

APPLICATION NO: 17/02460/FUL		OFFICER: Miss Michelle Payne	
DATE REGISTERED: 19th December 2017		DATE OF EXPIRY : 20th March 2018	
WARD: St Marks		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	New Dawn Homes Ltd		
LOCATION:	Playing Field Adj 10 Stone Crescent, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Erection of 13no. dwellings with associated road and sewers		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	29
Number of objections	27
Number of representations	1
Number of supporting	0

11 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 9th January 2018

A similar application was made some years ago, and my reasons for objecting now are the same as then.

My principle objection is that of traffic management and safety. Wharfdale Square and the surrounding roads are already oversubscribed with parked cars. Not only are there a number of multiple occupancy buildings in the area, with multiple associated vehicles, but the square also attracts local workers who park on the square to walk to work (e.g. adjacent school) or the local bus stop for easy access to GCHQ and the town centre.

The parked cars make a large proportion of the square and connected roads effectively 'single lane', and navigating them is already tricky. In addition to this, the square is extremely heavily loaded with cars during school drop-off and pick-up times. In no way are these roads capable of being used as 'through roads' to an extended development of the neighbourhood.

Further, the sole access road to the square is usually filled with parked cars, making that road also 'single lane'. Frequently, cars have to reverse back into the busy main road (Alstone lane) to avoid drivers exiting the square. This is worse at peak times, and safety issues are compounded by heavy pedestrian traffic crossing the access road to get to the neighbouring school and childrens centre.

Safety issues are not restricted to just the junction with Alstone lane. The main brick-paved areas of Wharfdale square, around the central garden, are currently used as somewhat of a 'shared-space' with local children playing. I have personally witnessed a number of near-misses already, and increasing the general traffic flow around the square will only add to the safety concerns.

Additional buildings will also affect the character of the neighborhood. Increasing traffic and noise, decreasing available space for residents to enjoy, impacting the visual amenity of the area, and impacting road safety.

4 Lucinia Mews
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DR

Comments: 6th January 2018

Thank you for the belated opportunity to comment.

My main concern is the effect on traffic levels on the roads of the existing development. The new houses, if built, would effectively increase the size of the existing development by a quarter. This would increase the traffic flow and hazards in Wharfdale Sq. and Stone Cresc. correspondingly. *What will be done to alleviate this?*

Wharfdale Sq. constitutes the access to my house and garage, so I know well that it and its junctions are already heavily parked much of the time, often on both sides of the narrow twisting road. In particular the ramp to and from Alstone La, and its junctions at both ends, are solidly parked during the school run.

The available plans suggest construction traffic would access the site via Wharfdale Sq. and Stone Cresc. *Large vehicles may not be able negotiate these tight turns safely* when they are heavily parked on both sides. *Size and type of contractors' vehicles should be restricted* e.g. no artics, and/or max. wheelbase length.

The hedge round Wharfdale Sq. makes the east and south corners of the square blind to drivers of most saloon, estate and hatchback cars and small vans. Near-misses at these corners are already common with current occupation and traffic levels, and are likely to increase, and lead to actual accidents, both during construction and after occupation of the new site. *What will be done to alleviate this?*

If contractors' and site workers' vehicles were to park in the existing development during construction, they would quickly swamp and block the existing development. This would be unacceptable for current residents. *Construction traffic must not be allowed to park on the existing development.*

Comments: 16th February 2018

Here is the message I e-mailed to Asset Protection at Severn Trent on 9 Feb. I haven't had a response.

"Good morning. Can you give me some information on your involvement in this proposed development, please?"

A developer is planning to build houses on low ground near my house in Cheltenham. The site currently functions as a sink for surface water from the surrounding higher area. Adjacent houses and roads already flood in wet weather. We understand there are sewers and a culverted stream running under the site.

SWT commented on 21 Dec 2017, but there is no indication of the status of the activities discussed there.

I and some of my neighbours are still concerned that the work may adversely affect drainage and exacerbate flooding. Some of my neighbours already experience flooding and sewage reflux in wet weather. *As preparatory site work has already been done, and the comment deadline is close, we are keen to know the status of SWT's involvement, and would like reassurance that SWT is getting adequate opportunity to identify issues and stipulate safeguards.*

The planning application is 17/02460/FUL. I understand the closing date for comments is 20 Feb 2018. The prospective developer is New Dawn Homes. Their revised drawing, uploaded on 6 Feb 2018 but dated Nov 2017, shows drains and diverted services, and an unidentified broad blue line in the N corner of the site. (The top of the plan is NE, not N as stated there.) Natural drainage from the site is northwestwards, across Brooklyn Road, above and below ground.

Thanks in advance."

Comments: 17th February 2018

Currently the southeast side of Wharfdale Square is effectively a single lane for much or most of the time. For the safety of the increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic, it should be widened to two lanes with a kerbed pavement. A strip could be taken from the central grass area, which is little used.

The trees along the northeast boundary of the site should be replaced. Trees not only absorb atmospheric CO₂, in flood areas they also absorb groundwater. This is a practical beneficial step that takes priority over technicalities of planning rules, land ownership or ransom strips. If the development goes ahead without those trees, and later floods, it will be partly because of the loss of those trees.

The sequence of the proposed site plans isn't clear. The plan submitted on 18 Dec is said to have been superseded, yet the revised one submitted on 6 Feb is also dated Nov 2017, so already existed before the Dec one was submitted.

15 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 7th January 2018

I would like to object to the construction of the 14 new homes. In addition to agreeing to all the points made by the resident at 4 Lucinia Mews, my main concerns are as follows:

- The traffic flow to / from Wharfdale Square will increase significantly throughout the construction of the houses and once they have been built.
- The noise level will increase significantly throughout the construction of the houses.
- During school start and finish times cars are parked alongside the entrance to the square and all around it. This will make it difficult for construction vehicles to enter / exit the site.
- As it has already been pointed out the size of the estate will increase by a quarter. I purchased my house based on the size of the estate, it being out-of-the-way and the noise level. All 3 of these will be impacted.
- Children can regularly be seen playing around the square. This poses a safety issue, as during the construction phase and post the construction this will increase the potential of a traffic related incident occurring, as the traffic to / from the square will increase significantly.
- Waste disposal vehicles have a hard time getting around the square. Construction vehicles will experience the same issues.
- Parking is already very limited for residents. Construction vehicles will elevate this problem further.

Comments: 10th January 2018

I am a resident of Wharfdale Square in Cheltenham.

I was recently made aware of a proposed development of 14 new dwellings which are being built in close proximity to my property. We were kindly made aware of this development late last week by my local Councilor, Sandra Holliday, who has been copied in on this email. She suggested I drop you an email.

Upon finding out about the development I spoke to a number of residents and put in an objection to the development going ahead. A number of the residents also put in objections. The details of my objection can be found on your website, so I won't go through it in this letter.

The reason I am writing this email is to specifically raise a number of concerns that I and a number of residents have regarding the way in which this Planning Application has been handled by Cheltenham Borough Council. We were only made aware of this development late last week and upon speaking to a number of residents in the area some of them were shocked and were not even aware that it was happening.

I would like to understand:

- Why we as residents and as such individuals who are directly impacted by this development were not made aware of this Planning Application upon submission? The number of objections submitted would be far higher if residents had been given ample time to reflect and comment.

- Who in the area has actually been contacted by yourselves to make them aware that this Planning Application had been submitted? There is one way into and out of the potential development so the residents of the following would be affected:

- Wharfdale Square
- Lucinia Mews
- Stone Crescent
- South Bank

- Why work has begun on the land when the Planning Application has not yet been approved? Upon speaking to concerned residents it seems that a gate to the site has already been put into place, trees have been cleared and the land has been marked out by an orange plastic fence. Is the Developer just being presumptuous or has this Planning Application already been approved and we are only just now being made aware of it as a formality?

