

<b>APPLICATION NO: 15/01163/OUT</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mrs Lucy White</b>	
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 21st July 2015		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 20th October 2015	
<b>WARD:</b> Pittville		<b>PARISH:</b> PREST	
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr S Lintern-Mole		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Pittville School, Albert Road, Cheltenham		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Outline application for the erection of up to 58 dwellings (approval sought for means of access with other matters reserved)		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>26</b>
Number of objections	<b>25</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

27 Pittville Lawn  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2BH

**Comments:** 4th August 2015

I wish to object to this proposal in the strongest possible terms.

Firstly, this area is already densely populated and overdeveloped. The proposed housing estate will serve to make matters worse, while the new road would lead to more traffic, more noise, more pollution and more accidents. Green spaces are in increasing short supply. Are we to build on every conceivable bit of land in Cheltenham in the name of profit?

What is more, in an area with a wealth of fine buildings, if the new plans are anything to go by, the houses will be the usual charmless identikit affairs which one sees spring up all over Cheltenham and elsewhere: homogenous Lego boxes devoid of ornament and character. One cannot help but feel that the proposed development will be woefully out of keeping both with nearby houses it also sorts and indeed with Pittville School itself.

Building this estate would inevitably ruin the open aspect as the playing field and so obscure the views of Leckhampton Hill. The presence of 58 houses would change the feel of the neighbourhood, and not for the better. It would undoubtedly make it feel smaller, not to say claustrophobic, much as a low ceiling makes a room feel oppressive.

Should the road be built, it is highly likely it would lead to a marked increase in traffic and therefore an increase in noise and possible accidents.

44 Cleevemount Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3HG

**Comments:** 12th November 2015

Letter attached.

44 Cleevemount Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3HG

**Comments:** 12th November 2015  
Letter attached.

7 Linden Close  
Prestbury  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3DX

**Comments:** 23rd September 2015

As a resident of Prestbury I am extremely concerned by the prospect of this development adding to the already excessive urbanisation of what is currently quite a pleasant and green part of Cheltenham.

This development, combined with the Starvehall Farm housing estate and New Barn Lane student village, is going to result in a lot of excess traffic in the Albert Road/New Barn Lane and Prestbury Road area. Moreover, the character of this beautiful part of Cheltenham will be compromised by a further collection of generic modern housing, none of which will add to either the Regency splendour of Pittville or the twentieth century houses of New Barn Lane and Prestbury Road.

The development at Pittville School will also affect the community's sports facilities which, despite not being regularly used at present, have a lot of potential for community use if the school would allow/promote this.

85 Welland Lodge Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2HH

**Comments:** 14th August 2015

As has happened with previous applications for the Prestbury/Pittville areas since 2010, this application has been lodged and distributed at the beginning of the school summer holidays which gives a lot of local residents less time to seriously consider and comment on the application. My apologies for my brief and late response.

The proposal seems to have been done without consideration for the existing (outline approval only) plan to develop Starvehall Farm. Particularly, the proposed new junction with New Barn Lane (NBL) which will now be too close to the new junction that will be created by building a road between New Barn Lane and Prestbury Road. As a result, New Barn Lane residents near these junctions will find it difficult to enter/leave their properties. Previous (smaller) applications for new junctions onto NBL have been turned down as being 'too dangerous', however no traffic planning has been arranged for this considerable proposed increase in road usage.

The outline planning permission for the Starvehall Farm development described the exit onto NBL as an 'existing right of way' (ie pedestrian) and NOT as a junction for approx 100 cars from this proposed development to the rear of Pittville School. I would contest that the outline plans for Starvehall Farm should be reviewed as no mention of vehicular access for this development has appeared on ANY of the previous plans for Starvehall Farm. Indeed, without the unfortunate fire

at the farmhouse in November last, then this proposed road would have been impossible as the outline application was agreed with some use to be made of the existing farm buildings.

Local residents are well aware that the back school playing field was used regularly by the school until 4 or 5 years ago with football and 'cross country' running in particular. With the expansion of the University Campus, Starvehall Farm and the Pittville School planning applications, more open green space would be required rather than losing a school field and a local recreation field (Prestbury Road Playing Field, not the Parish field).

I would ask that the Planning Committee seriously re-consider this access route, the density of the houses adjoining existing properties and the loss of yet another green space in Prestbury/Pittville Ward.

**Comments:** 17th November 2015

Please will some common sense prevail and this application be reviewed IN CONJUNCTION WITH 15/01794/REM Starvehall Farm? Existing properties adjoining both of these local developments will be greatly impacted by noise, traffic, visual impact, ecology and privacy.

This Outline Application seeks approval for the "means of access with other matters reserved", however, we would also comment that the number of plots has increased from 53 to 58. This is not advisable, especially with the additional plots having been added to the proposed North Western part of the Starvehall Farm development. Existing properties in New Barn Lane, Cakebridge Road and Welland Lodge Road will all be adversely impacted by any increase in the number of plots.

