

<b>APPLICATION NO: 15/01048/OUT</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mr Martin Chandler</b>	
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 16th June 2015		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 15th September 2015	
<b>WARD:</b> Benhall/The Reddings		<b>PARISH:</b>	
<b>APPLICANT:</b>			
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land to rear of Nuffield Hospital, Hatherley Lane, Cheltenham		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Residential development of up to 27 dwellings		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>6</b>
Number of objections	<b>6</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

9 Tylea Close  
The Reddings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 6RB

**Comments:** 27th June 2015

I have read the application made and disagree with the assertion that the development will not affect the adjacent water course and not increase risk of flooding. The use of soakaways will inevitably surcharge the local water table and increase the flow in the brook between Tylea close and the development. This brook is poorly maintained and has been on the verge of flooding on a number of occasions. The additional flow from the development could cause this flooding to become worst in future.

I also disagree with the assertion that wildlife will not be affected. There is a wild life corridor between Tylea close and the development and it must be incumbent on the developer to preserve and enhance this.

There is no indication on the application of the number of affordable housing units including within the development although I understand this would be a requirement of CBC. We would object to the development of social housing on this site.

10 Roxton Drive  
Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 6SQ

**Comments:** 10th November 2015

On viewing the latest revised plans for the above site I would like to add to my previously submitted, albeit unacknowledged, objections.

I note that on the landscape proposals drawing we again have an area (marked in a continuous green mass) as "existing extensive tree planting".

This is more accurately described as "an unfulfilled promise", as the previously promised re-planting has failed to materialise.

A site visit will confirm this, and show the unscreened office buildings, and allow you to hear first-hand the ASDA Lorries arriving and departing at all hours, and I and others can testify that no amount of additional 2.4 metre acoustic wall is going to protect the proposed occupants from the noise.

I can only add I sympathise greatly with my neighbours at No's 6 to 9, who are more affected than I by the existing development, & who stand to be even more affected by these plans.

Once again everything is being promised to sweeten the effect for planning on the housing development, for example screen planting to protect visual intrusion, hard and soft landscaping, a proposed buffer, increase green corridor etc.

I can see nothing to protect the residential properties on its boundary.

I therefore object to the development on the above, and my original concerns below.

Turning this site into a residential development means we would have the prospect of more light pollution, and more noise at all hours.

At least with offices the noise usually occurs over a specific day-time period.

I see there is a provision for planting trees, but we were promised this with the ASDA store.

In practice a very large amount of hedgerow and trees were removed, which now gives us residents a perfect view of ASDA, and the ever present sound of the delivery lorries, parking up at all hours with their refrigeration units running.

In fact there were some trees planted, a token effort I feel, & as some died, & they are in any case mostly deciduous, for much of the year we have a clear view of the premises and workers.

As with other proposals for this site the plan doesn't give enough thought and consideration for the residential properties at the southern boundary.

We now have another vast area that is going to have a huge runoff of rain water; I assume into the Hatherley Brook, the only surface water course 10 metres from the boundary of the site and attached to mine and other properties.

Since the flooding in 2007 I have paid particular attention to the brook, between Roxton Drive & this site. The rain frequently turns what is a trickling brook into quite a fast moving torrent of water.

Couple the runoff from the ASDA site, with the new proposed site, & this becomes of real concern to Roxton Drive residents, as the erosion to the banks is considerable and this will only accelerate the problem to the point where the erosion becomes a threat of subsidence to our properties.

With this in mind who is liable or responsible to rectify this if it happens ?

Lastly traffic congestion; no amount of surveys will ever convince me that this will not have an effect on an already chaotic and out of hand situation in this area.

We have newly built housing estates; M5 and Gloucester access, ASDA, GCHQ, B&Q, & soon the new BMW site, all of which add to the traffic.

Soon the queues will be stretching back past the Reddings Road roundabout, if it's not already there now.

7 Roxton Drive  
Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 6SQ

**Comments:** 8th July 2015

Firstly and purely as an observation, the Design and Access Statement says "The layout is intended to create a high quality residential environment". No disrespect but I can't quite bring myself to class a four storey block of eleven one and two bed apartments, 3 storey semi detached town houses and communal parking as high quality, I can however see the apartments being purchased as an investment and rented out for student accommodation.

I would like to object to the proposed development and my main concerns are below.

1. It seems from a glance at the plans there are 3 storey buildings that will have a perfect view of the rear of mine and other properties, and vice versa, plus a proposed elevated exit from the estate to the footpath via steps that would give a clear view into our properties.
2. Turning this site into a residential development means we would have the prospect of more light pollution and more noise at all hours at least with offices there are hours where noise is less of a problem.
3. And yes I see there is a provision for planting trees, but we were promised this with ASDA, instead a very large amount of hedgerow and trees were removed which now gives me a perfect view of ASDA and its delivery lorries parking up at all hours with their refrigeration units running.

