## 13/01605/OUT Land at Leckhampton

**Representations** 

## Batch 11

Name	Male	1 -	The state of the s		
					··-
Address	ir an	,,,		ef: Planning Applic	
	.15. Collum	<b>F</b> . 4 0		ef: Planning A	
(include	dolar	ese .	lecal	Applic Applic	ation 13/0400
	delete or modify th	ofall-	Leckhamp ter	1 (-1 -2	cation 13/01605/OUT
I wish to	Object to 11	is iollowing state	ements as	٠٠	OPA .
(0)	object to the proj	00sad da	ements as appropri ment on the followersus and ONE	ate)	******
(a) Gi	ven the ovide	- Joed develop	ment on the s.		
Cheltenha	m this "Vidence fi	rom the 2014	on the follow	vina around	
permitted .	m, this proposed o	levelopment	ment on the follow	a a. antid2;	

- (a) Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be schooling and other infrastructure have been proportive and transport,
- (b) The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in the peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the grave traffic problems.
- (c) The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church increases elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.

Reed 1 3 E 2013

- I am personally affected / deeply soneerned by the health and accident risks from the traπic
- queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development. my family greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. I strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its

amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill. Other comments: I cannot see how houses can be built locally unfhout making the traffic situation at peak times worse + affecting... residents ability to travel too Mary povents at leachampter. Princary School refuse to let their children walk to school alone because of danger from the hattic.

Our eldest daughter was unable to get a place at local stress faced.

But days camprehensive schools because they were hilly where will new residents send their children?

Name		
Address 1. Hillan Road	Chelterham, GL53 9LB	on 13/01605/OUT
(include, delete or modify the following	state your GLSS 9CB	BUILT
And the brohozed de	Velonment on the fire	Recd 1 6 DEC 2013
(a) Given the evidence from the 20 Cheltenham, this proposed to	O11 census and ONS projections are for	T-K

- (a) Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly resolved.
- (b) The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in the peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the grave traffic problems.
- (c) The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.

(d) I am personally affected / deeply concerned by the health and queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development (e) I / my family greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on	ion. I strongly support the sales in as a Local Green Space for its views from Leckhampton Hill.
Other comments: These	concerns.
with Thanks for constant	
other comments:  Lin Thanks to centialny these  Season's greeting!	***************************************
***************************************	
Ram Kemp	
***************************************	

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18 <sup>th</sup> OCTOBER (BUT probably to January 2014)
Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields
This is a very special area to all the locals. We have said 'NB' until we are blue in the Face
NO NO NO
BUILT
<sup>⟨ccd</sup>
ENVIRONMENT
Name  Ref. 13/01605/OUT  Address

17 DEC 2013

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KIDNAPPERS LANE 13/01605/OUT - Official End Date 18<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER (BUT probably to Janu<del>ary 2014)</del>

Comments & Observations on 650 House Application on Leckhampton Green Fields
I believe this proposal is completely
inappropriate for a site so close to the
HONBOLINA less than halt a mile from
the site I am not allowed to extend
my house because it falls within the
THONK SO how can it be permissible
tor such a development to totally change
the character of the area? In addition the whole area is jurded huge strain from traffic
Whole area is under huge strain from traffic
and congestion without an extra 650 dwellings
Name Ref. 13/01605/OUT
Address Broadclyst, Church Rd, GL53 0QJ
0 1

٨	la	m	0

## f: Planning Application 13/01605/OUT

Address Address And Address An

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

- (a) Given the evidence from the 2011 census and ONS projections on future housing need in Cheltenham, this proposed development is unnecessary. The application is premature and must not be permitted until the JCS is finalised and the big uncertainties over housing need, traffic and transport, schooling and other infrastructure have been properly resolved.
- (b) The traffic congestion created by this development together with the other proposed developments south of Cheltenham would create horrendous traffic queues in the peak periods. The planning application offers no solution to the grave traffic problems.
- (c) The suggestions made in the application for preventing traffic overload and gridlock in Church Road are tenuous. They are likely to promote accidents and even if they work they will cause big traffic increases elsewhere, such as in Moorend Park Road.

(d) I am personally affected / deeply concerned by the health and accident risks from the traffic queues and pollution that would result from the proposed development.
(e) I / my family greatly value the Leckhampton fields for recreation. I strongly support the case made in the LWWH and Shurdington Concept Plan for preserving the land as a Local Green Space for its amenity value, footpaths, landscape, wildlife, history and impact on views from Leckhampton Hill.
Other comments:
***************************************
***************************************