

<b>APPLICATION NO:</b> 18/02171/OUT	<b>OFFICER:</b> Miss Michelle Payne
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 27th October 2018	<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 26th January 2019
<b>WARD:</b> Battledown	<b>PARISH:</b> CHARLK
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	William Morrison (Cheltenham) Ltd & Trustees Of
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land Adjacent To Oakhurst Rise, Cheltenham
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Outline application for residential development of up to 69 dwellings including access, layout and scale, with all other matters reserved for future consideration (revised scheme following refusal of application ref. 17/00710/OUT)

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>156</b>
Number of objections	<b>113</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>43</b>

4 Charlton Park Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 7RX

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

This application provides much needed homes, in particular 28 critically needed affordable homes in a sustainable location.

St Edwards School will also be gifted the school and some 30 acres the land, which will enable them to improve the schools sporting facilities which are available to the wider community.

The development also retains and protects all but one of the veteran trees and will provide an additional 170 plus new trees.

17 Churchill Drive  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JN

**Comments:** 28th November 2018

Traffic in this area is already bad, the schools and doctors are over subscribed and there is an increased risk of flooding.

I also feel the underhand approach of the applicants is completely unacceptable.

I am happy to comment further or be contacted if required.

Outwoods  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6QJ

**Comments:** 2nd December 2018

As a local resident I am very concerned about the environmental impact of the Oakhurst Rise 69 house application

Cheltenham has enough affordable housing to meet need until 2031. This is an important green field site which is home to protected species such as bats, slow worms and adds not to mention our declining bird population. This development will: increase the flood risk; negatively impact on an area already suffering from traffic congestion; and add yet more pressure to our public services especially local schools and primary care.

Hilcot  
Stanley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6PF

**Comments:** 5th December 2018

We object to the proposal for many reasons, firstly due to the area being of historical importance. The site is of invaluable local historical interest. Building houses would destroy potential historical finds in the area. Secondly, as you approach the area the hill is clearly visible and is of particular geographical interest. Each area of green destroyed ruins Cheltenham's image. Building houses would obliterate this geographical feature. Thirdly, for environmental reasons due to the grass area being important for rainwater run off to prevent flooding to the area. Fourthly, the local infrastructure in particular the roads are already congested and dangerous and this would further exacerbate the dangers for local residents. Fifthly, the area is especially important for biodiversity as the area is home to many animals such as rabbits, foxes, badgers, barn owls, sparrows, sparrow hawks and many more smaller important elements in the food chain. I object to the proposal and urge you not to approve this scheme that would be disastrous for the reasons given.

Castle Farm  
Ashley Rd  
Cheltenham  
GL52 6NU

**Comments:** 24th December 2018

I am writing to object to these plans. Firstly this is an area of green space on a hilltop clearly visible from several sides, and building on this will damage the visual aesthetics of this area of Cheltenham. Cheltenham is a pleasant and popular place to live, and the views of the surrounding hills from the town is one of its greatest assets. Secondly, flooding. There have been flooding issues in the surrounding area, and building on the top of a hill is removing a key soak-away, that can only increase the flooding risks. Thirdly, the effect on wildlife. This a green space used extensively by local wildlife, and as it is surrounded by housing, there is no obvious alternative. Finally, traffic and congestion. This plot of land is in the centre of other highly populated areas, and access to it is therefore extremely problematic. It would cause further congestion and potentially dangerous situations for pedestrians and road users alike.

Flat 4  
Stanmer House  
Lypiatt Road Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2QJ

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

As an ex-pupil of St. Edward's School, I whole heartedly support this application as it will safeguard the school's future at no cost. In addition, the proposed development will provide a number of urgently required affordable homes for younger people together with 41 much needed homes in Cheltenham, going some way to assist in the council's shortfall in the provision of affordable and private housing stock. A win win.

5 Roosevelt Avenue  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JL

**Comments:** 10th January 2019

I object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- 1) Access issues with the proposed site: Regardless of the number of houses being proposed (I believe that this is the 3rd revision??), there is still no other access plan apart from that in Oakhurst Rise. This will have a knock on effect with congestion in an already congested area. The surrounding areas are already heavily trafficked which is an issue for families throughout the area with children and families. This, in turn, highlights safety concerns that I would have during and post-construction.
- 2) School places: The strain once again on local schooling will be too much. I cannot imagine the disruption with the addition of 69 homes (with potentially 120+ children) would have on an area that is already struggling on school placements and spaces
- 3) Overall infrastructure: It is taking sometimes 4 weeks to get an appointment in this area, is the local practice going to be able to cope and cater for additional appointments without further investment?
- 4) Local wildlife and environment: We can't simply ignore the fact that this will affect the local habitat. Just because there is land available locally does not mean that it should be necessarily developed. There are no doubt hundreds of better sites throughout Gloucestershire, the Cotswolds and surrounding areas that have better overall infrastructure opportunities and potential for development, rather than this which is being proposed. Just by reducing the number of houses each time does not make it necessarily right or ethical. From 100 to 69 on the same plot? It just goes to show how much profiteering that some people are prepared to do on a site which should be maintained in its current form.
- 5) Traffic: There is insufficient road infrastructure in the area to cope with the additional volume of traffic and pollution that this additional traffic could potentially bring. Time for local journeys are getting worse each year (Sixways junction, London Rd and Ewens Farm area in general) and this addition would make it worse in an already saturated area.

8A Linden Avenue  
Prestbury  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3DP

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I wish to support this application. I feel that the plans are sympathetic in relation to the area and will provide additional much needed housing. I understand that the plans have been scaled back considerably in terms of the number of houses planned to fit in with concerns raised. I would ask the planning department to therefore approve the scheme.

