the Shurdington Road would only be exacerbated. As it is traffic is bumper to bumper and at a standstill at peak times. It is already impossible to turn right onto Shurdington Road from Kidnappers Lane most times of the day, meaning that traffic has to go left down Shurdington Road to turn around at the roundabout and travel back up Shurdington Road in order to head to Cheltenham centre. Local residents do not want the situation to be made worse by building new houses.
The traffic congestion of the A46 is well documented and Church Lane serves as testimony to the previous overbuilding locally.

It is a well known fact that the local primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed and unable to meet the present needs of the community.

Similarly local medical services are already overstretched. The proposed new GP Surgery does not represent the establishment of a new GP Practice but is in fact merely the relocation of a pre-existing practice from its current premises to the new building. There is no NHS dental provision in this area.

Similarly there is scarce employment in the areas. Residents have to travel to their places of employment, mostly by car. Likewise they need to travel to the shops, largely by car. The location is too far from shops to expect people to walk or cycle when doing shopping for a family.

There would be an increase in levels of pollutants and areas further down the Bath Road have been deemed to have unacceptable levels of pollution already. This has a detrimental effect on those with lung diseases.

Lack of green spaces has been linked to increased levels of mental illness.

There would be more noise pollution, more light pollution and more dwellings in proximity to high voltage electrical cables.

The construction of houses in the area would have a devastating effect on Leckhampton. It would lose its character and identity. The development would be seen as a concrete jungle undermining the identity of Leckhampton and destroying its rural setting.

For all these reasons I object to any plans to build on this land.

Yours faithfully,
CBC Planning  
Municipal Offices  
Cheltenham Borough Council  
Cheltenham  
GL50 9SA  

Objection to planning application  

13/01605/OUT  

Dear Sir/Madam,  

May I please register my objection to any proposal or plans to build in Leckhampton.  

My objections are as follows:  

This site is continuous to and merges with the Leckhampton Hill landscape supporting the various species and bio diverse ecological niches of this AONB. Birds of prey are frequently seen in this site. Rare water shrews have been documented to live in the site. Regularly woodpeckers, Roe deer, pheasants, foxes, hares are spotted along with a huge variety of smaller mammals and birds and an extensive diversity of butterflies and insects. Farm animals like sheep, horses and pigs add to this very rural setting, which is very much appreciated not only by regular ramblers and visitors but also by the Leckhampton community.  

The whole of the view of the Leckhampton Hill landscape would be irretrievably lost for future generations if this area were not protected.  

Flooding of this site has been photographically confirmed and irrefutable. There was flooding onto Shurdington Road only recently.  

The traffic problems along the Shurdington Road would only be exacerbated. As it is traffic is bumper to bumper and at a standstill at peak times. It is already impossible to turn right onto Shurdington Road from Kidnappers Lane most times of the day, meaning that traffic has to go left down Shurdington Road to turn around at the roundabout and travel back up Shurdington Road in order to head to Cheltenham centre. Local residents do not want the situation to be made worse by building new houses.
The traffic congestion of the A46 is well documented and Church Lane serves as
testimony to the previous over building locally.

It is a well known fact that the local primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed
and unable to meet the present needs of the community.

Similarly local medical services are already over stretched. The proposed new GP
Surgery does not represent the establishment of a new GP Practice but is in fact
merely the relocation of a pre-existing practice from its current premises to the new
building. There is no NHS dental provision in this area.

Similarly there is scarce employment in the areas. Residents have to travel to their places
of employment, mostly by car. Likewise they need to travel to the shops, largely by car.
The location is too far from shops to expect people to walk or cycle when doing
shopping for a family.

There would be an increase in levels of pollutants and areas further down the Bath Road
have been deemed to have unacceptable levels of pollution already. This has a
detrimental effect on those with lung diseases.

Lack of green spaces has been linked to increased levels of mental illness.

There would be more noise pollution, more light pollution and more dwellings in
proximity to high voltage electrical cables.

The construction of houses in the area would have a devastating effect on
Leckhampton. It would lose its character and identity. The development would be
seen as a concrete jungle undermining the identity of Leckhampton and destroying
its rural setting.

For all these reasons I object to any plans to build on this land.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sir/Madam,

May I please register my objection to any proposal or plans to build in Leckhampton.

My objections are as follows:

This site is continuous to and merges with the Leckhampton Hill landscape supporting the various species and bio diverse ecological niches of this AONB. Birds of prey are frequently seen in this site. Rare water shrews have been documented to live in the site. Regularly woodpeckers, Roe deer, pheasants, foxes, hares are spotted along with a huge variety of smaller mammals and birds and an extensive diversity of butterflies and insects. Farm animals like sheep, horses and pigs add to this very rural setting, which is very much appreciated not only by regular ramblers and visitors but also by the Leckhampton community.