Looking at the "Site Plan, Alternative Layout", this appears to show the proposed houses to be very densely packed and insufficient parking for residences and visitors. The proposed access road will cut right across the 'wildlife corridor' on the West side of the Starvehall Farm development which was a 'locked in' matter when outline planning permission was granted.

Additional consideration should be given to the local wildlife, its habitat and foraging areas. A vast area of green fields (playing field, farmland and recreation area) is being lost to this Northern part of Cheltenham and the very least that could be done is to try to minimise the impact of these developments on the local residents and the local wildlife.

It appears that outdated traffic modelling data has been used to support this application. If the Planning Authority allows the developers of Starvehall Farm to permit access/egress from this new Pittville School playing field site of 58 proposed new homes, then the traffic modelling used in the Starvehall application is inaccurate and fatally flawed in terms of volumes.

The traffic generated by both sites would come from 358 families and not the "up to 300" submitted under the Starvehall 2012 revised Nash Partnership proposals. Allowing traffic from the proposed Pittville School site to leave/enter via Starvehall Farm will result in two busy north exiting roads (the "Spine Road" and the north west site exit road). These two roads will link onto New Barn Lane within 100 meters of each other, and, more importantly, the northwest site exit road will join New Barn Lane near the brow of the hill.

34 Cakebridge Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3HJ

**Comments:** 4th August 2015

As a resident directly affected by this proposal I would like to make the following comments:

1. The school is not 'replacing the 3 x existing tennis courts' it is actually adding an additional court. It is requesting 4 x tennis courts.
2. I feel that the proximity of the courts - right up against our back garden walls - is unacceptable. I have information about other such courts in Cheltenham and Gloucester and non of them are right up against residential properties. I have been informed that at least one application for such a development was refused - precisely because it would have located the courts too close to residential properties.
3. As these courts are intended to be available for use every single day of the year, including bank holidays and all Sundays, the potential noise pollution for those residents such as myself whose properties back onto the school is immense, and, in my opinion, unacceptable. Especially given the potential in summer for these courts to be operating from 08:00 to 22:00.
4. If the additional court (which should be clearly stated as such in the application) were not included in the application the courts would at least be one court's width further away from residents' back gardens and the noise pollution would therefore be slightly reduced.
5. What sound reduction measures, apart from a few trees, are being proposed to try and mitigate the noise pollution?

56 Cakebridge Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3HJ

**Comments:** 11th August 2015

I wish to Object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

The proposed development is sandwiched between the Starvehall Farm development (Planning permission granted 350 plus houses etc) and University Campus (Planning permission granted 750 plus beds), it is slightly larger than a football field, which is what the Pittville School used it for, and will be overlooked by a number of the accommodation blocks in the proposed Campus. There will be a very significant privacy issue in the large number of houses closest to the Campus perimeter and therefore the type and cost of these houses will reflect both the lack of privacy and the significant noise pollution emanating from the accommodation blocks (particularly in summer). It is highly likely that due to the size of the site and the limitation on housing type imposed by the proximity to the Campus, the majority of housing in this development will be low cost; low cost housing deteriorates quickly as can be seen in comparable developments across Cheltenham over the last ten years. The inevitable involvement of the rental market and the inherent transitory nature of its occupants will accelerate this process.

The privacy of the houses on New Barn Lane (2 to 10 Greenfields) will be significantly affected by the proximity of the proposed housing development. Loss of privacy is not the only issue, there would be a severe financial loss caused by the drop in value of these houses resulting from this proposed development. The value of these houses and their saleability has already been drastically affected by the planning permission given to the University Campus and Starvehall Farm.

Due to the size of the proposed University Campus the Sports Field provides the necessary segregation between the accommodation provided for the large number of (probably first year) University students and the Starvehall Farm development. When a very limited number of students were in residence prior to the current demolition work loud music could be easily heard on Cakebridge Road. Whatever type of house is built on this site and whether it is rented or owned one question is significant, who would want to live in a housing development that is within 200 meters of accommodation for up to 800 students

The School claims the football field has not been used since 2009 (Foxley Tagg Planning Statement). This is not true, we have lived here for five years and remember it being used on at least weekdays when we first moved in. These suddenly stopped. I'm sure our recollection will be corroborated by other residents in this area. There would appear to be a significant degree of constructive non use by the School in order for this development to be proposed.

It is noted that in the Planning Statement that Sport England needed to be convinced that this sports field is surplus to requirement and this is a pivotal point in the Outline Planning application bid. As I have stated above, it is obvious that the non use of this field has been engineered by the School and their statement that it has not been used since 2009 is not true. If statements are made by the proposing authorities it would be appreciated by the local community that they are accurate and not slanted towards gaining approval.