11A Churchill Drive  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JH

**Comments:** 6th January 2019

I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

Local roads are not appropriate in the slightest for construction traffic and housing access

Extra car use caused by development will seriously degrade local roads and environment of the local housing and inhabitants

Local Road junctions will not be able to support more vehicles, traffic is already a huge problem locally for example at the six ways junction.

The proposed housing is not necessary, local needs have proved to be met by existing council plans

During the previous planning meeting the pros and cons were argued by both sides, and I don't see any evidence that the fundamental facets have changed.

22 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JT

**Comments:** 11th January 2019

I object to the building of houses at Oakhurst Rise as it would make the traffic unbearable in this area, we already have a lot of vehicles on the road by Tim Fry's land rover and the challenge garage, as well as it is well known that Ewens Road and Beaufort Road are used as a cut through for traffic from the Hales Road to the London Road, also there are young children to whom the heavily increased traffic could pose a danger.

1 Southfield Manor Park  
Sandy Lane  
Charlton Kings Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 9DJ

**Comments:** 7th December 2018

This all looks like far too much development for housing where car usage will be high, in too tight a space linking into already over busy access roads. The road from the school already gets very congested at the entrance to the GP surgery car park. People are already parking on the grass here and driving over the grass as they pass each other coming in and out.

Many of the houses on the plan look like they will be luxury houses which may have 2 to 4 cars each.

This could work as an exclusively affordable housing development, where car ownership might be judged to be significantly lower, with it's within walking distance public transport and walkable access to GP surgery, chemist and shops including a small supermarket.

In such a built up area it would be better to leave this as quiet space for wildlife and people, mixed with exclusively affordable housing.

10 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I object strongly to the proposed development. As a resident of Oakhurst Rise, my main concern is the proposal to use this narrow cul de sac as the sole means of access to a large new development.

The impact of traffic associated with this development will have a life changing impact on the existing residents of this small, well established and compact community. This will start during construction with no doubt hundreds of lorry movements. Then later there will be, I guess, up to 150 or 200 daily car journeys from the 79 houses.

The roads are very steep and narrow and are regularly at almost bottle neck with on road parked cars which makes it totally unsuitable as a major thoroughfare to this development.

Another issue is that the road is regularly impassable in winter due to snow and the steepness of the first section up from Ewen's Farm. This happened on four occasions during the 2017 / 2018 winter. The few residents who commute daily leave their cars at the bottom of the hill and walk up and down. That's workable with 25 houses mostly with non-working families but what will the residents of the 79 new houses do with their two cars each?

I urge the interested parties to visit Oakhurst Rise and see for themselves how unsuitable it is as the sole means of access to this huge new development.

Coversdown  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
GL526NY

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

As a resident of Battledown my house, Coversdown, joins the northern boundary of the proposed development. I strongly object to this application. Not only is it in breach of national and local planning policy, which should be promoting healthy communities, it would mean the loss of valued open space which is used as a recreational area. It is of great value to those who live in this community. It threatens an area of beautiful green space.

The current plan also ignores the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) plan that is currently going before parliament. This plan quiet clearly identifies the land in this application, for a maximum development of 25 Houses.

Furthermore, I do not see any evidence that the reason the previous Outline plan 17/00710/OUT, which the Council turned down in August 2017, have been addressed. In the council's letter dated 16th August 2017, 5 reasons were listed and a mention was made of the NPPF. None of these reasons have been adequately addressed so this application should also be rejected.

In point of fact, I fail to see how this has been accepted as new application, as even the applicant is using the same supporting documents as they did for the previous plan that was turned down. I therefore believe that as the applicant is the same company as the previously rejected plan and they have used a number of the same original documents, that all the objections for 17/00710/OUT should still be considered by the planning committee.

Once again, the current application is riddled with inaccuracies, even down to the "Tree assessment and inspection survey for bat roost potential" using the incorrect layout in Plan 3 - Proposed Mitigation!! (Plan 3 is of the previously rejected layout! The references to the TPO trees in the various reports do not correlate with the Tree Preservation order Ref MHP 16087! TPO Tree T13 is actually an ancient oak yet in Arboriculture report done by Flac, the map on page 18 it is listed as an Ash Tree!

Perhaps this has been done deliberately to confuse CBC??

How can CBC and the surrounding residents rely on any of the supporting documentation as submitted by the applicant. The application should be rejected out of hand simply on the numerous inaccuracies.

My list of objections to the current Plan are as below:

#### 1. Charlton Kings Parish Plan published April 2017

This plan was published by the parish council to provide guidance for the next 5 - 10 years. It was produced by a public questionnaire and parish meetings. Page 8 states "a clear consensus emerged that development on open land and green spaces should not be allowed.". Page 9 states "There was preference to avoid building on 'green' sites of any description, favouring future development on brownfield/waste or infill land;"

Therefore this development is contrary to the conclusions drawn by the Parish Council and the residents of Charlton Kings.

#### 2. Right to Privacy

The conclusions of the developers report state that following the process of consultation, the application has been changed in a number of "significant ways". I strongly dispute this statement. At best, there has been some minor changes, but fundamentally the proposed development still has

- 69 houses
- only one inadequate transport access point,
- is still destroying natural habitat
- still gives significant flood risk
- still built on a steeply sloping site of clay
- still highly visible from offsite locations and
- still destroying an environment used by the St Edwards school for environmental and sporting activities.

The report states that the density of the houses was reduced on the boundaries that border Battledown. This is certainly not the case with the northern border of the proposed development. The plan shows double storey and 2½ story houses right on our boundary. In addition, the 2½ storey houses/flats will be on a higher elevation than our house and will therefore look directly down into 4 of our bedrooms, let alone our drawing room and conservatory. This is a gross infringement on rights to privacy.