- How will the submitted objections will be handed? As above, has this Planning Application already been approved?

I would like to ask that proper canvassing is carried out to gauge the views / opinions of the local residents prior to approving this Planning Application. At last count there are 15 objections from concerned residents and one from the Cheltenham Civic Society. I can only assume that the number of objections will increase if more people are made aware of the development and potential impact.

Please feel free to contact me at this email address if you want to discuss any of these points further. If you would like to discuss this matter over the phone please send me your number and I will call in.

Thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.

Comments: 13th January 2018

In addition to the comments already made, in the Public Comments Section it has Total Consulted down as 48. I believe this to be inaccurate as a number of people have already pointed out we have only in the last week and a half been made aware of this development. Please can you provide clarification on which 48 residents / properties were made aware of this development? It should be noted that there are about 65 properties that would be impacted by this development residing in South Bank, Wharfdale Square, Lucinia Mews and Stone Crescent.

Comments: 28th January 2018

I have submitted a FoIA request to customerrelations@cheltenham.gov.uk, as I do not feel due process was followed when 14/01276/OUT, which underpins this Planning Application, was

submitted and approved. I would expect a response to my FoIA request prior to any decision being made on this current Planning Application.

Comments: 2nd February 2018

Article in Gloucestershire Live about this Planning Application - <http://www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk/news/cheltenham-news/fears-plans-homes-near-cheltenham-1148653>

The Council have admitted the following:

According to Cheltenham Borough Council's website, 48 households have been consulted, but the planning officer admitted some of these were "incorrectly selected".

The officer also said that "due to an oversight", notices about the application were not put up in the neighbourhood until January 17 - eight days after the deadline for community feedback.

Comments: 20th February 2018

I can think of a number of reasons why the Planning Application should not be granted. As a resident of the area, I feel I am best placed to know the problems and issues the proposed new development will cause. My concerns about this particular Planning Application are as follows:

- Increased traffic to / from the area during the development phase and once the houses have been built. According to the amended plans the proposed new development will be for 10 houses - 3 bedroom (1 of), 4 bedroom (3 of) and 5 bedroom (6 of). This will total 45 bedrooms. Before the amendment the proposed new development was for 14 houses - 3 bedroom (6 of), 4 bedroom (5 of) and 5 bedroom (3 of). So a total of 53 bedrooms. The area already suffers from high levels of congestion during school pick up / drop off times and once people have finished work. Residents of Wharfdale Square, Lucinia Mews, Stone Crescent and South Bank will be heavily impacted by this increase in traffic, as there is a single entry / exit point to the area. The reduction in the number of houses in the amended plan and therefore fewer bedrooms doesn't really alleviate the issue by much. Table 5 / Bullet 1 of the Cheltenham Local Plan (Matters which may be the subject of Planning Obligations) states the following - "works to provide safe access to a site, to accommodate safely local increases in traffic due to the development, and to discourage the additional traffic from using unsuitable local roads".

- Reduction in the amount of parking available in the area. Parking is already at a premium in the area. An average of 3.8 cars has been allocated per house (This means at least 38 more vehicles.) in the proposed new development. This will increase exponentially if the dwellings are Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO). This was the reason for mentioning the number of bedrooms in my first point. What are CBCs parking guidelines - specifically what is the minimum level of car parking that proposed new developments should offer, according to its size? As I do not believe that the proposed new development provides sufficient parking space to meet these requirements. The proposed development is likely to generate a significant increase in the amount of local traffic and as such any loss of on-road parking could mean the loss of a valuable residential amenity. There are only 20 parking spaces shown on the Proposed Site Plan but the NDH literature (revised design and access statement) states there are 21 parking spaces. Which one is correct and where are the other 17 - 18 cars going to park? Possibly in the garage which will almost certainly be used for storage? Parking concerns were highlighted in the comments put in by 3 and 6 Stone Crescent when the 2014 Outline Planning Application (14/01276/OUT) was raised against the same plot of land. It looks like these comments were not taken into consideration. There are a number of HMOs mentioned in these comments, which have 4 - 5 cars each. Note, the Planning Office recently approved 16/00056/FUL for a house on Stone Crescent to be converted from a 6 bedroom to a 7 bedroom HMO. Where does it all stop!

- Please take the time to visit the local area at the pertinent times (e.g. school start times, school end times, in the evening when people have returned from work, when the refuse collections are taking place, etc.) prior to making a decision about the 2017 Planning Application. This clearly

has not happened up to now as is apparent from comments made by other residents in their objections. In a similar vein I would expect the NDH literature (revised design and access statement) to be updated to reflect accurate images of the parking situation, as the image shown on Page 5 was clearly taken at a time of day when there is plenty of available parking. See the image provided in the objection letter provided by 6 Stone Crescent to see an accurate representation of the parking situation in Stone Crescent. See the images in Gloucestershire Live (<https://www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk/news/cheltenham-news/fears-plans-homes-near-cheltenham-1148653>) to see an accurate representation of the parking situation at school pick up time. A decision must not be based on an inaccurate representation of the current situation.

- Children can regularly be seen playing around the area and there are also children walking to / from the school during school pick up and drop off times. This poses a health and safety issue, as during the development phase and post the development phase traffic flow will increase significantly, which also increases the chances of a traffic related incident / accident occurring. Note that there are no pavements in Wharfdale Square, so individuals (adults and children alike) are regularly seen walking on the roads. Residents of the local area have over the years become aware of this but there are still a number of 'near misses' in the area. The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 14.25) states the following - "New development can endanger highway safety if poorly located or built without adequate infrastructure. Policy TP 1 seeks to limit development, which may harm highway safety."

- The proposed new development does not have any pavements according to the Proposed Site Plan. If this is correct then this poses a health and safety issue to residents of the proposed new development and should be addressed.

- Hedges around Wharfdale square are renowned for blocking and impairing the vision of individuals driving around the square (i.e. lots of blind corners). There have been a number of near misses on the square due to the hedges being overgrown and not thinned appropriately, thereby making it difficult to see oncoming vehicles and increasing the potential of a traffic related incident / accident occurring. This has been highlighted to CBC's Parks and Landscapes department a number of times but they have said they only cut the hedges once a year. Construction vehicles entering / leaving the site via one entry / exit point may further exacerbate the issue as the roads are very narrow and you can just about get cars driving by each other side by side.

- The previous points will all result in highway safety being compromised. The following needs to be considered: traffic generation, road capacity, means of access, visibility, car parking and effects on pedestrians / cyclists.

- The 2017 Planning Application goes against a number of the areas highlighted in Core Policy 4 of the Cheltenham Local Plan (Safe and Sustainable Living). See Note 1 - "In assessing impact on amenity, the Council will have regard to matters including loss of sunlight and/or diffuse daylight (see note 2), loss of outlook, loss of privacy (see note 3), and potential disturbance from noise, smells, dust, fumes, vibration, glare from artificial lights (see also policy CP 3 (sustainable environment), hours of operation, and travel patterns, including heavy goods vehicles (see also policy CP 5 (sustainable transport))." The noise level in the area will increase during the development phase and once the houses have been built. The dust and dirt levels in the area will increase during the development phase. Note, this estate in its current form was completed in 2001. This will cause existing residents unnecessary disturbance and disruption to residents of the existing development.