I would also contest the Foxley Tagg Planning statement that Cakebridge Road houses do not significantly overlook the proposed development, we have a bedroom window which looks directly out onto the proposed development

The Outline application proposes a pedestrian/cyclist access to Cakebridge Road. Cakebridge Road is not very wide along its entire length with cars finding it very difficult to pass parked vehicles, and access for any emergency services is virtually impossible at times (a factor of concern to current residents). This has been accepted I think by the proposers and the proposed access has been limited to pedestrians/cyclists, however the cul de sac end of Cakebridge Road opposite the proposed development was designed as a cul de sac, the fronts of these houses are very close to the footpath (some 3 meters approximately) and an increase in the pedestrian/cyclist traffic would cause a significant invasion of privacy. A footpath running between house numbers 77 and 79 on Welland Lodge Road linking with the Starvehall Farm development is already in place and is only some one hundred meters from the proposed Cakebridge Road access. The houses on Welland Lodge Road (which will be subjected to this traffic) benefit from either being higher or much lower in elevation than the footpath and are therefore afforded significantly more privacy than Cakebridge Road. The adjoining Cleevemount Road which leads down towards the town centre is also much wider than Cakebridge Road with the houses set farther back. Given that in addition to this access, access is also proposed from the development to Albert Road giving a direct route into the town centre it is difficult to see why any access to Cakebridge Road from the proposed development is required at all.

With regard the limited comment posted from the Cakebridge Road occupants this is indicative of the significant number of rented properties rather than any apathy. It is also worth noting that the request for comments falls in prime holiday season when many in the neighbourhood are away.

The application for this housing development and an application for a Pittville School Sports complex are linked in that the Playing Field sell off would not be allowed to proceed without the development of the proposed Sports Complex. I understand that should Outline Planning be granted for the Sports Complex first then this could affect the consideration given to the Playing Field sale, in essence it would add weight to granting permission for the sale. This is wrong, getting Outline planning permission for the Sports Complex should not add any bias toward granting the proposal to sell off the School Playing field.

The Foxley Tagg Planning Statement contains the following paragraph 4.7 which I have copied in full, I find this rather disquieting.

It should be noted that overall the Council considered that, "in principle, the redevelopment of this 'greenfield' site for residential use is considered acceptable subject to a resolution of the loss of a playing field with reference to the relevant parts of Section 8 of the NPPF (promoting healthy communities)".

Given that the driver behind the proposed sale of the playing field is the School's requirement to refurbish and extend their Physical Education infrastructure, I think the following points are worth posting:

In the period 2008 to 2012 Pittville School was one of the Secondary Schools Ofsted visited to compile information for its report entitled 'Beyond 2012 Outstanding Physical Education For All' 120367 published in February 2013. Inspectors visited the School over two days and on 21st March 2011 a letter was sent to the Headmaster Mr Gilpin by Ofsted thanking him for his co-operation, and stating that the inspectors found the school to be:

- Satisfactory at 'Achievement in PE'
- Good overall in 'Quality of teaching in PE'
- Satisfactory in the 'Quality of the curriculum in PE'

In this letter there was no mention of the state of the facilities the school now identifies, and even if the survey did not have the remit to look at the PE infrastructure (which is highly unlikely) it is hard to understand how the school did well in the survey if the facilities are as poor as is claimed. Even though this inspection was carried out in 2011 I think the lack of facilities would still have been 'sub-standard or zero indoor sports facility', as claimed in the Foxley Tagg Planning Statement.

In 2012/13 the School applied to the County Council for funding to 'convert the Quadrangle into a multipurpose teaching and learning space. This area would also be used for indoor sporting activities' at an estimated cost of some £500000. In the following County Council evaluation process the School bid failed to realise sufficient points and was turned down.

While it is expected that the School sporting facilities require significant refurbishing (at an early presentation by the School we were told that female students had no showering facility however Gloucester County Council has no record of any funding requests to either provide or repair a female showering facility), it is hard to understand how the County Council could have turned down a funding request, or not allowed it to be amended, if the conditions are as dire as we are told. Perhaps a funding bid more in line with the requirement would have a greater chance of success.

In conclusion I have extracted the following statement from the Foxley Tagg website:  
"Our dedicated team have significant experience in the public sector, having worked for local authorities at county, district and unitary levels. This has given Foxley Tagg a unique insight into key governmental processes, procedures and protocols enabling us to use our excellent planning policy understanding to negotiate successful planning applications securing planning permission for our varied client base."

I have tried to read through the wealth of documentation Foxley Tagg have prepared and it is, as one would expect, written with the aim of gaining planning permission and is therefore patently reluctant to identify any problems with regard this application.

My final comment is that reading the Planning Statement submitted by Foxley Tagg is one of the most depressing things I have ever had to do. For reasons all too obvious it makes you want to live in another country which is a very sad thing to realise.