The Landscape and Visual Aspect Report, makes general mention of the impact the development will have on residents of Birchley Road, though it specifically avoids any mention of the most impacted properties such as Coversdown, Meadow View and Charlton Manor. This is a major oversight in the analysis, creating a clearly biased document.

In addition, as these houses are directly south of our house they will most definitely block light and direct sunlight into our property. In winter, we would not see any sunlight whatsoever.

We purchased in Battledown specifically because of its privacy and quietness. This proposed development will totally undermine our right to privacy and quiet enjoyment.

### 3. TPO Trees and Hedgerows

On our boundary with the proposed development, there is are magnificent specimen of an oak tree (T17 & T18), which I have been led to be believe is over 350 years old. There are also a number of other mature trees. Up until 2 years ago the St Edwards school ensured that T13 was well maintained and dead branches were removed by their tree surgeon. This practice has meant that this tree has up flourished and is in excellent condition. It is quiet noticeable that since the applicant has lodged for planning that the maintenance of these trees have been neglected. The regular maintenance of such magnificent trees is a necessity for the wellbeing of the tree. In addition as the tree is south west of our house and the prevailing winds and storms would otherwise place our house at direct risk during storms.

Who is going to be responsible for the well-being of this tree and thus ensure our house remains out of danger should this development take place? The developers have already shown scant regard for us neighbours in that they accessed the currently site illegally over our properties. They also showed no regard to the TPO tree and hedgerow they removed. To date we are not aware whether this breach of the law has led to prosecution.

Secondly, I believe that the proposed houses would be built far too close to the root system of these magnificent tree. The consequences of this would most likely lead to the trees demise. This would then place the foundations of our house and our neighbour in 29 Oakhurst Rise in danger to subsidence and cracking. In addition, any houses built within its vicinity would also be subject to these issues.

The developer already plans to destroy several protected trees including ancient old oaks. The developer also plans to destroy 2 ancient protected hedgerows (seen on a map from 1825) that are BAP priority habitat and protected by law. The site has a large number of veteran trees. These need aging as some may be ancient. Many of these trees should be protected and there have been frequent requests that this is done as a matter of urgency. I believe that developer acted against the guidelines of the 1997 legislation on hedgerows when a large section close to my house was destroyed without the correct permission in the spring.

I feel that the developers survey into the biodiversity of the site is highly inaccurate and should be discarded and not relied upon. As our house overlooks part of the field we witness all the various wildlife that many other residents have already listed. Our CCTV cameras also regularly record the presence of all this wonderful wild life.

Cheltenham Planning Policy GE 2; Private Green Space states "The development of private green areas, open spaces and gardens which make a significant townscape and environmental contribution to the town will not be permitted." So, does the proposed development site meet the requirements of significant townscape and environmental contribution? It clearly has a unique environmental impact with a wide range of flora and fauna, it is kept in semi-wild condition, with once per year grass cutting and occasional tree surgery. It is a unique site that it is surrounded by buildings on all 4 sides, it is visible from the AONB areas. It is a wonderful undeveloped area and forms part of the critical green space that goes to form Cheltenham. As such I contend that any normal person would agree the proposed development site does not meet these criteria - hence the application should be immediately rejected.

This new plan STILL does not address any on my previous objections and hence all my previous objections still stand. In particular as pertains to the houses on the North boundary that are in proximity of T13 & T18. (Note: I am using the TPO Order 96 Ref MHP 16087 as the tree references, as the applicant regularly has used the wrong references for identifying these trees.)

I have a copy of a report by Barton Hyett Arboricultural Consultants (BH), in response to the original Arboriculture report of the developers consultants (TKC).

The documents presented by TKC with regard to the TPO's and RPA's are based on guidance of BS5837 (4.6.1) whereby the maximum of 15m radius from the tree stem is being used. In fact, the Natural England and the Forestry Commission published in January 2018 that recommends that "for veteran trees a buffer zone of at least 15 times larger than the stem diameter or 5m beyond the crown edge if that is greater" should be used.

In addition, the councils own Tree Officer stated on 8 Mar 2018

"Veteran trees have not been classified as per BS5837 (2012) recommendation where veteran trees should have an automatic A3 classification. Similarly, the Root Protection Areas do not conform to the Woodland Trust and Ancient Tree Forum recommended areas equivalent to an area described as a circle of 15 (as opposed to 12 in BS5837 (2012)) times the diameter of a tree or 5 metres from the edge of the canopy. Indeed, such recommendation of no hard surfacing within BS 5837 (2012) para 7.4 recommends that no construction occurs within a RPA."

This has a significant impact on the developments in the proximity of T13 & T18 to mention just a few. Even the new report by Flac has errors in it!

Using the diameter of "T13" in the report as 1505mm (Which I believe is incorrect and should be closer to 1700mm), then the RPA from the T13, that should be excluded from development, should be a radius of 22,5m and NOT 15m as per the Table. Flac also lists T13 as 22m high. This is also quite clearly inaccurate.

Even based on their own drawings of the layout as submitted by the Everitt Architects, Property 66-68 falls within this "incorrect excluded area" of the radius of 15m of the Oak Tree let alone of the correct radius of 22,5m. When the correct diameter figure is applied of 1760mm diameter, this exclusion radius should be increased to 26,4m and hence the whole of this property contravenes the RPA regulations.

In addition to the above, we object strongly to the fact that Flac recommend that a number of the "Veteran Trees" have been demarcated to have their crowns reduced in size by 5m in height and diameter - is this to allow the tree to conform with the development. These trees are hundreds of years old and should not be subject to the risk of being endangered in the name of housing. It is the housing that is encroaching on the trees, not the other way around.