- The NDH literature (revised design and access statement) states - "This planning application can ensure that there is adequate access for emergency and refuse access to the properties." Waste disposal vehicles already have a hard time getting around the area. They can regularly be seen reversing in and driving out of roads off the main square, as there is no turning area. Construction vehicles will experience the same issues. This will increase the potential of a traffic related incident / accident occurring. The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 14.45 and 14.46) states

the following respectively - "Heavy goods traffic has increased considerably in the last 10 years, and with it problems of safety and air pollution." and "Heavy goods vehicles are an essential component of the economy of Cheltenham and those with local destinations will need to have access throughout the network. These vehicle movements are best accommodated on the main highway network using positive measures designed to steer them on to main roads and to discourage them from seeking alternative routes through sensitive areas." I consider construction vehicles to be of the same ilk as HGVs and as such believe that the proposed new development is a direct contravention of these principles.

See Consultee Comment from the Joint Waste Team -

"The access road connecting to Stone Crescent must be constructed to a suitable standard to allow up to a 26 ton refuse vehicle to service each week.

The properties within this development will be required to present their waste and recycling receptacles at the kerbside of the road and I note that there doesn't seem to be any pavements in place? This will pose a problem with full and then empty receptacles causing obstructions for motorists/residents driving into the development. In such a development elsewhere we have had regular complaints about driveways being blocked with bins after the collection has taken place. With nowhere off the road for the bins to go, this issue would be repeated here."

- The NDH literature (revised design and access statement) states - "The proposal will, as much as possible, maintain boundary planting (and replace it with native species where necessary), but the site is otherwise devoid of any features of interest. The submitted arboriculture report deals with the trees off-site, and it is noted that the site is capable of being developed without impact on these trees. The new landscaping will greatly improve the landscaping of this disused piece of land. " However, trees have already been felled (circa 20 - 30) on the site of the proposed new development which previously protected the estate against the elements and provided homes to breeding birds and other wildlife including bats. The Cheltenham Local Plan (Policy GE 5 and Policy GE 6) discusses Protection and Replacement of Trees and Trees and Development respectively. Have these policies been taken into consideration during the felling of these trees? Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 6.15) states the following - "Human life, health and well-being depend on a healthy natural environment. Vegetation contributes to the physical well-being of a town by absorbing carbon dioxide and releasing oxygen, so improving the quality of air. Acting as a baffle, it can also absorb and so reduce noise." The area may now be more prone to flooding than it already is. The Cheltenham Local Plan Objective 30 states the following - "to reduce the risk of flooding and flood damage." The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 13.4) states the following - "The primary responsibility for safeguarding land and property against flooding lies with the owner." A number of the houses, which back onto the proposed new development in Lucinia Mews currently experience issues when it rains heavily (i.e. flooded toilets, drainage problems, etc.). A local resident has commented that Brooklyn Road experiences "localised flooding during and after periods of heavy rain." Has anyone in the Planning Office looked into this aspect, as it was highlighted to them during a meeting with them on 5th February 2018? The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 13.15 and 13.17) states the following respectively - "Development usually increases the area within a site covered by impermeable materials. This will result in an increase in the quantity and rate of surface water run-off to watercourses. Many watercourses are susceptible to flooding, or are only capable of accommodating run-off under pre-development conditions. Additional run-off from development can instigate or exacerbate flooding. In addition, development within flood plains, as well as increasing the risk of flooding, can disrupt existing flood flow regimes, which, in turn, can result in damage to buildings, property and infrastructure. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems has been published which sets out in greater detail the requirements for sustainable drainage measures." and "PPG25 states that it is the responsibility of the developer to provide an assessment of whether proposed development is likely to be affected by flooding and whether the development will increase flood risk elsewhere. An assessment may also be needed of the risk of groundwater or local flooding due to overland sheet flow or run-off exceeding the capacity of drainage systems during prolonged or intense rainfall. The developer must satisfy the Council that any flood risk

arising from proposed development can be successfully managed with the minimum environmental effect." I believe that the proposed new development is a direct contravention of these principles. Please can you confirm that a Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out by the Developer and if yes please make it available for public consumption? Things will get worse for local residents now the trees have been felled, as they would have absorbed some of the rainwater during heavy rainfall. There seems to be a lack of transparency as we haven't yet been definitively informed who carried out this tree felling and for what purpose (i.e. assuming someone did something is not good enough). The land was sold to New Dawn Homes mid-2016 according to GCC yet we have the following statements from various individuals which are contradictory:

"I can let you know that the land is Glos County Council owned. There are no TPO's and the site is not in a conservation area. The felled trees were not too special and there is an (outline) proposal to plant new trees if the site gets permission. It is assumed that the county felled the trees but there is no case to answer." - Sandra Holliday (Email)

"I am waiting to hear who authorised this work to be carried out." - Sandra Holliday (Letter)

"The trees that are being felled are privately owned and are not protected nor are they worthy of protection. Whilst we understand the concerns of residents on this point, the council is not in a position to prevent this work." - Martin Chandler (statement in Glos Live)

"I am not aware of any tree-felling works to have taken place by us at this site." - New Dawn Homes Rep (Callum Hughes) (statement in Glos Live)

- I understand there is a culverted stream / brook (River Chelt possibly?) that runs under the site. The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 13.34) states the following - "Both the Council and the Environment Agency are in general opposed to the culverting of watercourses because of the adverse ecological, flood defence and other effects that are likely to arise, unless there is no reasonably practicable alternative or if the detrimental effects of culverting would be so minor that they would not justify a more costly alternative. Where practicable, the Council seeks to restore culverted watercourses to open channels and will require existing culverts to be opened up where they are affected by development proposals. Culverting can exacerbate flooding and destroy wildlife and amenity habitats. Where exceptionally culverting is permitted, suitable measures of mitigation or compensation must be provided (including the opening up of other sections of culvert and enhancing open stretches of watercourse within close proximity to the development). Such measures would be secured within the development by condition or planning obligation." Please can the Developer highlight what they intend to do with this culverted stream?

- A more recent Arboriculture Survey is required. The last one was submitted in February 2014. Are there any trees on the land for the proposed new development which have associated TPOs? Are there any roots belonging to existing trees which will potentially interfere with the proposed new development and as such need to be dealt with if this Planning Application is given the go-ahead? A Tree Protection Plan will also need to be produced to protect those trees to be retained during any building works.

- An ecological appraisal carried out in support of 14/01276/OUT (previous Planning Application on the land) says "There are no specific records of bats within 1 km of the site". An ecological appraisal carried out in support of 17/02460/FUL (current Planning Application on the land) says "No protected species were recorded during the survey, although the habitats present provided opportunities for protected species: Breeding birds. The cherry tree on Site provided suitable habitat for breeding birds." However, a comment made against 17/02460/FUL (current Planning Application) by a resident of Brooklyn Road says the following - "We regularly see many birds and bats around these trees so we believe further surveys should be carried out to ensure these species remain protected." I suggest further work is done to actually assess what the wildlife impact will be, as what is currently published is contradictory." The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 6.16 and 6.21) state the following respectively - "Green spaces are essential in providing habitats

for a wide range of flora and fauna. Some green spaces, particularly the more extensive and relatively undisturbed grounds of large houses and non-residential properties, may also harbour legally protected species such as barn owls, badgers and bats. Green spaces are therefore of significance to nature conservation." and "In its role as custodian of public green spaces the Council will seek opportunities to improve the value of existing spaces. PPG17 sets out that local authorities need to assess existing and future community and visitor needs for open spaces." I believe that the proposed new development is a direct contravention of these principles.