**Comments:** 2nd December 2015

The Planning Office guidance on comment content states that only comments relating to Noise, Traffic, Visual Impact, Privacy and Amenity will be considered. The fact that a proposal is contrary to common sense and the fact that something is just wrong carries no weight according to the guidelines the Planning Office must work from. Given the proposed developments on Starvehall Farm and the University Campus the logical requirement would be to leave this small playing field as it is, providing a green buffer between the 800 bed University Campus (and its

inevitable inherent antisocial attributes) and the residential housing on New Barn Lane, the top of Cakebridge Road and Starvehall Farm.

The proposed development on the School Playing field is driven by the School requiring a state of the art Sports Complex. A large sum of money is required to fund this project and therefore the design, layout and number of houses has been dictated by the sum that is required. When a development of this size is proposed I believe Government requires a certain percentage of the build be Affordable Housing, once again because the School requires a significant sum of money a Viability Assessment has been submitted in order to get this requirement waived. I would suggest that these factors do not subscribe to a balanced and well thought out development, the immediate proximity to an 800 bed University Campus merely demonstrates this.

If the School toned down its requirement then I'm sure funding could be found from other sources, especially if the School is in the dire need the Headmaster identifies in his Supporting Note.

As has been stated in other comments to this application, at this time little consideration seems to have been given on the impact of the proposed construction on Starvehall Farm or the University Campus. Surely it would be prudent, given the relatively short timeframe that these applications are being considered across, and their colocation, to evaluate these applications collectively.

An example of this is the proposal for a pedestrian/bicycle footpath from the proposed development on the playing field down Cakebridge Road. The Starvehall Farm development already includes an existing public right of way running between 77 and 79 Welland Lodge Road, literally less than a hundred meters from the proposed Cakebridge Road pedestrian/bicycle access. As it is proposed that the two developments will be linked by an internal road, and the proposed access on Albert Road, a third pedestrian/bicycle access on Cakebridge Road would be superfluous.

With respect to the Cakebridge Road access I would like to raise the following points:

It is very narrow down its entire length and adjacent parking in the evenings and early mornings make it barely passable for other traffic (certainly not emergency vehicles), indeed I have just paid a neighbour for damage done while trying to squeeze between two parked cars.

From the point where it adjoins the playing field it runs steeply downhill in a straight line for over 400 meters, and in the summer evenings young children frequently play in the road along its length.

Given the above points allowing bicycle access from the proposed development down Cakebridge Road is creating the potential for serious accidents. Some young people, and some adults, like to ride bicycles quickly, especially downhill, and will have to weave between obstacles, (we have all seen this even in town and on our roads). Give them access to the top of a steep hill, down a long straight narrow road, with cars parked adjacently on both sides and the potential for young children playing in the road, then the outcome of an accident can be very serious. As a person used to walking next to cycle paths when going to work I can also testify that you don't hear bicycles coming behind you, they run on rubber tyres.

The Starvehall Farm public footpath access onto Welland Lodge Road does not have this problem due to the layout of the roads and access to Albert Road for pedestrians and bicycles is already in this playing field proposal.

10 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 10th August 2015  
Letter attached.

**Comments:** 12th November 2015  
Letter attached.

9 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 12th August 2015  
Letter attached.

7 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 29th July 2015  
Letter attached.

6 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 14th August 2015  
I refer to your letter of 22 July 2015 and have the following comments.

1. The proposed development comes at the same time as 2 other developments in the area : The extension of the University premises in Pittville with an increase in student numbers and the Starvehall Farm development. The combination of these 2 developments will have a dramatic effect on local amenities, sewerage, roads, traffic and adding another development will only add to these concerns. The University development is already causing disruption by noise and great vibration to our houses.
2. One specific aspect of the development that makes no practical sense is allowing traffic access onto New Barn Lane when that access will already be over-utilised with traffic from the Starvehall Development. That development did have detailed analysis of traffic flows and pollution effect that are lacking in this proposal. This question of access needs to be re-visited with appropriate consideration to the numbers involved in traffic flow.



3. The question of access for traffic would have been better addressed by developing the lower end of the Pittville Schools fields that does have access to Albert Rd. Was this not considered?
4. The current plan shows houses directly behind our houses in Greenfields with insufficient space between them and us. In addition the plan does not address how we will maintain access to the back fences/hedges of the Greenfields houses. Also if the houses in the proposed development are built directly in line with the existing Greenfield houses that will create a wind tunnel effect which will cause damage. These points need to be addressed.
5. It is also a concern that given the government's objective to encourage participation in sport, and the part that sport plays in health, that an area that is ideal for sport should be turned over to developers. There are many ways that this space can be used to develop sport and the school provided with the gym it requires.

We believe that this proposal for development has been put forward with the notion of jumping on the bandwagon of other developments and has not been thought out properly to answer all our concerns regarding noise, pollution and traffic.