#### 4. Density

According to the Battledown Estate site <http://www.battledown.co.uk/covenant.asp>, in the Deed of Covenants and Regulations , number 5 states "No person is to build on the Original Lots of



Estate land more houses than in proportion of one house to each half acre of land". Battledown Estate is adjacent to the proposed site on its North and East Boundaries where the density of the site is +-20 units per hectare which equates to +-4 units per half acre of land. This is considerably more than the allowed adjacent density of 1 unit per half acre of land. As such we believe that the proposed development is not in keeping with the developments that surround the site to the North and East.

#### 5. Increase Flood risk.

Historically there have always been significant issues with surface run off and groundwater flooding around the site. I believe a full and proper impact study needs to be done investigating the impact of the scheme on the River Chelt through Cox's Meadow onto Bath Road and Neptune's fountain. Some proper flood modelling is called for. Even with all the modelling done for the Cox's meadow flood barrier, the first time this barrier was put to the test, it failed, with large scale flooding of properties down-stream from the barrier.

I am not at all satisfied that routing all foul and rain water under Charlton Court Road will be an adequate solution at all. The ageing lower sections of the sewage system are already vulnerable to blockages and collapses according to a helpful local expert on drainage.

The consultant does not seem to recognise that there is any existing flood risk, I believe residents will tell a different story from their personal experiences.

In addition, the flood zone map created 26 March 2008 shows on page 4 a preponderance of incidents of "Recorded Flooding" in both the categories of "Artificial Drainage" and "Unknown" following the line of Oak Avenue. Anyone who has dug their garden or who remembers the old brick works will know this is an area of clay soil, which is always damp.

This is further borne out in the fact that we already have a continual spring, that starts in the field and runs through part of our property, nearly all year round. If the spring runs at present with all the natural protection that the field currently affords it, what is going to happen once this water has nowhere to go due to the impermeable surfaces that will cover the proposed site.

#### 6. Access to site

Oakhurst Rise is a small, narrow and steep cul-de-sac. Many residents park on the road as the driveways are so steep and narrow with often dangerous drop offs due to the gradient. The gradient is 1 in 5 at the top and narrowness of the road make sole 2-way access to 69 houses from this site totally inadequate.

In snow and icy weather the road is immediately cut off as residents prioritise the grit for the lower part of the Rise and the busy and dangerous bend and slope near Pine Close. I wonder where snow bound cars will park on congested Beaufort and Ewen's Road. How will emergency vehicles access the development in snow? The Rise is accessed via the very narrow and congested streets of Ewen's Farm; one of the worst streets being Oak Avenue. Blind bends already make these roads that are occasionally 2-way in sections dangerous.

#### 7. Change to Cheltenham skyline

The site is a very visible green part of the visual landscape. It adjoins Battledown, which is one of the highest points in Cheltenham. As the 2½ storey building and 2 storey house are going to be built on the crest of the development the skyline of Cheltenham will forever be blighted. Particularly from Leckhampton Hill, the A435 and the popular Cotswold Way at Lineover Wood where the path emerges from the trees. There is no dense housing at this elevation at present and the new estate will have a very significant impact on visual amenity. It will be a scar on the tree dense and greenfield nature of the landscape at this height on the hill line as currently afforded by the

properties on Battledown. This will further erode the character of Cheltenham as a scenic spa town.

#### 8. Loss of a community recreation area

The field is used by the wider community and it is a well-regarded venue for county cross-country competitions hosted by the school, as well as being a huge draw on bonfire night when the school PTA run their fund-raiser. Children from the school benefit from the access to the field to get closer to nature, such as the popular "welly walks" from the pre-school section.

#### 9. Damage to biodiversity.

The developers' environmental consultant claims that the majority of the site is "poor semi improved grassland" which is "regularly mown". They claim it is "short grassland" that is of "low conservation significance". I completely contest this. The developers study was done at an inappropriate time of year. I believe that other expert opinion has been obtained who believes that the site is actually species rich grassland which requires a detailed grass species survey, ideally done May-July. I understand the developers' nature survey was done in early September 2016 soon after the farmer had cut the grass down and driven over it with a tractor. Like most wildflower meadows throughout history the grass is cut once a year, contrary to the developers' claims this does not constitute regular mowing or cultivation. I must insist that a proper survey is done to establish the true status of the meadow.

#### 10. Amenities in the area

Already the amenities in the form of schools, hospital places and Sixways surgery are under extreme pressure. It is fairly common for current residents to have to wait 3 weeks to see a GP. This proposed development will further exacerbate the problem. Simple financial contributions/penalties as appear to be the norm when these issues arise in other planning applications (eg Tim Fry brown field development) will not solve the problem of residents being able to see a GP or getting places in schools.

#### 11. Conflicts with the NPPF plan

In particular this application conflicts with the NPPF plan in the following sections:-

Para 11, 12, 43, 97,102,103, 155, 170, 170e, 175e, 190, 193, 194

#### 12. Conflicts with the Local plan

I would like to point out that when reading the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review Adopted July 2006, it would appear that this application falls foul of the following objectives as set out in the above document. :-

##### General

O3 to protect public safety and amenity

O6 to create more sustainable patterns of development, with priority use of previously-developed land

O7 to make best use of development land

O8 to meet the needs of the elderly and people with disabilities

##### Environment

O9 to conserve and enhance the setting of Cheltenham

O10 to conserve the natural beauty of the Cotswold Hills

O11 to conserve and improve Cheltenham's architectural, townscape and Historical heritage

O12 to conserve and improve Cheltenham's landscape character and green environment

O13 to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and inappropriate development

O16 to protect and improve the quality of land, air and water  
O18 to maintain and encourage biodiversity

Housing

O23 to secure a high standard of residential amenity

Utilities infrastructure

O30 to reduce the risk of flooding and flood damage

O31 to make adequate provision in development for the satisfactory supply and treatment of water

Transport

O32 to promote sustainable transport

O33 to safeguard the potential for the future provision of transport infrastructure

O34 to ensure infrastructure in development is provided to a satisfactory standard

O35 to safeguard or improve personal safety in the transport system

O36 to contribute to road traffic reduction and improve traffic flow

It would therefore appear that this application fails in so many of the prescribed principles as laid out in the Local Plan.