- Severn Trent Water have said the following:

"Severn Trent Water advise that there are public sewers located within this site. Public sewers have statutory protection and may not be built close to, directly over or be diverted without consent. You are advised to contact Severn Trent Water to discuss the proposals. Severn Trent will seek to assist in obtaining a solution which protects both the public sewer and the building. Please note, when submitting a Building Regulations application, the building control officer is required to check the sewer maps supplied by Severn Trent and advise them of any proposals located over or within 3 meters of a public sewer. Under the provisions of Building Regulations 2000 Part H4, Severn Trent can direct the building control officer to refuse building regulations approval."

Have STW been approached for comment and if yes why aren't their comments posted? I have provided CBC's Planning Office with an email chain between local Councillors (John Webster, Sandra Holliday, Mike Skinner, Charmian Sheppard and David Fidgeon) and the ex-lead of the area's Neighbourhood Watch Scheme stating the following - "the land behind has lots of sewer pipework underneath it and I believe and a ducted watercourse and can't be built on even though it is CC property." I would like to understand what has changed which has now made building on this land possible and whether it will negatively impact the residents of the existing development in any way. The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 13.38) states the following - "Responsibility for sewerage and sewage treatment lies with Severn Trent Water, which has a duty to provide such public sewers as may be necessary for effectively draining their area, and to provide sewage disposal works which deal effectively with the contents of sewers. Development proposed over or adjacent to a public sewer which would make maintenance or replacement of that sewer unacceptably difficult or would prejudice the structural integrity of the sewer will generally be unacceptable." I believe that the proposed new development is a direct contravention of this principle.

Residents of the local area have sent STW an email asking for their view on this proposed new development. I would also expect the Planning Officer to do the same and publish the results.

- The building of residential homes will ruin a much needed recreational area and reduce green space in this part of the town. This land could easily have been made into a children's play area. My understanding was that the land in question was originally going to be used as a nature reserve by the local school. Why did this plan not come to fruition?

- The Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 states that "a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land." We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Table 5 / Bullet 12 of the Cheltenham Local Plan (Matters which may be the subject of Planning Obligations) states the following - "facilities or measures to offset the loss of or impact on any resource, such as woodland or open space, present on a site prior to development". The Cheltenham Local Plan (Para 6.8) states the following - "Green space in the urban environment has worth for its townscape, environmental, wildlife and recreational values. PPG17 on Sport, Open Space and Recreation, published in July 2002, describes the contribution open spaces make to people's quality of life, and in making towns and cities attractive places in which people will want to live. It states that open spaces should be recognised not only for their recreational and community value, but also for their contribution to urban quality, and for supporting wildlife. The Borough Council will take these issues into account when making

development control decisions and formulating local plan policies." I believe that the proposed new development is a direct contravention of this principle.

- The NDH literature (revised design and access statement) states - "The application site itself is a vacant piece of land which has been fenced off for some time with metal gates." This is incorrect as the metal gate that is at the end of Stone Crescent now was actually a metal fence originally. This metal fence was funded by residents (CBC contributed £500 via grant and residents made up the rest). The fence cost over £1750. CBC wouldn't pay for it as they said it sat on the original Developer's land. The original wooden fencing erected by Barratt Homes back in 2001 had been vandalised and panels had been removed to enable people to use it as a cut through. Several houses had been broken into and groups of youths would use it late at night to cut through to the playing fields. A number of Councillors who have already been mentioned above were aware of this situation. The metal fence which residents funded has now been replaced by someone with a metal gate and is sometimes left unlocked, thereby defeating the point of having it there in the first place! This can be seen in the following article - <https://www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk/news/cheltenham-news/fears-plans-homes-near-cheltenham-1148653>. As yet no one has admitted to replacing the fence with a gate. I would expect this situation to be investigated and residents who funded the fence to be compensated accordingly. Collateral has been provided to GCC and members of CBC to substantiate my claim that residents funded this fence.

- There are 6 Objections and 1 Neutral comment from Stone Crescent residents. As there are only 11 houses in Stone Crescent please can you clarify the statement in the NDH literature (revised design and access statement) which states the following - "5.3 - The local neighbours have been door knocked to show them the planning application and most concerns were regarding making sure that the access road was not blocked during deliveries." If the statement is correct then why would 54% (doesn't include the Neutral comment) of residents on Stone Crescent have raised an objection? I would like to understand which 'local neighbours' were actually canvassed as the NDH literature (revised design and access statement) states - "The application site comprises a rectangular piece of land located to the north of the King George V playing field (a protected open space), and to the south of the former Gloucestershire Marketing Society site (wholesale fruit and vegetable market) which is now a housing estate of 60 dwellings developed by Barratt Homes in 2002". So knowing this I would have expected all 60 dwellings to be door knocked for their view.

Sandra Holliday has commented as follows when asked whether NDH had canvassed impacted residents about the proposed new development but worryingly none of our publicly elected representatives seem to be willing to follow this matter up:

To Resident 1 - "Unfortunately what New Dawn Homes have said in their literature may be not true or even misleading but that is out of everybody's hands."

To Resident 2 - "I can assure you that I will keep a watchful eye on this application as I have had no communication from any local resident who has been door knocked by New Dawn Homes despite them saying this in one of their documents."

- The NDH literature (revised design and access statement) states - "Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is clear that for decision taking, the presumption in favour of sustainable development means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay". However Paragraph 13 of the NPPF states - "The National Planning Policy Framework constitutes guidance⁸ for local planning authorities and decision-takers both in drawing up plans and as a material consideration in determining applications." Guidance is defined as "advice or information aimed at resolving a problem or difficulty, especially as given by someone in authority." As such it may or may not be followed dependent on external factors. What the NDH literature (revised design and access statement) does not state is that "where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless: - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies

in this Framework taken as a whole; or - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted." As such, due care and consideration should be taken prior to making a decision about the 2017 Planning Application. This does not mean making a decision without knowing the full facts as the NDH literature (revised design and access statement) seems to be intimidating.

- Due to an 'oversight' Site Notices were not originally displayed for the 2017 Planning Application. When alerted to this fact, Site Notices were then placed in discrete locations and wrapped around lampposts making them near impossible to read. An image in Gloucestershire Live (<https://www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk/news/cheltenham-news/fears-plans-homes-near-cheltenham-1148653>) shows how these Site Notices were displayed. An email was sent requesting that they be placed in more prominent locations and made more visible to local residents. This didn't happen. This was again requested in a meeting with Planning Officers on 5th February 2018. The yellow site notices were replaced with blue site notices when amendments were made to the development plans. However, they were displayed in the same places and in the same manner.

- Letters of notification were originally not sent out to all impacted residents and the Planning Office admitted that in some cases letters of notification were sent out to houses which were 'incorrectly selected'. Following a meeting with the Planning Office they agreed to send letters of notification out to a more focussed and accurate list of impacted residents if amendments were made to the 2017 Planning Application. They followed through with this when the recent amendments were made to the 2017 Planning Application.

- With regards to the NDH literature (revised design and access statement):

o The second image shown on Page 6 is of a house on South Bank and not on Stone Crescent as stated in the NDH literature (Revised design and access statement). I suggest this is corrected.

o It states "There is no planning history for the site itself." This is not true - see Planning Application 14/01276/OUT. I suggest this is corrected.

- The press got involved as we were not getting the support or answers to our questions from the Council and its representatives. See the following article - <https://www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk/news/cheltenham-news/fears-plans-homes-near-cheltenham-1148653>

- The Construction Method Statement is not on the Website against the 2017 Planning Application. This was requested by a Consultant in the 2014 Outline Planning Application (14/01276/OUT). Please make this statement publically available

"No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall:

- i. specify the type and number of vehicles;
- ii. provide for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iii. provide for the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iv. provide for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- v. provide for wheel washing facilities;
- vi. specify the intended hours of construction operations;
- vii. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction

Reason: To reduce the potential impact on the public highway."