**Comments:** 16th November 2015

Thank you for inviting us to make comments on the above application.

We have the following comments.

1. Our area of Pittville has been the subject of 3 applications or housing developments in less than 18 months causing unnecessary concern and worry to the residents. We already have a proposed increase of 600 students with the University development and the Starvehall Farm development with residents from over 300 houses. This current application for up to 58 dwellings will make matters worse. The amenities and facilities cannot cope with such an increase in numbers. We also take exception to the fact that this has been referred to as a small development compared to the other two and will not make much difference to amenities, roads and facilities. That is not a valid argument.
2. Traffic Access - This application should be considered in conjunction with the Starvehall Development. The new road access onto New Barn Lane B4075 from the Starvehall development will bring a huge increase in traffic. That will be made worse if there is a development on the Pittville playing field. We recommend that a new traffic study be commissioned to replace the outdated 2012 one to assess volume of traffic on New Barn Lane at peak times.
3. Noise and Disturbance - From the plan it appears that there will be houses with north facing gardens leading inevitably to noise and disturbance. There will also be boundaries that border on each other raising issues about access to boundary fences.
4. We understand that this proposed application is to fund the construction of a 3 million pounds sports and leisure centre for Pittville School. We object as a basic principle to school playing fields that could be used by not only the school but also by the community. Assets such as this once disposed of cannot be reclaimed.
5. Pittville Sports centre - We do not object to the school improving its sports facilities but first of all the plans seem in excess of what the school actually needs and also there are many other ways of funding a sports centre improvement project. Sport England, the Football Association, Private concerns and many others are always interested in developing sports at school, community and grass roots level. They would potentially be interested in not only a sports centre but using the playing field with artificial turf pitches. We note that the proposed leisure centre would be available to the public but there are already sufficient sports centres within

easy access and our fear is that this would end up becoming a "white elephant" costing money.

Thank you for taking the above points into consideration and we trust the planning committee will recognise that the views of existing residents are highly important in assessing the future of Pittville/Prestbury as an attractive place to live.

**Comments:** 18th January 2016

These two applications have received many comments and these have been well summarized in the Planning Officers Report.

As a neighbour in New Barn Lane we object to the suggested disposal of the Pittville School Playing Field to fund a new Sports centre.

Once a playing Field is gone it is lost forever and greater effort should be focused on improving standards of education and working towards a sixth form facility which will require space.

\* While we accept that the school needs improved sports facilities these do not need to be as costly as those proposed especially as the area already has excellent sports facilities at the local authority centre at Tommy Taylors Lane. In addition Pittville Campus will have one which will be in direct competition.

\*The question that concerns me is who will actually approve and be liable for the success or failure of the business plan for the new Sports Centre which will have very significant ongoing costs. Are School Governors and Councillors liable ?

\* Sport England who are acknowledged professional experts have nor been consulted as you can see by the various errors in the proposals. They do have funding available and it would have been more logical to approach them for a grant of a reduced amount and concentrate on improving facilities for school pupils rather than chasing the elusive community usage.

\*In addition the proposed Sports centre has not been identified within the Local Authority needs assessment for sports and leisure provision

5 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 4th August 2015

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed planning application to build up to 58 residential dwellings on the Pittville School North playing field for the reasons detailed below :-

I have lived at 5 Greenfields, New Barn Lane, Cheltenham for over 15 years and up until recently (last few years), the school playing field was used daily by the students of Pittville School to play football, other sports and for general exercise etc during lunchtimes. Furthermore the playing field was also used in the evenings by youngsters to play football and was used most weekends by local football teams competing in leagues and tournaments. It seems a bit of a coincidence that all these activities suddenly stopped, Pittville School now claim that the playing field is no longer used, is surplus to requirements and hence why they wish to sell it off to be built on?

The whole idea of a school playing field is for students to be able to carry out sporting activities in the fresh air to help them improve their overall fitness and health. With growing concerns about child obesity, diabetes etc it is unbelievable that Pittville School is looking to sell off the school

playing field. Information from Public Health England (PHE) already shows that the percentage of children in Gloucestershire classed as obese or overweight is above the national average.

Richard Gilpin (Headteacher of Pittville School) stated in the Gloucestershire Echo on 30th September 2014 that the school has a thriving PE Department and youngsters play county football amongst other sports. Surely a school with such a thriving PE Department should be making use of such a fantastic playing field for football, hockey, rugby, cricket, running and other field sports rather than selling it off to build houses on? Instead the school is looking to build an artificial turf pitch that won't be full size and is designed for 5 aside football and hockey? The plans state that Pittville School will retain the South field (which is on a slope), for sports, but surely it makes sense to retain and play such sports on the North field which is flat?