In conclusion, whilst the developers supporting documents appear to be comprehensive and all encompassing, they are far from this. They are at best extremely biased and in many cases inaccurate. They are at worst lacking in substance for a development of this scale which has far reaching implications not only to the residents of the immediate vicinity of the development but also to the greater community of Cheltenham.

We therefore implore the council to reject these plans outright.

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

Letter attached.

16 Naunton Park Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 7DQ

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

With the ongoing shortage of property within the Cheltenham and Gloucestershire area why this wouldn't be passed I have no idea.

Wadleys Farm  
Ham Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NJ

**Comments:** 23rd November 2018

Letter attached.

21 Cakebridge Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3HL

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

Cheltenham needs 'affordable' homes for younger people.

23 Sandy Lane  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 9DF

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

As a former pupil of the school I too agree that the application is one that is very beneficial to them with regards to expanding and improving their facilities. Also with regards to the wildlife aspect of the planning there is going to be a habitat created to conserve wildlife and also 30 acres are to be transferred to the school.

In addition to this I too agree that the town is in need of affordable housing due to the inflation of housing prices especially in this region, by creating homes for those that need this type of housing is a step in the right direction.

Tor  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NS

**Comments:** 16th November 2018

I strongly object to the application on a number of grounds

The new application other than reduce the proposed number of houses has not addressed the fundamental issues raised during the planning hearing and by previous objections the main issues being,

1. The access issues from Oakhurst rise, an extremely narrow and steep road, its not about the number of cars but the completely inappropriate and dangerous access
2. My property borders the school and the proposal is for 2 houses to be built bordering my property which will reduce my privacy and natural lighting
3. The loss of wild life, the badger set, the wild deer and other creatures
4. I do not accept that the flood risk will not increase and my property has previously flooded without the increased number of houses
5. Loss of green space
6. loss of ancient trees and hedgerows
7. local amenities cannot cope with additional pupils for schools, doctors surgeries etc
8. Increased road traffic around sixways junction and from sixways towards Cheltenham town centre

14 Greenway Lane  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6LB

**Comments:** 17th November 2018

We wish to register our strong objection to this application.

First and foremost, as per the JCS and local plan, there is sufficient supply of housing already identified for Cheltenham and development at this level, significantly beyond what the local plan targets on this site, is simply not required.

Beyond that, we feel the access available to the site is grossly inadequate to support the significant volume of road traffic that would be generated by so many houses in such a location. The transport assessments in the application are disingenuous - the physical reality of access to the site means far more car journeys will be generated than suggested, and Oakhurst Rise is not suitable to support that. Beyond the immediate site access issues, the existing traffic issues on the busy London Road junctions would be exacerbated.

We are concerned about the increased run-off and flood risks for neighbouring areas likely to result from such extensive loss of vegetation and permeable surface area. Our locality is already prone to flash flooding; increased run-off down the hill will not improve this.

The loss of valuable habitat for wildlife is a further concern, both in conservation terms and for residential amenity - the very regular presence of deer and owls, in particular, on the site provides a real contribution to the well-being of my family and neighbours.

We do not believe the local social infrastructure (schools and doctors in particular) have anywhere near the capacity to absorb this significant additional demand. In addition the site provides valuable community space, for cross county running and fireworks, that would be lost and not easily substituted.

In summary, we do not believe the proposal is remotely appropriate or in accordance with a number of aspects of local planning policy.

10 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JT

**Comments:** 7th November 2018

I would like to object to the above planning application.

If this went ahead there would be increased traffic on a road that is already very busy. Also it would be increased danger from traffic for local children.

There is also not enough local amenities - school places, drs appointments etc. This would put increased pressures on these.

We would lose a lovely green open space and the wildlife that goes with that. This would be a terrible loss to our local community.

There are concerns regarding drainage and flooding for the surrounding houses and area.

Having such a large number of houses and flats would mean less privacy for current local residents and also more noise and disturbance.

There is also concerns regarding access to this housing estate - the main access round is a small quiet road and the increased traffic and footfall would be very distributive and dangerous for pedestrians particularly children and young people.

This planning application should be refused.

10 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

I strongly object to this proposal for all the same reasons that the Planning Committee cited for it's refusal of the previous application.

I fail to understand why the amended proposal is even being contemplated, as one of the main issues under the original application, was the steepness/narrowness of the only access to the site, namely along Oakhurst Rise AND THIS HASN'T CHANGED??!! I believe members of the Planning Committee visited Oakhurst Rise in the summer, to be amazed that access using this road was even being considered. I trust they will feel the same under this amended proposal. I believe it is therefore essential that this application goes before the same Planning Committee, as they appeared to understand the issues at stake last time.

Likewise, access to local amenities hasn't improved since the previous proposal, for example, it is still extremely difficult to get GP appointments at Sixways Clinic. A new development will make things like this even harder.

The loss of the open space and the wildlife it supports would be unacceptable, as it was under the previous application. During 2018 we have had squirrels, foxes and deer in our back garden (photographic evidence is available) and I would happily put up with the deer eating all my peas and beans every summer to stop this development!

I trust the Planning Committee will see sense, as they did before, and refuse this application.