- A FoIA Request submitted against the 2014 Outline Planning Application (14/01276/OUT) revealed that due process was not followed for this particular application. This led to the Outline Planning Application being approved subject to a S106 without any real input or opposition from

local residents (4 of the 7 residents that objected weren't even provided with letters of notification). This is also apparent from the number of objections (currently 27) against the 2017 Planning Application, which again did not follow due process, until the Planning Office were reminded of their obligations as set out in <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/595/article/15/made>. Note that there was a discrepancy between the number of residents that were made aware of the 2014 Planning Application (32) and the 2017 Planning Appli

Comments: 23rd March 2018

All of my previous comments related to Health and Safety, increased traffic flow, limited parking, flood risks, impact on wildlife, etc. still apply. Please ensure you take them into consideration prior to making a decision on this Planning Application. In its current form the proposed new development will have a significant detrimental impact on the local area and its residents. This is the reason why the existing estate has been in place since 2001 and the land for the proposed new development has never been built upon. It is also the reason why you have 27 Objections and no one Supporting this particular Planning Application.

1 Lucinia Mews
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DR

Comments: 11th January 2018

As a resident of Lucinia mews I was very shocked to hear about the proposed building application at the back of our estate. Information provided by our local Councillor in the past few days Why was this information not provided by yourselves to the residents????? A long time ago!! Ground work, tree removal to this site were completed last AUTUMN..NO INFORMATION ABOUT THIS WORK WAS GIVEN AT THE TIME BY ANYONE Gates were put in & diggers used...

Our boundary trees were removed...Why?? Our boundary trees were at an elevated level & not at ground level on the proposed site, these trees provided residents with privacy, protection from the elements & provided homes for many birds & wild life...

The drainage system for the estate is already terrible, we do not need any more problems.

There is only one access onto the estate, the main square is made of block paving & not suitable for heavy vehicles,, the main entrance is always very limited access due to school parking.. the estate roads are narrow & residents parking due to MOH is a nightmare.. Access is narrow & limited , again not suitable for heavy vehicles..

26 Cornwall Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8AY

Comments: 21st January 2018

To be honest, I think that majority of my feelings have been aired before but I cannot see the sense in this plan if it goes ahead.

Not only will it affect the privacy of properties in Brooklyn Rd, Lucinia Mews and Stone Crescent, it will have a massive impact on Rowanfield Schools (Infant, Junior and Childrens Centre). Imagine the noise during building work, along with the mess, the builders parking and then, if it goes ahead, minimum of 2 cars per property going in and out of the area on a single road into Alstone Lane.

The area is a mess anyway for parking thanks to people using Rowanfield to park and get the train after being pushed from other areas who now have parking permit schemes (strangely any road that may impact race traffic at a guess). Then at school run time the area is like a car park anyway.

Add extra traffic to the proposed area and you are just lining up an accident, where, at its worst could be a child being hit.

Couple with the green space slowly being used up (have the trees started to be taken down already in the area as mentioned above - if so, something is fishy) . If this goes ahead it gives developers the go ahead to build in any little nook of green that they can.

The bottom of King George is always wet so this development could cause more flooding, affecting residents already there and the school. I have friends in the roads affected and they say they already have drainage problems.

Hopefully the councils sees sense.

10 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 7th January 2018

All the cars and construction traffic have to go round Wharfdale Square, and therefore directly in front of my house, which is accessed directly from the street. The roads in Wharfdale Square were designed only to service the existing houses, and in the application there is no consideration of the change to the access road usage. Also the nature of the proposed housing means that it is likely that a number of the houses will be let to multiple occupants, as is the case with the larger houses in the existing development. The impact of this is not considered in the application. As one of the other comments has made the spaces on the plans are mostly one behind each other, rather than adjacent, so it is likely that a number of the spaces will not be able to be used. I would also like to point out that despite the fact that my garage is off Stone Crescent I had not received any information on this new development, can this be addressed if further consultation is required.

7 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 9th January 2018

I object on the grounds of the Impact on traffic and parking, there is no social housing or no community facilities and visual intrusion for existing properties.

214 Alstone Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8HY

Comments: 20th February 2018

There is only one route in and out of wharfdale square and this development will cause even more traffic in an already busy area. Parking will also be an issue.

19 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 9th January 2018

Main worries as mentioned by other neighbours- hazards caused by increased traffic around the close. During the construction process, the use of the only entrance into the square for large construction vehicles which is already busy and often has parked cars along it.

16 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 7th January 2018

I object to this proposal for the following reasons:

1. There will be an increase in traffic and noise as a result of the construction of these new houses which will affect all residents of Wharfdale Square.
2. The road around Wharfdale square is not designed to accommodate large vehicles/trucks or increased level of traffic as the road is already narrow (especially with residents cars parked in front their houses). The road around the square is only wide enough for a single car most of the time.
3. Wharfdale square as the only access road to the new development will likely to result in significant wear to the brick road. The increase in traffic and overcrowding will become a health and safety issue especially for children and residents who regularly walk through the area considering there is no real designated footpath around the square.
4. Residents are now only being consulted regarding the development as an after thought, and very late on in the planning phase with no impact assessment provided.

Comments: 14th February 2018

The proposed development will cause increased congestion in an already busy school/residential area. Wharfdale Square is a narrow brick road culdesac which was never designed to cope with additional traffic and cars.

Wharfdale Square does not cope with HGVs or new residential traffic and there is no designated pedestrian path making it this a potential health and safety issue.

The additional housing development should have its own private access so there is no impact to existing residents within Wharfdale Square.

3 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 17th February 2018

My main concerns with the proposed development have already been said multiple times by my neighbours. My main issues are the access to Stone Crescent for the proposed development and related to this my issue with pedestrian safety.

As it stands right now the access roads are very dangerous as they are constantly full of parked cars causing obstruction for the local residents. This situation has already resulted in my car being damaged by having to avoid other large vehicles in the square.

Cars have nowhere to park, so they park on the pavements. I walk in and out every day with a pushchair and I have to walk in the tight road with two children and I fear for them everytime a car comes past. I shouldn't be on the road, there should be adequate walking space for the local residents.

These dangerous problems will only exacerbate themselves with the new development. Care must be taken to improve the local area if this development should be built.

131 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DX

Comments: 23rd December 2017

- No details have been provided to indicate any screening to the south and west elevations
- No details of any additional planting to the boundaries
- No archaeological investigation details provided
- Only an attempt to achieve the lifetime homes criteria specified not a full commitment
- No details of proposed benefits to the local area of this development included in the application
- No ecological benefits explained in the application only a statement saying the development will improve this
- No statement on the impact to traffic on orchard way in particular to periods during school time
- Landscaping plan has not been included in the application
- No details of HQM compliance
- No impact assessment provided in relation to construction activities orchard way is a very congested area at peak times
- No SI provided with the application in relation to potential contamination

147 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DX

Comments: 8th January 2018

Our prime concern would be the four proposed properties Ref: 6,7, 8 and 9. As they are 3 Storey buildings with notably small rear gardens, it will have a huge impact on ours and other neighbours privacy and views. We also have an abundance of breeding birds and other wildlife including Bats which we are privileged to see in the summer evenings and would not like to see ANY of the

existing trees taken down. The Tree Survey does suggest the 'Stump' (T12) could be retained for conservation values. We hope this is possible.

Another concern would be the interference with the existing water/sewage works. Our gardens already struggle to drain with heavy rains and the new development would only add to this problem.