It is also somewhat ironic that the school is proposing to sell off an existing sports facility that is excellent for outdoor sports in order to fund the redevelopment of other sporting facilities ie new sports hall/gym. I would ask the question why the playing field isn't currently used and why it can't be enjoyed as it once was? Also, why can't the new sports hall be funded by the National Lottery as surely this is exactly the sort of project that the lottery was set up for?

As a sweetener, the proposals state that the new sporting facilities can be used by the local community, however with Leisure at Cheltenham (with it's comprehensive leisure facilities including swimming pool) being in such close proximity, there is not a need for more sports facilities of this kind.

From a residents point of view, I am extremely concerned about the increased traffic, congestion, noise and pollution that the proposed new development would bring what with 300 new houses been given the go ahead on Starvehall Farm and the proposed student accommodation for the University of Gloucestershire. The increase in traffic from this development will undoubtedly adversely affect highway safety and the convenience of road users of New Barn Lane.

The residents of 2 to 10 Greenfields in particular, enjoy a great deal of privacy, light and open views across the playing field to Leckhampton Hill. Plots 21 to 28 in the proposed plans directly overlook numbers 2 to 10 Greenfields and would completely eradicate the privacy, views and light that are currently enjoyed by the residents of these houses and the proposed buildings would also create overshadowing in view of their close proximity. I am also concerned about the noise and disturbance that will be created by having people living directly at the end of our gardens.

Many of the residents also have trees, shrubs and other greenery backing on to the playing field and these are maintained in part, by accessing the school playing field. How will we be able to maintain these if the land becomes somebody else's back garden?

Whilst I fully appreciate that the school needs to improve its sports facilities, the funding for this should be through other means and not by selling off such a valuable asset as the North playing field.

I strongly object to the proposal and would respectfully ask that the application be declined.

**Comments:** 28th December 2015

The proposed access route through Starvehall Farm was not on the original planning application and should therefore be rejected. The original plan did not allow for the extra traffic so no impact study has been performed on the traffic flow in New Barn Lane. The traffic along New Barn Lane is already very heavy and this will be made worse with the additional traffic from Starvehall farm. With the proposed addition of 58 houses and circa 100 - 200 cars this will make the road even more dangerous and congested, especially where the proposed exit is situated. To allow such a proposal will be putting lives at risk as the traffic will already be far too heavy with the Starvehall development. It should be remembered that it is a 'Lane' (a narrow road/passageway in between houses, hedges, walls and fences) that all this additional traffic will be accessing and it wasn't

designed for this level of traffic. I strongly object to the proposal and would respectfully ask that the application be declined.

Comment submitted date: Tue 04 Aug 2015  
(see above)

4 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 25th July 2015

Notification of this planning application was received on 24/07/2015. That gives any interested party 19 days to comment before 12/08/2015.

As this weekend is the start of the great British getaway, one can assume that many people from this area, who may wish to comment, will be on holiday.

In the interest of fairness to all and to avoid any suggestion of opportunism the period for comment should be extended until the end of the school holidays, at least

**Comments:** 12th August 2015

We wish to object to the application by Pittville School to sell off their north playing field for the building of 58 houses.

It is ironical that the notice of this application arrived with us on the same day as GB was celebrating, with Games in London, on the anniversary of the 2012 UK Olympic Games.

As you are no doubt aware the sale of school playing fields is a highly contentious issue. Michael Gove the former Education Minister was pilloried by the national press regarding this matter.

The playing field which Pittville School wishes to dispose of was in use until quite recently (2009 we are told). Football was played regularly by various teams while pupils used it for archery, golf lessons etc. PE involved the pupils running round the perimeter. All good healthy sporting activities.

This was all stopped we believe as a deliberate policy in order that the school could claim that the field was unused and surplus to requirements thus fulfilling one of the conditions necessary for disposal. There are now children at this school who have never been allowed to set foot on this field during their whole school career.

This is no ordinary field. It is flat, well maintained and in the opinion of many it is the sports field with greatest potential in this area. With the greater emphasis now on outdoor sport to combat obesity and diabetes and the increase in women's football and cricket it is regrettable that Pittville school should consider it appropriate to concrete over a perfectly good sports field.

Anyone with a soul would not look at the field and say "What a great field to build houses on".

We must also address the matter of sustainability of this proposed housing development.

The House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee have made comments on the NPPF Fourth Report of Session 2014 – 2015. Here are some which may be relevant to this planning application:

*It is important that the definition of sustainable development in the NPPF is applied equitably and consistently, and approval is given only to development that meets this definition. While the NPPF makes clear that economic, environmental and social dimensions of sustainable development should be given equal weight, we were concerned to hear so many people tell us that this was not happening in practice.*

*Planning inspectors and local authorities must account for decisions they make and must be able to explain how all three dimensions of sustainable development have been given equal consideration.*

*A recurring concern in our evidence was that greater emphasis was being given to the economic dimension of sustainable development than to the environmental and social ones.*

*A particular concern about unsustainable development was that planning permission was being given to substantial housing development on the edge of towns and villages.*

In view of the fact that the purpose of the Planning application by Pittville school was to raise £3,000,000 to fund a sports hall this application could be regarded as fulfilling the economic dimension. Ostensibly this sports hall could be used by the local community.