38 Bournside Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3AH

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I have already commented on the planning portal for the previous application but will comment again as I understand this is considered a new application.

- veteran and ancient trees are not protected
- heritage assets are harmed
- traffic and transport plans are not credible - it is so busy on the hailes road/a40 intersection - stretching all the way back to the old bath road at times. 2 cars per household are required for such a steep slope there is no viable route across cheltenham - pollution will be atrocious.
- the lives of those in Ewens Farm and Oakhurst Rise will be badly affected as a fit and healthy person can't walk that slope in the time listed so it will be car based
- the "social / affordable" housing claims are not credible

- Charlton Kings schools and doctors surgeries are already over capacity
- Gloucestershire loses a cross country course that has been used by primary school children since 1957
- badgers, bats, reptiles and rare birds all lose an organic meadow habitat
- springs and ponds are affected on a steep clay bank; currently this field protects the whole of the downstream area from flooding. Building on it will introduce flood and subsidence risk for 100s of homes - look at merestones drive development - it is going to have to be walled to protect collapse into hatherley brook.

The local plan says a maximum of 26 homes should be built on this land. A 69 house estate is being proposed in a completely unsuitable location.

Overdale House  
 Ashley Road  
 Cheltenham  
 Gloucestershire  
 GL52 6NU

**Comments:** 14th November 2018

The following comments are requested to be considered by the officials and Councilor's when making the decision whether this outline application for residential development should proceed.

1. The provisional plans are quite attractive, but not in this geographical situation which has been an open space for over 2000 years. Currently in an overall urban situation this green space is a welcome refuge for wildlife and brings a feeling of living close to the countryside to those who live in Charlton Kings. As briefly covered in the Design and Access statement (2.1/2.4) the field is visible from approaches into Cheltenham. However, it rather glosses over the extent to which it can be seen from all parts of the surrounding escarpment and within Charlton Kings i.e. Copt Elm Road, Cirencester Road, and Sixways. Those visiting Regency Cheltenham for recreation or a shopping experience are influenced to come by the town's architecture and the extent of its parks and open spaces - as they descend from the escarpment this area is highly visible and greatly adds to that ambiance.
2. The proposal to issue vouchers for 750 pounds to each dwelling or apartment is interesting and perhaps CBC Planning Department might make this a mandatory inclusion in all new builds - perhaps an option for all the retirement building. The Travel Plan however does state that London Road is only suitable for 'experienced cyclists', so these bicycles may have a reduced usage for commuting as with no secure cycle storage at Six Ways they cannot be safely left when using public transport. In paragraph (3.4) times for moving on/off the estate are somewhat speculative and would seem to be based upon 'downhill' times rather than the steep upward walk through Ewan's Farm and Oakfield Rise. At aged 80; together with people in their 50's we have walked the route from Oakfield Rise to Six Ways and return, at no time could we get near the times quoted.
3. Although the provisional numbers of dwellings have been reduced the Oakfield Rise narrow and steep road cannot realistically and safely take the amount of traffic associated with those coming and going from their homes and the commercial support vehicle units required to service normal postal/refuse/shop deliveries and 'net' deliveries. Realistically upwards of 200+plus vehicle movements/day. During initial construction heavy delivery vehicles and contractors 'white vans' will need to park off site until the entrance and hardcore on site parking has been laid - all passing through the existing associated one way system with traffic

calming and green space for the Ewan's Farm children. This places the existing residents of Oakfield Rise and the surrounding area in a potentially dangerous situation.

4. The loss of this rare open ground used by wild-life over many centuries would be a disaster for all types of nature. Currently deer, rabbits, foxes and badgers roam freely and use the field as an urban through route. The Department of the Environment recommends such routes should be preserved. I note that the Badger set is to be relocated, an admirable theoretical concept but one that has been a failure in other areas. The Badger Societies do not recommend such movement. The whole biodiversity of this open space is likely to be destroyed however well intentioned the developer and his supporting professionals appear to be.
5. At the Planning meeting which refused the first application, after the decision had been made, the Chair commented that the JCS had already identified sufficient land to meet the perceived requirements into the future thus this land was not needed to meet any immediate needs.
6. Concerning amenities. Currently the land is an open space used by St Edwards for nature studies and cross-country and has been either farmland or meadow so since before the founding of Whitefriars. The current Trustees have been offered the freehold by the Carmelite Order if the field receives outline planning permission. The thrust of the supporting planning letter from the Trustees implies that the freehold will mean that money currently paid to the Carmelite Order for the lease will be used to provide additional amenities, primarily to the Charlton Park site. An admirable intention by a fee paying Christian school but leaving the field as an open urban space would allow religions of all faiths to enjoy the views. A better amenity might be to open the existing field for public controlled recreational use. If the Trustees have the freehold of both sites that might bring further planning pressure on the Charlton Kings Council as other current school land could be offered to developers. In recent years the Junior School has invested in an animal farm stocked with unusual animals which are feed during the school week by the children. This amenity is on the southern boundary of the proposed new development and would be at risk from construction noise. I see no major improvement in long term amenities to the general public of Cheltenham and district beyond the existing school/local societies relationship.
7. Given the above I am against any planning being granted by CBC.

**Comments:** 15th December 2018

The Planning Officers and Members of the Planning Committee are reminded of a previous planning application relating to the grounds of St Edwards Junior School and the comments of the Planning Inspector at the appeal which are highly pertinent to the current Planning Application.

Namely:

Para 230: The Council attached great importance to protecting the appearance of Battledown Hill. In recent years there had been intense pressure for development in this area. However, a firm restraint policy had been imposed, and this had regularly been supported by the Secretary of State on appeal. Policy 94 had been introduced into the Local Plan in recognition of the threat which large scale development might pose to Battledown Hill's unique environment.

