

## Appendix 5 - Comments made on outline planning application 17/00011/OUT (crematorium access roads)

**Note: The planning application referenced Route A (via Imjin Rd) and Route B (along the southern boundary of the cemetery). Therefore the comments below reference routes A and B. However readers need to be aware that the Cabinet report of 7th March refers to the Imjin Rd route as route C**

	Support for		
	Route B	Route C/A (see note above)	Comments
5 Imjin Road	n	n	<p>I object to both of these routes for access to the planned chapel &amp; crematorium for the following reasons:</p> <p>The amenity of the field will be severely affected. A road running through the middle or at the edge the playing field will restrict access and make it unsafe for children to play, dogs to be walked and for ball games to be played. These are all activities that the residents of Priors estate, Oakley, Whaddon, Prestbury and beyond would lose local access to if this application is approved.</p> <p>It will increase noise, traffic congestion and pollution on the estate especially due to the nature of funerals with lots of people arriving and leaving at the same time.</p> <p>The increase in noise and congestion will definitely be more prominent on Imjin road where many residents use on street parking, which in places effectively turns it into a single track road.</p> <p>This problem can already be seen on days when football matches are held in Priors field, where the road becomes extremely congested when all players and families leave at once. I also feel that this is counterintuitive to the recently imposed 20MPH speed limit. This was designed to make the estate safer for vulnerable residents and increasing the traffic load on the estate will not help to achieve this.</p>
3 Somme Road	y		Letter available to view in Documents Tab (see planning applicationb 17/00011/OUT)
14 Ladysmith Road	n?		<p>I am a resident of Ladysmith road and and writing to say that I will be directly affected if it is decided that the lane behind the houses on the road will be used for access to the new crematorium.</p> <p>Whilst the lane has been problematic as it is overgrown and is used as a dumping ground, I am not sure that it is going to be suitable alternative for access to the crematorium either. The gardens attached to these houses in the area are not very big at all and so the cars would be traveling very close to the properties and would definitely cause a noise issue. ( who wil provide new fences or walls for the end of the residents gardens?? ). Also I am concerned about the trees and the wildlife in this area. ( birds, squirrels, shrews etc ).What will happen to the evergreen trees lining the existing cemetery entrance and the big trees inbetween the track and the current entry lane?? As the track is only big enough for one way traffic are the trees going to be removed to accommodate more cars or is it going to be one way in on the current entry road and one way out on the track if this is the option decided.? Also you say that the track will be locked when not in use. This will not deter people from entering the area when it is isn't being used and so I am not sure this will reduce any of the anti social behaviour that currently exists.</p> <p>I think before a decision is made, more information needs to be provided for both options so an informed decision can be made by all.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
93 Imjin Road		n	<p>We strongly oppose the application for the road to be extended up Imjin Road and across the playing field, how are the children that play football on a weekend going to cross this road, we are a family estate where our children go outside to play and do we really want hearses and grief stricken families driving up our road every 15mins especially during the 6 weeks holiday when children will be outside playing.</p> <p>What will happen to the people who walk there dogs up the field, where will they park.</p> <p>Where will the football players park when they are using the field</p> <p>How is this going to be policed to stop the joy riders spinning around on it, as we have issues with speeding on this road as it is.</p> <p>Also we are very concerned about the HIGH RISK to flooding,</p> <p>We have issue's with parking up here now as most homes have 2 cars and cars are parked on both sides of the road, also what will happen when it is rubbish day?</p>
8 Kimberley Walk	y	n	<p>I write in support of the planning application for option B for the new cemetery to be approached via the existing track at the back of Ladysmith Road with the provision this road be improved and kept locked out of hours to avoid antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>I oppose and object to the planning application for option A and believe that residents on Priors Road and myself would prefer to see the play area left as open space to be enjoyed and not be spoilt by the flow of funeral courtage every day. Dog walkers, children go there to raise their spirits and play games. It is a place of enjoyment and happiness.</p> <p>The mourners deserve respect and a quiet and more dignified approach to their loved ones final destination. On Imjin Road there are cars parked on both sides leaving only a narrow gap so a long stream of traffic would cause problems and blockages. It would make it difficult for emergency vehicles to approach at that time. There are quite a few disabled and elderly residents who may require emergency services.</p>
22 Ladysmith Road	y	n	Letter available to view in Documents Tab (see planning applicationb 17/00011/OUT)
6 Ladysmith Road	n?	n	Letter available to view in Documents Tab (see planning applicationb 17/00011/OUT)
65 Imjin Road		n	Letter available to view in Documents Tab (see planning applicationb 17/00011/OUT)
2 Imjin Road	n?	n	<p>My partner and I moved to Imjin Road just over a year ago. We object to the proposals because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the road already has a problem with cars driving too fast.</li> <li>2.it is already a busy road, made worse by the chip shop parking, not sure how they were allowed to expand with no further provisions for traffic and parking</li> <li>3.the road for the crematorium will no doubt be a stepping stone for a through road up to the new estate, we suspect this is as much a part of plan (A) as the crematorium. If this were the case it would be outrageously bad for Imjin Road.</li> <li>4. the area beyond the playing fields is beautiful and should be protected from any further damage</li> </ol> <p>plan A is totally unacceptable to us</p> <p>plan B is the better of the two, though we still object as we do not want any more traffic, it is already a problem that needs a solution not making worse</p> <p>thank you for your time</p>
5 Blackberry Field	y	y	I support this application if it helps enable the delivery of the important enhancements to the town's crematorium facilities
55 Salamanca Road	n	n	We understand the need to expand the crematorium but to dig up green fields that people walk dogs on and play football is wrong, the other route is too narrow and would directly give us more road noise and pollution, there must be another route or alternative solution