145 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DX

Comments: 5th January 2018

We would like to put forward concerns for the new proposed development adj to 10 Stone Crescent.

There has not been a site layout plan submitted to show where the houses/roads etc are to be built, this is a concern.

Our rear garden has an 82 year old Horse Chestnut tree growing within and against our boundary fence line (no11), the branches are overhanging into the proposed area.

Our concerns are for the safety of the tree and the wildlife that uses it (squirrels, various birds) We believe that our privacy and security of our property will be compromised from people climbing the tree and entering our garden as the covering bramble currently protecting it will be removed! The last tree survey that has been documented was in 2014, our tree has grown immensely since then.

We request a site plan detailing the plots of the proposed houses, it has been put forward that they will be 3 storey houses, this could be a privacy issue for us as the occupants will have full view of our entire garden and into our home.

As we do not know the plot setting there is a concern over the street lighting to the proposed housing.

I would like to ask for our tree (no11) to have another consideration within planning constraints and the plot drawing to be re-submitted to residents for further consideration before this application is given the go ahead.

151 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DX

Comments: 19th February 2018

After viewing the plans for the erection of 14 dwellings and road at Playing Field Adj 10 Stone Crescent Cheltenham we object to these plans going ahead as there has been no increase in the drainage system away from the area and no analysis done to prove the current system can cope with further dwellings being built.

The plans should state the capacity the current drainage system can take, what capacity it is running at this time and what extra capacity the 14 dwellings will add to the system. I am referring to the drainage pipes running pass my house 151 Brooklyn Road. It should be explained with figures to back it up that these pipes can manage the extra dwellings. If not, extra drainage should be added to the plans.

A further objection is to draining of surface and rain water as these dwellings are being built in the lowest level of this area.

It should be explained if the current field is or is not a soak away for this low-level area which receives surface water from the King Gorge V playing area. This could lead to surrounding gardens becoming boggy. There has been no mention of the brook that once ran through this field and alongside our property. A survey should be taken to determine if the brook is still functional and if so what effect the new dwellings may have.

We feel more investigation needs to be carried out regarding drainage and how surface water will be channelled to ensure these new dwellings do not cause flooding and costly damage to them and nearby houses. Before building starts or the field remains as it is.

149 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DX

Comments: 8th January 2018

We would like to put forward concerns for the new proposed development adjacent to 10 Stone Crescent.

- The Environment Agency has identified the site as being at a high risk of surface water flooding. Our concern is that any mitigation (such as raising the level of the land) may direct excess water to surrounding gardens, particularly those at the bottom of Brooklyn Road.
- Further to the previous point drainage and sewage services identified on the proposed site plan are already heavily oversubscribed, which causes backflow and localised flooding during and after periods of heavy rain. Any additional demand would exacerbate this problem and would directly impact on residents of Brooklyn Road.
- Trees currently at the rear of 147 Brooklyn Road have not been shown on the plans. Is their removal planned? If so, we would be interested to know if an ecological survey for breeding birds has been considered, as this was recommended in the initial ecological survey. We regularly see many birds and bats around these trees so we believe further surveys should be carried out to ensure these species remain protected. These trees would also provide privacy to all houses, so should not be removed.
- Finally it appears the proposed properties backing onto Brooklyn Road appear close to existing property boundaries, which would likely result in both our own, and neighbouring properties being overlooked.

8 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 5th February 2018

I would like to object to the erection of 14 dwellings adjacent to 10 Stone Crescent. The access roads of Stone Crescent and Wharfedale Square are just not suitable to carry any more vehicles. With a minimum of 3 cars per house on the new development making just two return journeys each day, there would be an additional 168 car journeys with a possibility of over 300. In Wharfedale Square there are no footpaths so pedestrians are required to use the road, so the additional traffic would be very dangerous. There are also two tight corners as you leave Wharfedale Square and enter Stone Crescent which are not suitable for this number of vehicles.

At the moment Stone Crescent is a short road but once extended it will become much longer enabling drivers to increase their speed as they approach the corners. As previously mentioned, the area around the school is highly congested at various times of the day and such an increase of vehicles making the turning onto Alstone Lane would increase the danger for school children.

6 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 16th February 2018
Letter attached.

5 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 7th January 2018

Object to erection of 14 houses Due to inappropriate access road to proposed housing estate. I understand STONE CRESCENT will be the access road which already is congested given that of the 10 houses in Stone Crescent have 4 multi-let's each taking up to 4 parked cars per house on Stone Crescent. Stone Crescent is presently structured as a residential road and NOT A THROUGH ROAD.

Please consider health and safety.

10 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 10th January 2018

Hello, I'm a resident of 10 Stone Crescent, Arle, Cheltenham where I have enjoyed residency for the past 10 years. I find the area peaceful and the neighbours very pleasant. However, I'm very disturbed by the planning application for the 14 residential homes on the playing field adjacent to our house which will cause negative effects on amenity.

The cul de sac already attracts loitering and building a road through the fence is likely to encourage more nuisance as well as generating unnecessary traffic. In addition, few years ago after loiters broke the wooden fence, we asked the Council to erect a steel fence to discourage this, however, the Council told us that this was our responsibility so the residents crowdfunded thousands of pounds ourselves to have this fence built.

The field currently is a suitable playing and recreational area for children and families. The building of residential homes will ruin a much needed recreational area in this part of the town.

The building of the new homes will have a negative affect our enjoyment of our home with more congested parking which is already a problem with people parking on the estate especially during the school run. We will be very disappointed if the fields overlooking the home we've grown to love is turned into more residential homes.

Comments: 5th February 2018

Hello, I'm a resident of 10 Stone Crescent, Arle, Cheltenham where I have enjoyed residency for the past 10 years. I find the area peaceful and the neighbours very pleasant. However, I'm very disturbed by the planning application for the 14 residential homes on the playing field adjacent to our house which will cause negative effects on amenity.

The cul de sac already attracts loitering and building a road through the fence is likely to encourage more nuisance as well as generating unnecessary traffic. In addition, few years ago after loiters broke the wooden fence, we asked the Council to erect a steel fence to discourage this, however, the Council told us that this was our responsibility so the residents crowdfunded thousands of pounds ourselves to have this fence built.

The field currently is a suitable playing and recreational area for children and families. The building of residential homes will ruin a much needed recreational area in this part of the town.

The building of the new homes will have a negative affect our enjoyment of our home with more congested parking which is already a problem with people parking on the estate especially during the school run. We will be very disappointed if the fields overlooking the home we've grown to love is turned into more residential homes.

Unit 8
Isbourne Way
Winchcombe
GL54 5NS

Comments: 7th February 2018

I live at No. 11 Stone Crescent.

There are big problems with traffic and parking but I feel these can be overcome and such the whole of the estate would benefit.

There is a big problem with the "school run" - Cars park at the entrance to Wharfdale Square too close to the corner of Alstone Lane on the left facing Alstone Lane and on the pavement too close to the corner of Alstone Lane on the right; both of which are, not only illegal, but also causes a blind spot for pedestrians and motorists alike. I feel that double yellow lines should be put down, not just at the corners of Alstone Lane and Wharfdale Square but other junctions near the school and enforced with Traffic Wardens at the peak times. I also think if the landscaping in Wharfdale Square was changed - Made smaller and made into a roundabout, and/or redeveloped into parking, with some landscaping for permit holders between the hours of 4pm to 8am this would solve the problem making it safer and easier for all. As for the proposed development, there doesn't appear to be a pavement which I think is important for safety reasons and making it easier for refuse collections. I feel that building/planning regs are not fit for purpose with regards to car parking/spaces; garages need to be bigger - wider so you are able to drive your car in and be able to get out of your vehicle, as well as longer to provide some storage for tools etc. rather than, as is the case these days, garages getting used as an oversized shed.