Para 231: In essence, the Battledown Hill Policy Area covered a substantial spur which extends westwards towards Cheltenham from the main Cotswold escarpment. When viewed from the west, the hill appeared to be part of the main Cotswold Escarpment. However when seen from the south, it stood out as an independent landscape feature. The western and south-western flanks of the hill were prominent in a number of distant views. These slopes had a rural or semi-rural appearance, which contributed to the attractive character of the area.



Para 233: In contrast to this wooded character (para 322 had related to the northern area), the southern slopes of the hill consisted of open parkland and fields forming the grounds of a Whitefriars School (St Edwards Junior School). The school buildings stood in the centre of these grounds. To the north of the buildings the fields were used for grazing, and which were defined by strong hedgerows. Below the school buildings, there was a more formal parkland and playing fields. This parkland dated from the 19th century. It had been laid out in association with 'The Oaklands', a grand house built in 1837 (Predated Battledown Estates). The 'Oaklands' was a Grade II Listed building.

Para 234: In the draft Local Plan the lower slopes had been excluded from the Battledown Hill Policy Area. The council's principal concern had been to protect the views of the more elevated ground from the town and the surrounding countryside. But, following the publication of the draft plan, a number of comments had been received expressing concern at the exclusion of the lower part of the School grounds from the protected area. On reappraising the position, the council came to the view that the lower slopes formed an integral part of the landscape, and that it was irrational to exclude them from the scope of Policy 94. Accordingly, in the deposited plan, they were included within the Battledown Hill Policy Area. Xxxxx The inclusion of the whole of the Whitefriars (St Edwards Junior School) site was appropriate and in no way excessive.

Para 235: Policy 94 allowed for some development within the Battledown Policy Area. There was scope for some limited residential development by infilling; and essential educational development connected with the existing school might be permitted xxxx But more expansive or intensive development projects would be inconsistent with the need to conserve the agreeable visual quality of this locality.

Para 236: The council's approach to Battledown Hill was in accord with the Structure Plan Policy L5. This stated special attention should be given to the protection of the landscape in especially sensitive areas. The advice from Government Circulars echoed these sentiments.

Para 237: As to Policy 103, following discussions with objectors, the council had agreed to the following amendment: The Development of green areas, open spaces and gardens, which make a significant environmental contribution to the town, will not normally be permitted. Xxxxx in line with Structure Plan Policy BHE1.

Para 239: The grounds of Whitefriars School (St Edwards Junior School) came within the ambit of Policy 103. They make a significant environmental contribution to the town in a number of different ways.

Para 241: Thirdly, the school grounds were an important feature in the local landscape. They provide contrast and relief to the busy urban area of Charlton Kings. Fourthly, this open land was an important and agreeable feature in the distant views of Battledown Hill.

Para 242: In view of these considerations there was no doubt that, even in its amended form, Policy 103 should apply to the whole of the grounds of Whitefriars School (St Edwards Junior School).

Para 251: There is no doubt in my mind that the special provisions for the protection of Battledown Hill, contained in Policy No 94 are fully justified. This hill is a particularly attractive landscape feature, which is visible across a wide area. In distant views it has a distinctly rural appearance, dominated by trees and open fields. The residential estate on the northern part of the hill is characterized by good quality detached houses set in ample grounds with abundant planting. It is quite different from Cheltenham's other residential areas and plainly warrants protection from over-intensive development.

Para 252: There is no doubt that the open fields above the school buildings should be included in the Battledown Hill Policy Area. These are prominent in distant views of the hill and clearly contribute much to its rural appearance.

Para 254: For the foregoing reasons, I think that the Battledown Hill Policy Area should cover the lower slopes of the hill, as shown in the Local Plan. Taken as a whole, the grounds of Whitefriars School (St Edwards Junior School) have a particular charm, without which Cheltenham would be poorer. Their environmental significance is such that I believe they must come within the compass of Policy 103 of the Local Plan. That policy reflects the important role which open spaces play in making Cheltenham such an attractive place.

Given the above if Planning Permission is given it will reverse a Planning Inspectors previous rulings and recommendations.

Southern Lawn  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NU

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I am a little confused that a planning application, despite being explicitly linked to a previous one, appears to have a completely new reference number. It is unclear whether previous concerns expressed in relation to the previous application are still being taken into account.

Lest our comments cannot be "brought forward", I wish to repeat the following:

This is an excessively complex application, made more confusing by inconsistencies of fact and detail. The high level of objection to the scheme is sufficient to demonstrate its sensitivity. As a green field development in a highly visible area, it will - if approved - have an everlasting impact upon the environment and landscape as seen from the AONB and the village of Charlton Kings (stand outside Smith and Mann by the bus stop on the little roundabout and look up at the hill).

A full application would allow better assessment and more detailed conditions to be applied, and as such may allay some of the anxieties expressed. Once outline permission is granted, our Councillors have lost their ability to fully manage the situation, so:

Please could you consider requesting a full planning application, not an outline one, so the impact can be fully assessed before determining this matter?

The impact of a development can be mitigated by the choice of materials. Given the sensitivity of the site, materials which would mellow might be suitable - and ideally these would be natural, environmentally friendly materials. This might help to limit the impact of any building on such a visible and sensitive site. For example, the use of timber cladding or sedum roofing, rather than geometric shapes, masses of glass and render. The housing next to Sainsbury on Hales Road is a sad example of builders who use convenient and cheap materials which look pretty initially but fail to stand the test of time. So:

If a full application is requested, please could there be very careful consideration of materials and their visual and other impact on the local environment?