89 Imjin Road	y	n	I live in Imjin road, & I believe that an access road via Imjin road & playing fields would spoil the playing fiedpld & bring more traffic down Imjin road where children play, & where there a lot of cars parked. I believe that access via ladysmith road would be better, & also that it already exists as a pathway
42 Ladysmith Road			<p>I wish to point out that for route alignment B (cemetery / Ladysmith Road) that there is buried drainage infrastructure (a culvert) within the vicinity of this access track which conveys flow from the ditch running along the cemetery boundary. During heavy winter weather and where flow exceeds the capacity of the culvert, run-off is re-directed towards the access track (Route B) between the cemetery and the rear gardens of Ladysmith Road and flows along it.</p> <p>The new development should incorporate upgraded drainage measures along the southern side of the cemetery considering previous surface water studies within the area. It is not clear that drainage measures from the FAS scheme referred to in the Design Statement would accommodate this development.</p> <p>The development should incorporate adequate drainage capacity considering actual flow within watercourses and run-off within the area.</p> <p>Environmental screens should be considered for the change of use of the track and for open field areas for Route B if adopted</p>
33 Imjin Road	y	n	<p>I wish to vote for plan b for several reasons</p> <p>there are four roads that exit imjin road - burma avenue, imjin court and salamanca road</p> <p>the busy traffic flow will disrupt the funeral processions, delivery service vehicles, visitors to the crem and residents.</p> <p>I am against any plan that would possibly jeopardise the free green spaces we have currently on the estate</p> <p>The Occupiers of 16 Imjin Road have requested they be included as an occupant is disabled and they are not able to get into town nor do they have computer access</p> <p>On Saturday and Sundays there are football matches held at the field at the top of Imjin Road - just the extra 10-15 cars causes awful traffic delays, with the road not being wide enough for traffic to pass in both directions,</p> <p>As you come out of Imjin Road you have a pelican crossing, yellow box and traffic lights, this prevents free flow of traffic, plus cars parking undoable yellow lines outside the shops (chip shop, chinese takeaway and haridressers which adds to the madness.</p>
46 Ladysmith Road	y		<p>I am in strong support of Option B as a new access route to the cemetery.</p> <p>The existing track at the back of the properties on Ladysmith Road is a focus for anti-social behaviour and is badly littered. I understand it has also been used as an access route in a number of recent burglaries. Re-purposing this land provides the opportunity to tackle all the above, together with sensitive landscaping, to support the development of the cemetery</p>
8 Imjin Road		n	<p>I object to the use of Imjin Road as access for the new crematorium. We live just inside Imjin Road near Priors Rd and the traffic on Imjin is very heavy already. Due to Simpsons Fish and Chip Shop parking in this area is also heavy and Imjin Road for a vast majority of the time is one line traffic. Please take heavy traffic on Imjin into consideration when making your decision. Thank you</p>
62 Salamanca Road			<p>The anti social behaviour which Mr Colin Hay has mentioned in his recent letter that takes place on the track behind the houses on ladysmith and Salamanca road actually takes place in the garages which also run infront of the track. Mr Colin Hay has stated if the road was built where the track was it would stop the anti social behaviour and extreme litter as it would be locked at nights. It would not stop the anti social behaviour as they would still be able to access the garages. The garages also need some security to prevent access as this is where it all goes on. Only garages owners should be able to get in there. Also the houses that run along the back of the track on Salamanca road have had a problem with rat infestations which is a concern if they are to dig right behind the houses.</p>
69 Imjin Road	y	n	Letter available to view in Documents Tab
10 Kimberley Walk	y	n	<p>We cannot see anything in the Design and Access Statement submitted to support the need for either Route A or B. The report suggests there are "significant logistical challenges" with routes within the site, but no justification is offered.</p> <p>If the need can be established, then Route B is the only sensible option. The fact that Route A is being considered at all seems incredible, since it would be entirely unsuitable and suggests that there has not been much thought put into the scheme to date.</p> <p>The junction of Imjin Road with Prior's Road is not set up to allow a significant increase in traffic, particularly so near to other junctions and traffic lights. Imjin Road itself is too narrow to suit additional traffic (particularly construction traffic). The playing fields car park gets particularly busy at weekends for sporting use, and would not allow traffic to the crematorium to flow freely.</p> <p>If Route B is to be adopted, then the need for it needs to be firmly established</p>
Grey Gables Southam Road	y?	n	<p>Although we are in general agreement that car parking and access to the Cheltenham Cemetery needs improving we are opposed to one of the proposed access roads, namely Route A, Imjin Road.</p> <p>Imjin Road is one of the main routes to the residential housing development and access to Imjin Road is at a very busy and dangerous junction close to a pedestrian crossing, Sainsburys Supermarket traffic lights and the busy entrance to Whaddon Road.</p> <p>We have to make frequent visits to Imjin Road and we know from experience that access to and from Priors Road is not easy. Also, Imjin Road is quite narrow and due to residents cars parked on both sides of the road reduces the remaining carriageway to just over one cars width. If vehicles from the cemetery were also using this access it could cause major traffic problems and also be a danger to pedestrians and children in the area. Access to the playing fields and early years playground is also via Imjin Road and extra traffic would be a danger to children and parents using these facilities.</p> <p>Although we are not happy with Route B, via Ladysmith Road, being used, it would probably be a better alternative if no other improved solution can be found.</p>
50 Salamanca Road	y	n	<p>To Summarise: We would strongly object to Imjin Road ( Route A ) being used as access to the new Cheltenham Cemetery.</p> <p>I object to the use of Imjin Road being used as it is so very busy already and the playing field and land beyond should be kept as it is natural for walkers/dog walkers. It makes sense to me to use the track which goes behind houses and up side of field. Seems less disruption and more straight forward route.</p>
25 Goodrich Road	y?	n	<p>I object to Route A because not only does this blight my property which will overlook this road, but will cause potential congestion in Imjin Road. It makes much more sense to exit straight to a main road as proposed in Route B, although I am unconvinced that the case has been made for a secondary exit requiring either option.</p> <p>Additionally, I am concerned that already the car park and area to the changing rooms and further to the swings is already a meeting point for off road bikers and others at late hours and despite locked gates may cause further nuisance to residents.</p> <p>Finally, I am extremely concerned that this could be used as an incremental extension of home building and would appreciate an assurance this is not paving the way for further development as an extension of the properties at Imjin Road.</p>