However Cheltenham is well served with leisure facilities and we can see no need for this.

Would it not be more prudent if Pittville school adopted a more modest plan. We would all like a Rolls Royce and a Villa in the French Riviera the only problem is we can't afford it. Therefore we have to do without. It is called in modern parlance austerity or in other words living within your means.

There are a number of other issues to be resolved and we will comment on those at a later date when more information becomes available.

**Comments:** 9th November 2015

I am in receipt of your letter of 26th October 2015 inviting me to submit any comments on the alternative indicative layout of the above planning application. Before doing so I would be grateful if you would indicate the changes on which you wish me to comment.

**Comments:** 1st January 2016

The devastation caused by the present flooding in the UK must surely concentrate the minds of planners on the folly of allowing housebuilding on floodplains.

I therefore wish to voice my concern about the proposed building of houses on Pittville School playing field, and how the loss of a field, which up until now has absorbed heavy rainfall, will affect the surrounding houses.

In 2007, when the Jet Stream parked over this area, I watched the water rise on the north west periphery of the playing field and encroach on our rear gardens, while at the same time having to collect water from a bowser on New Barn Lane.

The new University development and the Starvehall Farm development will add massive hard surface on two sides of the playing field causing increased run off.

Is it not foolhardy to consider adding more impervious surface and more run off ?

Should permission be granted to build houses on the school playing field, can we have an assurance that, when the Jet Stream next parks itself over Cheltenham, as no doubt it will, the houses in Greenfields and anything below the level of Pittville school playing field will not flood.

The cost of rectifying potential damage could well exceed the £3million the school want to fund a non-essential sports complex.

I also wish to add my support to the residents of New Barn Lane who have drawn attention to the danger of the increase in traffic and having two accesses on to New Barn Lane within such close proximity.

Outline planning permission for Starvehall Farm was restricted to 300 houses - reason: 'In the interests of highway' safety. This being the case, how does the Highways Authority justify the following conclusions from their report of 5th December 2015 regarding traffic from Pittville School proposed development.

\*It is not considered that these additional trips will have a severe or significant impact on the local highway network.

\*This is negligible and not sufficient to affect the operation of New Barn Lane.

\*The Starvehall Farm access to new Barn Lane should therefore have more than sufficient capacity to accommodate the modest level of traffic generated by an additional 58 dwellings.

In an era of two car families, on line shopping and more places of employment away from town centres the statistics for traffic which has been produced, seems unrealistic.

May I wish the planners and planning committee a very happy new year and hope that good sense will prevail in 2016.

2 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 11th August 2015

I wish to object on two grounds: moral and planning.

Firstly the government, councils, schools bemoan children obesity. What is the answer apparently at Pittville close down a school playing field. Due to this sport field being in the grounds it is one of the very few sports fields in the town dog mess free. Sports groups would love to use this but for the last 4 years the school has not allowed anyone to use this facility. Shame on you.

Secondly the proposed access route goes through Starvehall Farm, this was not on the planning application made at the time and therefore the outline planning is invalid. The Farm project should now be made to reapply.

Furthermore no public consultation has taken place over this access onto New Barn Lane . The local residents will have great difficulty getting in/out of their property and will make New Barn Lane very dangerous

Furthermore I cannot see a shade study and my garden will suffer from the houses at the North boundary, these houses will also cause a loss of privacy as they will look into my dining area and lounge. The houses on the West boundary will suffer from the student noise between 2am/4am and may well reduce value are we sure this project is viable

**Comments:** 17th December 2015

Tracey Crouch Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Sport has just announced today a new government strategy for involving young people to be more involved in sport

To approve the closure of this excellent sports field for housing development goes against this strategy

117 New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LQ

**Comments:** 25th July 2015

The proposal seems to have been done without consideration for the existing (approved) plan to develop Starvehall Farm. Particularly, the proposed junction with new New Barn Lane will be too close to the new junction that will be created by building a road between New Barn Lane and Prestbury Road by the Starvehall Farm development. As a result, New Barn Lane residents near these junctions will find it difficult to enter/leave their properties.

103 New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LQ

**Comments:** 7th August 2015

About six years ago, The Highway Dept refused to allow an exit onto New Barn Lane for a new build house that had been put in front of the Planning Committee, this was subsequently overturned because an exit had been allowed at the time further along the road.

Since then, we have added onto the busy road, the Chase area, all extra. Now traffic from Starvehall Farm via the Link road will make entering/exiting homes on NBL even more dangerous.