In fact there were insufficient trees planted, some died and as some or most are deciduous for three quarters of the year we have a clear view of the offices and workers. As with other proposals for this site the plan doesn't give enough thought and consideration for the residential properties at the southern boundary.

4. We now have another vast area that is going to have a runoff of rain water over a huge area I assume into the Hatherley Brook, the only surface water course 10 metres from the boundary of the site and attached to mine and other properties. Since the incredible flooding in 2007 and because of the vagaries of our weather with even more bizarre rainfalls, the rain turns what is a trickling brook into quite a fast moving torrent of water. This coupled with the runoff from the ASDA site and now the proposed site is of real concern to me as the erosion to the banks is considerable and this will only accelerate the problem to the point where the erosion becomes a threat of subsidence to mine and other properties. With this in mind who is liable or responsible to rectify this if it happens.
5. Lastly traffic congestion, no amount of surveys will ever convince me that this will not have an effect on an already chaotic and out of hand situation in this area. We have new housing estates; M5 and Gloucester access, ASDA, GCHQ, B&Q, and shortly the BMW site will be adding its traffic. Soon the queues will be stretching back past the Reddings Road roundabout if it's not already there now.

I appreciate something has to go there but more thought and consideration for the surrounding area should be the priority of any developer.

**Comments:** 8th November 2015

On viewing the latest revised plans for the above site I would like to submit my previous objections, plus these observations below, and I might add none of which have been acknowledged or answered to date. Yes there have been amendments to the angle of the properties and layout plus a slight reduction but still pretty much as before.

Again we have on the landscape proposals drawing an area (marked in a continuous green mass) as "existing extensive tree planting", although promised there has never been extensive tree planting here, I invite you to take a look from my lounge or bedroom window to confirm this to see the office buildings and hear the ASDA Lorries arriving and departing at all hours, and I and others can testify that no amount of additional 2.4 metre acoustic wall is going to protect the proposed occupants from the noise.

Once again everything is being done to sweeten the effect for planning on the housing development, for example screen planting to protect visual intrusion, hard and soft landscaping, a proposed buffer, increase green corridor etc. very nice wording but nothing specific to protect the residential properties on its boundary.

I therefore object to the development on the above and my original concerns below.

Turning this site into a residential development means we would have the prospect of more light pollution and more noise at all hours at least with offices there are hours where noise is less of a problem.

And yes I see there is a provision for planting trees, but we were promised this with ASDA, instead a very large amount of hedgerow and trees were removed which now gives me a perfect view of ASDA and its delivery lorries parking up at all hours with their refrigeration units running. In fact there were insufficient trees planted, some died and as some or most are deciduous, therefore for three quarters of the year we have a clear view of the offices and workers. As with other proposals for this site the plan doesn't give enough thought and consideration for the residential properties at the southern boundary.

We now have another vast area that is going to have a huge runoff of rain water; I assume into the Hatherley Brook, the only surface water course 10 metres from the boundary of the site and attached to mine and other properties. Since the incredible flooding in 2007 and because of the vagaries of our weather with even more bizarre rainfalls, the rain turns what is a trickling brook into quite a fast moving torrent of water. This coupled with the runoff from the ASDA site and now the proposed site is of real concern to me as the erosion to the banks is considerable and this will only accelerate the problem to the point where the erosion becomes a threat of subsidence to mine and other properties. With this in mind who is liable or responsible to rectify this if it happens.

Lastly traffic congestion, no amount of surveys will ever convince me that this will not have an effect on an already chaotic and out of hand situation in this area. We have new housing estates; M5 and Gloucester access, ASDA, GCHQ, B&Q, the BMW site will be adding its traffic. Soon the queues will be stretching back past the Reddings Road roundabout if it's not already there now.

6 Roxton Drive  
Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 6SQ

**Comments:** 5th July 2015

The documents stated that the ground floor of properties 6 & 7 Roxton Drive were not overlooked by the nearest dwellings proposed.

The ground floor, on the side of the new dwellings, is the basement level of these properties, which are built so their 'ground' floor is at street level in Roxton Drive.

The new dwellings therefore, which on land raised up above the level of the properties in Roxton Drive, have plain line of site into both our living areas and our sleeping areas.

There is a thin line of trees running alongside the footpath between the proposed dwellings and Roxton Drive, which afford some cover in summer months, but as they are deciduous, provide no cover at all from Late Autumn until Spring is well under way. The proposal makes no mention of additional measures to protect the privacy of resident of both Roxton Drive and the new dwellings.

The previous proposal promised considerable new planting of trees to protect privacy - this has not been forthcoming. A tiny number of small trees were planted, several of these have died and the level of planting was inadequate for the purpose intended.