49 Imjin Road			This road is only going in so that Goodrich Road can join it and keep the rich in Battledown quiet. I hope you do it with learner drivers doing three point turns and Refuse lorries doing their collections in between parked cars what will happen to the poor old Hearse & Limo with the family sat in the back
1 Kimberley Walk	y	n	I support the application providing on the condition that the access road is Option B. viz: The current track at the rear of Ladysmith Road. Option A. Imjin road is not suitable. It is already substantially restricted by parked cars, and excessively used by driving instructors for training learner drivers. Any further increase in traffic would place an unacceptable burden on residents.
51 Imjin Road	n	n	I think that both the routes will disturb the area and make it really busy and much more hectic. It's a lovely place to live at the moment and there is access to the cemetery just down the road and there is no need for it. The park is a safe place for children to play and it's an enclosed area. On Imjin Road a lot of cars park on either side of the road and it already is hard to get through sometimes.
23 Goodrich Road			Can appreciate why new access road is needed. Presumably these are alternative routes though this is not clear on site map.
			Both routes are near water courses: Route A adjacent to Wymans Brook and Route B to stream along Cemetery fence.
			Clarification of flooding risk is needed. Field is already very prone to waterlogging.
			Many manholes (presumably over drainage channels) have recently been highlighted. There are more than we were ever aware of!
			Route B is preferable as it causes minimal disruption to playing field area.
			Will there be any means to prevent road being used by young racers? i.e. gates and/or speed bumps. There is already enough evening disturbance in Priors Farm car park.
45 Imjin Road	y	n	There have been active badger sets along Cemetery fence. Will Route B disturb these? Of the two routes proposed, it is clear that Route B will cause the least disruption on an ongoing basis and will not cause the playing fields to require huge modification going forward. The facilities can remain and it will continue to be a safe space for the local community to use.
47 Imjin Road	y	n	Route A would be a huge concern in terms of traffic in the area as the majority of house on Imjin Road have no off street parking meaning that cars are parked on both sides of the road. Congestion is an issue on the road during busy times as it is - to introduce whole new streams of cars using the road would be a huge problem. Of the two routes being proposed it is obvious that Route B which follows the old abandoned Farm access road is a lot less disruptive than Route A.
			Route B delivers traffic out directly onto Bouncers Lane and does not involve changing the playing fields layout and facilities.
			Route A would not only impact the playing fields but would also put traffic out onto Imjin Road which is a heavily parked road (both sides of the road leaving enough space for 1 vehicle in the middle) with most houses having no off road parking. Also Imjin Road and the rest of the estate has a 20mph speed limit - this was done for a very good reason, and turning Imjin Road into a exit route from the cemetery, or an access road for heavy vehicles, would seem to fly in the face of that decision.
			So I support Route B but object to Route A.
			Also you state "The flood alleviation scheme has been overlaid on the attached proposed access route options to help understand its impact on the new Crematorium scheme and permission has been given by GCC to share and use environmental impact survey work undertaken by their consultants."
			There seems to be no sign of documentation relating to the flood alleviation scheme anywhere on this application.