There doesn't appear to be and plans for the land adjacent to my house - 11 Stone Crescent and I would suggest this could be used for further car parking again permit holders and if the council did redevelop Wharfdale Square a childs play area could be incorporated. As kids will always find a way into King George Playing Fields I suggest a entrance to field would also be a good idea thus allowing all the residents of the estate easy access. I notice that the School has a gate in its fence backing onto this land and maybe the roadway could be made up to this making a suitable turning area. There are a lot of comments about concerns with construction traffic - is it possible to use the entrance to K. G. F. on Brooklyn Road? Maybe the changing rooms close to the proposed development, which have been burnt out now for many years, need knocking down and

rebuilding - perhaps something the developer may want to get involved with as they would have men, machinery and materials on site?

To sum up I think a well thought out plan for the development would enhance the road giving better facilities for the existing residents and new alike.

14 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 7th January 2018

I object to the application for the reasons given by my neighbours. Construction traffic, and an increase in the number of vehicles needing to use the square once the houses are built, will exacerbate the following situations:

- Accessing and departing Wharfdale square is already difficult and often dangerous during week days as staff from the local school park all along the entrance road, and in the square itself. I have regularly had to reverse into oncoming traffic when entering the square, to avoid a collision. Refuse lorries and large delivery lorries often have difficulty negotiating the square because of the numbers of cars parked. One driver delivering supplies for a recent construction in Stone Crescent, said that he should have been told how difficult access was.

- Access is impeded by parents dropping off and collecting children from Rowanfield Infant and Junior schools, and using the square as a car park. The entrance road is often double parked during these times, making passage even more difficult and dangerous.

Additionally, there does not appear to be sufficient parking set aside for the new builds - on the plan, spaces seem to be double parked rather than adjacent, meaning that some residents would likely look to park in Stone Crescent and Wharfedale Square.

Finally, construction would eliminate our rear view of the playing fields - one of the reasons for which we bought the house.

Comments: 9th February 2018

Responding to the revised site plans: 10 properties now proposed instead of 14, but with the same number of bedrooms in total - 49, and even fewer car parking spaces - 36 including the spaces allocated in the garages, when there were 38 for the same number of bedrooms on the old plan. Given that only a quarter of garage owners use their garages for storing cars, this is going to exacerbate the parking situation even further. With six 5 bed houses now proposed instead of 3, it's fairly certain that they'd be purchased by absentee landlords, and rented by the room - as is already the case with most of the four and five bedroom properties on the estate, meaning that there will be even more cars to find spaces for. Why, when the land was sold under the proviso that a percentage of it be allocated to affordable housing, are only large houses being built? A Five bedroom house is not an affordable one, by any stretch of the imagination.

Again, as a neighbour commented previously, building the development in a hollow would exacerbate the existing flooding problems in Stone Crescent, and lead to a very damp living experience for any new residents.

12 Wharfdale Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DL

Comments: 7th January 2018

Given the information available at present, we have the following concerns and items of consideration:

Proposed size of development: 14 dwellings seems excessive given the size of the site and limited access to the proposed dwellings by a single, existing road.

Loss of green space: 3 storey buildings will obstruct the view of the playing field and trees, part of the original appeal of the existing properties.

Site traffic and site access: From the plans it appears that the only access to the site would be via Wharfdale Square. There is potential for damage to the existing road surfaces. Access to large lorries and long vehicles is restricted on the street presently, is there a plan to create a temporary site access road?

Short-Term Implications: During the building phase, given that this is a residential area, this could potentially cause severe disruption and raises concerns of safety especially as access to current housing may be restricted i.e. by work vehicles.

Long-term: the proposal is that each residence will have 3 parking spaces. The existing road on Stone Crescent via Wharfdale Square was not designed to sustain such a large, potential increase in traffic flow.

Loss of existing parking spaces at the end of Stone Crescent that are in regular use.

The site is low-lying:

Susceptibility of proposed site to excess surface water - the site sits lower than surrounding land, could a new development on the site increase the risk of localised flooding both to the existing estate and the new houses?

177 Brooklyn Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DX

Comments: 27th January 2018

Yet more of our precious recreational parks are being STOLEN from us to make way for big rich property developers.

The park is always used by the local residents who exercise their dogs and kids who are always playing down there making rope swings from the trees and making dens in the bushes.

Where does it end? What will stop the council selling off the rest of KG5 years down the line?

The residents and children of rowanfield and surrounding areas HAVE A RIGHT to as much green recreational space as possible and the council of this town MUST respect that right!

You will be robbing us - the council tax paying residents of this area, of recreational green park space.

226 Alstone Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8HZ

Comments: 19th February 2018

I was recently made aware, by letter from a concerned citizen, of a proposed development comprising 14 new dwellings on undeveloped land, which I believe has now been amended to 10 dwellings, as per the latest development proposals available on the planning portal.

The lack of information in the Planning Design and Access Statement and Community Involvement, pertaining to transport and flood risk, is borderline inept and has left me speechless.

Please see below a list of issues, which should be discussed and are not mentioned.

Transport

No assessment, apart from a a sentence, of the sites accessibility and opportunities for sustainable travel have been undertaken. It is necessary to identify what local services and amenities are located in proximity to the site, and also what alternative sustainable travel opportunities are present to enable future residents and visitors to choose sustainable alternatives i.e. walking, cycling and public transport facilities in proximity to the site.

No assessment has been made of the local highway network in terms of reviewing personal injury collisions in proximity to the site.

There is no mention of the amount of vehicular trips the site will generate and a trip generation exercise has not been undertaken.

No swept paths have been undertaken showing safe access/egress of a refuse & emergency vehicle or the simultaneous access/egress of a refuse vehicle and large estate car.

As per Manual for Glos 4 'Developers are encouraged to calculate the parking demand that would be generated by the proposed development using the methodology set out in the NPPF and submit this evidence with the planning application. 2011 Census data in respect of car ownership is available for super output areas and this should be the starting point for determining likely car ownership levels for you development'. No justification for parking standards based on census data have been provided in the Planning Design and Access Statement.

Flood

At no point in the Planning Design and Access Statement and Community Involvement report has flooding been assessed. Considering across the site, as shown on Environment Agency flood maps, the risk of pluvial flooding is classified as 'High' and 'Medium', the lack of flood risk assessment is shocking.

As per NPPF guidance it is recommended, given the pluvial flood risk, that a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is carried out to examine this risk in more detail. The Level 2 FRA should also demonstrate how, through the use of SuDS, the amount of surface water entering sewer systems or local watercourses is managed to minimise the risk of pluvial flooding.

Considering the site is undeveloped greenfield land, it is vital to show how any excess surface water resulting from an increase in impermeable areas as part of the development is to be managed.

It is obvious that substantial additional information is required before any planning decision is made.

2 Lucinia Mews
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DR

Comments: 8th January 2018

My objection to the plan has been eloquently highlighted by (so far 11) other residents to date - all of which I echo and agree with.

This just feels like another money-making exercise for the developers, with no real thought to existing residents and/or environment.

Parking is already an issue in and around Wharfdale Square. How will the site be developed to accommodate this increase? One of the reports I have seen in relation to this plan mentions there is already an average of 3 cars per household.

Linked to the parking issue is ease of access. How will the building vehicles safely enter and exit the site? Where will the contractors park? Surely not in the existing residential streets?!