The whole of the view of the Leckhampton Hill landscape would be irretrievably lost for future generations if this area were not protected.

Flooding of this site has been photographically confirmed and irrefutable. There was flooding onto Shurdington Road only recently.

The traffic problems along the Shurdington Road would only be exacerbated. As it is traffic is bumper to bumper and at a standstill at peak times. It is already impossible to turn right onto Shurdington Road from Kidnappers Lane most times of the day, meaning that traffic has to go left down Shurdington Road to turn around at the roundabout and travel back up Shurdington Road in order to head to Cheltenham centre. Local residents do not want the situation to be made worse by building new houses.
The traffic congestion of the A46 is well documented and Church Lane serves as testimony to the previous over building locally.

It is a well known fact that the local primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed and unable to meet the present needs of the community.

Similarly local medical services are already over stretched. The proposed new GP Surgery does not represent the establishment of a new GP Practice but is in fact merely the relocation of a pre-existing practice from its current premises to the new building. There is no NHS dental provision in this area.

Similarly there is scarce employment in the areas. Residents have to travel to their places of employment, mostly by car. Likewise they need to travel to the shops, largely by car. The location is too far from shops to expect people to walk or cycle when doing shopping for a family.

There would be an increase in levels of pollutants and areas further down the Bath Road have been deemed to have unacceptable levels of pollution already. This has a detrimental effect on those with lung diseases.

Lack of green spaces has been linked to increased levels of mental illness.

There would be more noise pollution, more light pollution and more dwellings in proximity to high voltage electrical cables.

The construction of houses in the area would have a devastating effect on Leckhampton. It would lose its character and identity. The development would be seen as a concrete jungle undermining the identity of Leckhampton and destroying its rural setting.

For all these reasons I object to any plans to build on this land.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sirs,

**Outline Planning Application (REF. 13/01605/OUT)**

I strongly object to the outline planning application, Ref 13/01605/OUT, as submitted by agents for Bovis Homes Limited and Miller Homes Limited

Accordingly, I urge Cheltenham Borough Council to reject the application for the following reasons:-

1. **Traffic Congestion - Health Risks & Unsustainability**
   
i. Traffic congestion on the A46 approach to Leckhampton is already a recognised problem and becomes very severe during peak hours. The high levels of traffic, on the A46 and Church Road, create a health risk through damage to air quality, which falls below acceptable levels in winter months, contributing to the designation of Cheltenham as an Air Quality Management Zone.

   **NB.** The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), the cancer arm of the World Health Organisation, has officially classified air pollution from traffic as a definite cause of cancer. **IARC Scientific Publication 161 “Air Pollution and Cancer” - October 2013.**

   ii. Reports by HM Inspectors have acknowledged that there is little scope for mitigating the impact of additional traffic on the A46 Shurdington Road and/or Church Road, and have rejected earlier development proposals in the area on the grounds of the unsustainable impact of additional traffic from proposed sites.

   iii. The additional traffic generated by the proposed 650 dwellings (i.e. up to an additional 1,000 vehicles based on the existing cars per household ratio) would prove equally unacceptable and unsustainable.

2. **Flood Risk**
   
i. Flooding severely impacted parts of Warden Hill during 2007 but, despite the building of a minimal flood protection scheme, the area would still be at significant risk of further flooding if adjacent land, including the proposed site, was built on.

3. **Shortfall in School Capacity**
   
i. Local schools have been oversubscribed for some time and do not have the capacity to provide for significant additional demand. For example, both Bournside and Balcarras have indicated that they have no plans to expand
despite operating close to full capacity now. These schools could only absorb students from the proposed development through redefining their catchment areas to the detriment of existing residents of Leckhampton.

4. **Amenity Value**
   
i. The proposed site currently provides a “green lung” on the edge of Cheltenham, comprising farm land, allotments and a number of well used footpaths. The land and boundary hedges are currently a haven for a wide range of wild life. The existing land usage delivers high natural landscape and amenity value for local residents to enjoy through their use of the footpaths and allotments.

   ii. Research has shown that the natural amenity value of green spaces provides health benefits for local residents. (e.g. Barton & Pretty 2010, Pretty et al 2005, Bird 2004).

   iii. This natural amenity value would be lost forever if the proposed development were approved.

   iv. In addition, the special character of Cheltenham would be diminished by more development along the currently attractive A46 approach.

5. **The Proposal is Premature**
   
i. For the reasons set out above the proposal should be rejected now, but in any event it should not even be considered for approval in advance of the agreement of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) by participating Authorities.

   ii. The current draft of the JCS remains subject to further consultation and many questions, with a number of key underlying statistics requiring verification (e.g. re traffic modelling & population growth) before a meaningful (JCS) plan can be submitted for approval.

**Please reject the Outline Planning Application (REF. 13/01605/OUT).**

Yours Sincerely