In the previous proposed use of this site, breach of privacy was also an issue, but because the proposed usage was for office space, the likely hours when someone was likely to be present in the building would tend not to coincide with us being active in our homes.

This new proposal put homes on higher land, overlooking our properties and assumes that because they cannot see into our basement our privacy has been adequately taken into consideration.

That is wholly inaccurate.

Adding a large number of new dwellings into the traffic flow is highly likely to cause congestion at the Park & Ride roundabout.

There is peak congestion backed up as far as the roundabout at the junction of The Reddings/Grovefield Way already as a result of the recent large expansion of homes in the area as well as heavy peak time traffic flow to and from Asda. Adding additional residential flow will add additional traffic in the same direction as the other residential traffic in the area (as opposed to the previous proposal which would have added traffic in the opposite direction and therefore not added to congestion.) The current auto-dealership development on Grovefield Way seems to also add to this issue. Planners cannot continue to add traffic into the area without consideration.

The previous application was for office space. This would have added an essentially silent neighbour - most importantly, a neighbour which would have been silent in hours in which our families expect to be able to enjoy their homes without disturbance. The new dwellings, at an elevated height, will be occupied at the same time as our homes, and as they are raised above our homes, any noise made in the new properties will carry. The intended site has never been residential, so this represents a considerable negative impact for the homes at the end of Roxton Drive.

The new proposal puts a large number of dwellings above the small, unmanaged stream which runs behind Roxton Drive.

This has already been put under greater pressure of flooding caused by building in recent years. Any additional outflow into this stream will definitely cause issues.

The stream is not maintained in any way, which from a wildlife point of view is probably beneficial - the banks are overgrown and fallen branches lie uncleared in and across the stream.

However, if the stream is to be expected to carry additional water load from the new site, it will need to change from being a wild stream to something else.

That would not only have an impact on local wildlife, but also on the attractiveness of the stream itself. A cleared, managed culvert would be unattractive and less safe.

Neither option is attractive, but the proposal appears not to take either of them into consideration.

The new proposal states that no additional provision needs to be made for public transportation - that either new residents will use the footpath to the Reddings for the local bus or take the Park & Ride.

This is ingenuous at best, from their location, with no additional provision made, residents will take their cars to travel locally.

This site, and its long term partial development status have been a blight on our properties for a considerable time now.

The solution to this is not to add ill considered residential development, but to add the council's considerable resources to aiding the developers in attracting businesses into the area. This would be of far greater value to the local community than this development.

**Comments:** 6th July 2015

This application is missing all the associated documents online.

I reviewed much of the application last weekend, intending to respond to it in detail this weekend, but the documents are no longer available on the website.

As this puts the public at a disadvantage in terms of responding properly to the application, I would request that you

- a) Put the documents back online as soon as possible
- b) Delay the deadline for closure of comments as the documents are not visible to the public as they should be

Andalin  
The Reddings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 6RY

**Comments:** 9th July 2015

I object to this proposal on the following points:

It denies future expansion of commerce and the creation of sustainable and much needed jobs in Cheltenham. This is a strategically important industrial site that owing to its proximity to GCHQ and Ultra Electronics has the potential with the right office development to host and support high paid jobs.

The Councils previous policy of allowing change of use for B1 land for either housing, retirement apartments or A1 use is in my opinion short sighted since it denies future expansion of office space and jobs and will inhibit Cheltenham's capacity to create wealth in the future as the economy improves.

I also question the sites suitability for houses on the grounds of sustainability. As a result of ad-hoc housing development in the area, higher birth rates, and poor planning by GCC the schools within the locality are full and already cannot serve the demands of the local community.

The proposed houses are cramped of poor design and I don't think it works mixing residential and office buildings on such a small site. The site is also elevated above the adjacent houses in Roxton Drive as such the height and proximity will impact on the privacy of the existing homes and will look out of keeping to the area.

The four story apartment will negatively dominate the site and do nothing to improve the local character of the area.

Trying to maximise profits and cram so many dwellings into such a small site will inevitably cause parking problems since it is clear that not enough parking spaces are available in the plans for the number of dwellings proposed, this will of course cause disputes and will mean parking on the road or illegally in Asda become the norm.

**Comments:** 15th November 2015

Having previously commented on this proposal I have read with interest the comments from other residents relating to the reference in the plans of "continuous green mass" and the "existing extensive tree planting" which has been pointed out was promised but never materialised.

The following provides an account of what really happens with the planning processes and how residents have to live with the consequences and are so disillusioned.

When the original planning application was made for a B1 office development on the former Woodward Site a substantial line of trees did exist between site and the residents of Tylea Close, Roxton Drive and Northbank Close.

The plans included these trees in its submission as 'mitigation against noise and light pollution on the adjacent residents'.

The application for the office buildings was duly approved by Cheltenham Borough council and the owners of the land then set about clearing it.