To inform us that we have to put up with another entrance, quite close to The Link road for the Pittville School houses, is just too much and very selfish of the planners if this is allowed.

No one has mentioned the 16 days of Cheltenham Horseracing when cars are bumper to bumper way back along the road. They do not all go via Southam. this will cause a backlog with cars unable to enter their property.

My suggestion would be, a lot less homes, if any built on Pittville and the entrance/exit onto the quieter Albert Road or Cakebridge.

Planners, where are all these people going to work? Where are the children going to go to school? Doctors, where are they?

99 New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LQ

**Comments:** 17th December 2015

Letter attached.

7 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 1st November 2015

Re this development. I am totally against it.

These houses are not needed and the land is only being sold to fund a sports hall. We have a good Leisure Centre ten minutes away which local schools use.

The school should be keeping the field for outdoor sport for future generations and raising money for the the sports hall through Sport England, National Lottery and Children in Need to name but three.

Having said that, if I have to comment on the proposal of these houses on the field, please note that I do not want to lose privacy.

Also there is a stupid idea for traffic from these houses to exit in New Barn Lane.

This road is congested as it is already and the development at Starvehall Farm is also going to exit on New Barn Lane.

Albert Road is the most obvious exit as this is only busy school term time for short periods and gets the traffic into town quickly and does not congest the roundabout at junction of New Barn Lane and Albert Road which is always busy.

4 Chase View  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3AL

**Comments:**

NONE GIVEN

73 New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LB

**Comments:** 12th December 2015

Adding the traffic generated from this proposal to the traffic already envisaged for the smaller secondary exit on to New Barn Lane from the North West corner of the Starvehall Farm development seems ill conceived. It will at least double the output on to a busy main road at an awkward point for sighting by traffic coming in either direction along New Barn Lane. This is already almost a blind spot, being just over the brow of a hill from the East, and just past a lay-by and place where cars stop for the nearby shop and pedestrians cross the road from the university to reach it, to the West. This is a poor solution to a problem which needn't exist in the first place. It heightens the risk of a serious accident on New Barn Lane. Don't do this.

I get the impression, once again, that councilors are being asked to vote on a business plan, this time for a school pretending to be a business. All this to ensure that we lose more green fields and sports pitches. This is not a common sense solution for Pittville or Cheltenham as a whole.



I object to this proposal in its current form.

Orchid House  
101A New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LQ

**Comments:** 18th December 2015

The proposed access route through Starvehall Farm was not on the original planning application. It should be rejected rather than let developers continue to add extra items & therefore sneak things in after the original application was approved.

The original plan did not allow for the extra traffic so no impact study has been performed on the traffic flow in New Barn Lane. Currently the traffic is heavy, with Starvehall farm traffic it will become very heavy, an extra 58 houses with 100 to 200 cars will make the road very dangerous & very congested.

A change of this magnitude should require both the Starvehall Farm & Pittville School plans to be rejected and restarted from the beginning.

2 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 15th December 2015

I wish to OBJECT to this application. Something has gone badly wrong in the planning process. The Starvehall Farm application was submitted without this access road. Therefore those developers have to resubmit with the access road shown Also 58 houses adds some 20% additional traffic coming onto New Barn Lane I submit to you that a new traffic assessment has to be carried out. With the 800 students 300 new houses the amenities this area will be overwhelmed

Additional my property the kitchen and dining area sit forward much more then the other houses in Greenfields The proposed sir drawing does not take this into effect and we will suffer complete loss of Privacy I cannot see any mention of boundary fences on the North end of the proposals. Do the developers propose to share my boundary fence if so I do not give permission

9 Greenfields  
New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LG

**Comments:** 21st December 2015

Relating to planning application ref 15/01163/OUT .This plan relies on a change to planning already passed for new estates on the Starvehall Farm development .Their planning approval did not allow for a road with direct access to New Barn Lane other than the approved one through the centre of that estate. When the application was approved it did not take into consideration an extra 58 buildings needing to access New Bar Lane.

Ordinary residents are not allowed to change plans passed by your department to suit themselves and so by extension neither should a substantial change of plans passed originally for Starvehall be allowed to be changed on a whim

27 New Barn Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LP

**Comments:** 22nd December 2015

Prestbury Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons:- It is difficult to understand the impact traffic will have on the community. It is being compared with traffic output from Starvehall Farm in 2021, why is this.

Parking details are not shown.

The Prestbury Parish Council also object as this is excessive development in the area, there is already Starvehall Farm, the University development and this is a loss of Green Space and playing fields area within the conservation area.

This application does not comply with the following planning policies:-

GE2 Private Green Spaces.  
BE1 Open space in conservation area  
CP3 Sustainable Environment

63 Albert Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2RB

**Comments:** 18th January 2016

Letter attached.

61 Albert Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2RB

**Comments:** 18th January 2016

Letter attached.

**Comments:** 20th January 2016

Letter attached.