Concerns have already been highlighted in relation to the school run and the additional pressure on parking (or lack off) as well the potential safety of residents and those picking up/dropping off their child. More housing and its associated traffic can only have a greater negative impact.

I bought my house on the basis of the small size and quiet nature of the site. How will noise levels from residents and vehicles be managed?

Developments should integrate and enhance the existing environment and I feel this plan just simply doesn't offer that.

2 South Bank
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DN

Comments: 28th January 2018

As per all the comments of our neighbours I feel very strongly that the planned building of new houses on the playing field should NOT be allowed.

Already the cul de sacs of all three roads are over burdened with resident parking which is regularly made worse at school drop off and collection times. This coupled with children running about from the school, our own children who often play outside after school, plus increased builders traffic is a huge safety concern to us. This is before the new houses are occupied which again will make the parking situation and traffic worse. It is only a matter of time as it is before a child is involved in a serious accident and the increased traffic during building and after with further residents is just going to increase the risk!

We have one narrow entrance roadway permanently with cars parked down one side of it which is a nightmare normally when entering and exiting the square. Add to this large lorries and building works vehicles on what is essentially a one way access is going to cause major issues. Then there is the added issue of how the block paved road itself will cope with the additional heavily laden lorries and diggers etc.

The roads themselves prove awkward for our refuse lorries and any delivery vehicles let alone construction vehicles trying to manoeuvre around the square. This extended cul de sac was never designed as a access route/through road! Somebody is going to get hurt or residents cars will get damaged!

The drainage and power to this cul de sac is flaky at best normally, with drainage issues and power cutting off and low water pressure being a regular issue. Building new houses and linking them to the same systems will only cause more problems.

I have to question why we have only been consulted about these plans in the past week and it has taken local neighbours to get together to find out information about it all. Work removing trees etc has already taken place on the site before anything has been authorised! This all seems very unhand on the Council's part.

There are already very few green areas for our children to play and now you are not only going to build on a large part of one of them but you are also inadvertently restricting our children from playing outside their homes because of the risk from both the building traffic and then at least 42 more cars when all properties are filled.

1 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 19th January 2018

We would like to make an objection against the planning application for 14 residential homes on the playing field adjacent to 10 Stone Crescent.

The reasons for this is that there will be difficulties in parking and turns in the road so this will cause hazardous driving conditions.

In addition there will be noise disturbance and hazardous materials.

I hope you take these reasons into consideration.

Comments: 5th February 2018

I am a resident at 1 Stone Crescent. We would like to make an objection against the planning application for 14 residential homes on the playing field adjacent to 10 Stone Crescent.

The reasons for this is that there will be difficulties in parking as it is already disruptive during school drop offs and picks up as parents are literally parking wherever they want which is already causing major disruptions further enhancing the chances of potential collisions. There are also children walking during this time which poses health and safety issues. There will also be an increase in traffic.

The field is also a suitable playing area and recreational area for children and their families. The building of homes will mean that families will be unable to use that area.


I hope you take these reasons into consideration.

10 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8DP

Comments: 19th January 2018

I have been a resident at Stone Crescent for 10 years and I have thoroughly enjoyed my time here. However, I am troubled at the application made by New Dawn Homes to build 14 more houses and destroying the current cul de sac we reside in. This would lead to an increase in traffic/noise and will cause problems for parking for the residents. Previously we have had issues with youths trespassing on private property and this will increase if the fence is removed.

In addition to this the fence was paid for and installed by residents. When we approached the council to install the fence for our safety and protection they refused and said it was our responsibility. Therefore this fence belongs to the residents of the street who paid for it and organised its installation.



6 Stone Crescent
Cheltenham GL51 8DP
14-2-18

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: Planning Application reference 17/02460/FUL

Firstly, I wish to draw attention to a number of aspects of this application that I believe give inaccurate and misleading information regarding the true impact of this development. These are as follows:

1. The 'Statement and Community Involvement' document includes a photographic view looking down Stone Crescent toward the proposed site. The photograph's field of view is exaggerated (presumably through the use of a fish-eye lens or later manipulation) so as to make the road appear wider than it actually is.
2. The picture referred to in point 1 above, has been taken at a time when the road was empty of vehicles apart from one car parked in the turning area where it is proposed to continue the road to lead to the proposed development.

As a resident of Stone Crescent, I can confidently state that the photograph does not provide an accurate impression of the normal parking situation on my road. For the majority of the day from early evening until approximately 9am weekdays, Stone Crescent is absolutely full of parked cars. The under supply of parking spaces necessitates people parking on the pavements as well as on drives. During this period, I have counted as many as six cars on the left-hand side of the facing the proposed development and five on the opposite side plus four cars in the turning areas (two in each leg). In addition, Stone Crescent is heavily used for temporary parking by parents at the near by school at 9am and 3pm. To evidence this, see the photograph below taken during the hours stated.



3. Paragraph 1.5 of the same document states the site has no planning history. This is incorrect. There have been two previous planning applications preceding this one, the first for 13 dwellings, occupying the entire site area including the strip of land to the left-hand side of the extended Stone Crescent road to the development. The second was for an undisclosed number of dwellings.

4. I note that the application has been superseded calling now for, 6 x 5-bed type 'F' houses (an increase of 3), 3 x 4-bed type 'R' houses (a decrease of 2), 1 x 3-bed type 'B' houses (a decrease of 5). Both the current and the previous application are for more 5-bed houses than is stated. If one looks at the Type 'R' 4-bed house, it is apparent that it is not a 4-bed house, but a 5-bed house, just smaller than the 5-bed type 'F' house. So, in fact, the latest amended proposal is calling for 9 x 5-bed houses, an increase of one 5-bed house.

I have the following concerns with this proposal:

1. A number of the larger properties in Stone Crescent have in recent years been converted to houses of multiple occupancy (HMOs). The existing HMOs already have on average 4-5 cars associated with them, but they were built only with the standard parking capacity of 2 spaces per household. This is one of the reasons for the parking situation described above. There is a high probability that the same will happen to the proposed 5-bed dwellings, exacerbating the parking situation further. In addition, Stone Crescent will lose what are currently 2 parking spaces in front of the access to the site (by the steel gates) when the road is extended to the new development.

2. I note that the revised plan with 10 proposed dwellings has a slightly wider road than the existing Stone Crescent. This is a welcome amendment, but I note there will be no pavement. I believe the lack of pavement will encourage parking on either side of the road as is currently the case on Stone Crescent. It is already the case that access by refuse collectors on Stone Crescent is impeded (they are unable to turn in due to parked cars). Apply this to emergency vehicles and the situation becomes dangerous.

In summary, I believe that the development does not have sufficient provision for car parking which based on my current experience, will cause problems for the new residents as well as exacerbating the problems for existing residents on Stone Crescent.

3. I note that the strip of land to the left of Stone Crescent (on entering adjacent to the school's playing field) is not included in this application. I am concerned that this should be taken into consideration as there is clearly the potential for future development in this area, and the increase in the number of dwellings will impact on the issues with parking and access outlined in my letter.

4. I wish to state that I am not against the development of this site. People need homes. My concern is that the current proposal has been drawn up with the developer's profit in mind, at the expense of the quality of life and safety of existing and future residents. For this proposal to be workable, it is my opinion that pavements should be in place and consistent throughout the development and adequate parking spaces should be planned (taking into the account the provision for HMOs). Perhaps the strip of land adjacent to the school should be dedicated to parking. In addition, the possibility of a one way system for vehicular traffic should be adopted. There should be stipulation that future HMOs should not be permitted unless there is provision of sufficient parking spaces.

Yours faithfully,