Not long after this started little blue crosses appeared on the trees that were presented in the plans as mitigation against noise and light pollution.

Fearing that they would be cut down I contacted the Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Officer and said "I think they are going to cut down all the trees" and was told "don't worry the developer has no intention to cut down any trees on the site"

The next day the site owners got contractors in to cut them all down!

I contacted the Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Officer and said "they have just cut down the landscaping that they said they were keeping to lessen the impact of the buildings on the nearby residential housing"

I was told by the planning office "Sorry they are their trees so there is not a lot we can do"

I contacted Chris Chavasse the tree officer who was appalled by their behaviour and we managed to get the owners to plant a few token replacements, unfortunately these are small and half of them have died.

So there we have it no 'existing extensive tree planting' and the reason why the residents would lose privacy and be subject to noise and light pollution from any adjacent development.

Therefore after viewing the revised plans for the site I remain unconvinced that this is an acceptable use for the land and would reiterate my previous comments below.

It is a strategically important location for office buildings

It denies future expansion of commerce and the creation of sustainable and much needed jobs in Cheltenham. This is a strategically important industrial site that owing to its proximity to GCHQ and Ultra Electronics has the potential with the right office development to host and support high paid jobs.

The Councils previous policy of allowing change of use for B1 land for either housing, retirement apartments or A1 use is in my opinion short sighted since it denies future expansion of office space and jobs and will inhibit Cheltenham's capacity to create wealth in the future as the economy improves.

I also question the sites suitability for houses on the grounds of sustainability. As a result of ad-hoc housing development in the area, higher birth rates, and poor planning by GCC the schools within the locality are full and already cannot serve the demands of the local community.

The revised proposed houses remain cramped and the application does not include any details of the height or design of these houses so I have got to assume that the design remains poor also I still don't think it works mixing residential and office buildings on such a small site. The site is also elevated above the adjacent houses in Roxton Drive as such the height and proximity will impact on the privacy of the existing homes and will look out of keeping to the area.

The apartment block will negatively dominate the site and do nothing to improve the local character of the area.

Trying to maximise profits and cram so many dwellings into such a small site will inevitably cause parking problems since it is clear that not enough parking spaces are available in the plans for the number of dwellings proposed, this will of course cause disputes and will mean parking on the road or illegally in Asda become the norm.

Northwood Investors  
St Catherine's House  
Oxford Square  
Oxford Street  
Newbury  
Berkshire  
RG14 1JQ

**Comments:** 2nd December 2015

I write regarding the above application to form 27 residential dwellings on Land to the rear of Nuffield Hospital, off of Hatherley Lane and object to the proposed development.

The application site is situated on land identified for protection as an employment site. Contrary to Policy EM2, it has not been demonstrated by the applicant that the "retention of the site for employment purposes has been fully explored without success."

It is not evident from the letter of KBW, dated 11 June, the duration for which endeavours to market the site for employment uses has been undertaken. Whilst the Planning Statement states that the owners have undertaken marketing for the site for the last 6/7 years, evidence and further details of this has not been provided. A small advertisement board has been erected on the main road, however this is a recent addition and not evidence of long-term marketing efforts.

Whilst the Joint Core Strategy Employment Land Review is in the process of adoption, NLP found "one agent was concerned that many brownfield employment sites within urban areas have been development for residential use; and as such there could be a void in the supply of land suitable for future development for employment purposes." The Employment Land Review stated that "the JCS team may wish to re-consider the Councils' approaches to determining planning applications



for non-employment uses on allocated employment land, to ensure that the employment land 'bank' is protected." It is therefore evident that the risk to employment uses from new residential uses has been identified and is under consideration in the Joint Core Strategy.

In advance of the Cheltenham Plan - which is currently undergoing consultation - it would be premature and create a dangerous precedent to permit the change of use of the application site to residential uses, which would enable further erosion of Cheltenham's employment land without the full understanding of future employment needs in the area. The application site remains identified as an existing employment site in the Cheltenham Plan consultation document.

As such, it is considered that the proposals will result in the loss of employment land which has not been fully justified and is contrary to policy EM2, particularly given the extant office development planning permission.

It has also not been demonstrated that the proposed residential use is appropriate to the location, which is characterised by employment development and commercial uses encompassing a range of A1 and B1a uses, and that the proposals add value to the local community and area.

Notwithstanding my previous comments on the lack of full evidence on the marketing of the site for employment uses, the proposed residential dwellings will constitute an inappropriate use within a commercial site. On three sides the proposed development will be adjoined by a mix of commercial and retail uses. It is recognised that existing residential units of Roxton Drive and Tylea Close are situated to the south of the site, however these will never be seen in the context of the proposed development. The proposals will result in an incongruous in-fill of residential units on land protected for employment uses.

I remain concerned by the proposals; the precedent which this will set for future employment uses and the conflict which will be experienced between residential units in a commercial setting.