There is often a shortage of affordable housing in Cheltenham. When there is housing eligible for government schemes, such as Help to Buy, it is often in the form of apartments. Apartments are notorious for management charges and on-going high costs, and they are small with no gardens. With people buying their first home later in life (most are 30 or older now), an alternative form of affordable housing would be very welcome.

A terrace of 2 and 3 bedroom houses would be ideal, with gardens and parking, so that those who have scraped together a deposit can plan to stay there for a few years. Given the disruption

to all the people who will have extra traffic going past their houses, having genuine and desirable affordable housing on the site might slightly mitigate their objections.

Sadly, developers frequently back out of the affordable housing liability on the grounds of cost. Is there any way to secure it, so this does not happen?

I hope that our elected representatives will continue to resist this unsuitable development on our behalf, and many thanks for all your help.

Ash Tree House  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 23rd November 2018

I wish to reiterate my strong objection to this 'new' planning application having reviewed the latest documentation with regards potential development on this site.

Furthermore, I do not see any evidence that the rationale regards the previous planning application - 17/00710/OUT, which the Council recently turned down, have since been addressed. This application is merely a minor amendment to the previous application by the developers which was comprehensively rejected by CBC. From the council's refusal decision letter, five key reasons were recorded and a mention was made of the NPPF. None of these reasons have been adequately addressed by the latest application so this application should also be rejected.

11 Battledown Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6RX

**Comments:** 2nd November 2018

I strongly object to the planning because of the heavy traffic on the Hales road and London road during the peak time at the moment. Such high density development will inevitably make the situation worse.

21 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 26th November 2018

As a resident of Oakhurst Rise, I am very disappointed and extremely concerned that there is yet another planning application by the developer so soon after the last refusal.

There are many concerns regarding this development and I personally feel that once again there has not been adequate time for people to air their views.

This proposed development affects not only the residents of Oakhurst Rise but Ewens Farm and surrounding areas.

The only access route through Oakhurst Rise is a major concern, particularly the steep entrance road as cars are regularly parked at the junction.

Last winter with the snow and ice the steep hill was impossible to negotiate by car, it was difficult enough on foot!

The volume of traffic through Oakhurst Rise and Ewens Farm would increase significantly, this area is still used as a 'rat run' even though there are speed ramps, there will also be a knock on effect with an increased volume of traffic onto the already busy London Road.

There will be a significant increase/demand for the already overstretched doctors surgery at Sixways and other facilities and services.

I appreciate the demand for houses, but there should also be consideration for the abundance of wildlife that already inhabit this site, and the many ancient trees and green space that would be lost forever.

I do sincerely hope that these concerns are taken into consideration.

17 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Reference the planning application to develop land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

I have several objections to a development for 69 houses.

Firstly, the infrastructure of the estate not just Oakhurst Rise, is beyond capacity. The estate is used as a traffic run to avoid the busy London Road and Six Ways traffic. This has increased recently with the increased traffic diverted from the closure of the town centre. The increased traffic from a new development would only exacerbate this.

Secondly, the access of Oakhurst Rise is not suitable for the additional volume of traffic. The two steep inclines are unsuitable for pedestrians and dangerous in adverse conditions, the increased traffic would only increase the risk of damage to people and property.

15 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

We would like to express our objection to the developers building 69 dwellings on the land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

As the new application has changed only by a reduced number of homes, the reasons of objection obviously stay the same as before.

The traffic in this area is already high volume for the area, therefore affecting local residents if it increases with more homes being built.

Charlton Kings doctors and schools are already full to capacity, where are the people of 69 new homes supposed to go?

Flooding is also a large concern as the gradient is so steep in Oakhurst Rise, our bungalow is in the lower row facing the entrance of the proposed estate. At the moment the field naturally takes the rain water as there are beautiful large trees and hedgerows to absorb it.

Our lives will be badly affected by this development, one of the reasons being a privacy factor, this is a quiet cul de sac, the location is completely unsuitable for building such a large amount of new homes.

11 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 26th November 2018

I would like to object to the planning of 69 houses to be built on the fields adjacent to Oakhurst Rise. The reasons the original plans for 100 homes was rejected still remain.

Firstly the road that would be used for access to the site is far too narrow and steep for any more traffic and is completely inadequate. Also the other roads close by will be badly affected.

We will be at risk of flooding when it rains heavily as the run off will come straight into our homes. Please remember the houses on Oakhurst Rise are bungalows so, if flooding occurs, we would have no way of saving any of our possessions. Any flood prevention put in place will never be as good as nature. Subsidence is a concern as well.

There are a lot of wildlife who will loose there habitats if the built goes ahead. Also there are ancient trees that would lost.

The doctors surgery and schools in Charlton Kings are already over capacity and will be unable to cope with extra demand.

Please reject this application as we are very concerned about the issues mentioned.

5 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

As long term residents of Oakhurst Rise, we strongly object to the above planning application. A letter written by the Borough Architect and Planning Officer In Oct 1984 states various reasons why planning permission was refused, most of which are still relevant today.

We moved in to Oakhurst Rise in 1982 and at that time no household had more than one vehicle and some residents had no transport at all. Since then most households have two cars and some three, which necessitates them parking on the road as some drives are too steep to safely hold more than one car. The roads are still narrow and steep and the amount traffic to just 22 bungalows has vastly increased, particularly since the emergence of internet shopping and the resultant daily deliveries by ever larger vehicles. The additional traffic generated by a further 69 houses would create an impossible situation for residents old and new.

The veteran trees must be protected as they in turn are protecting areas further down the hill from flooding.

The resident wildlife i.e. badgers, deer, and bats etc. would all lose their organic site and their habitat must be saved.

School children ( and not only St Edwards ) would lose a rare and valuable open space for Cross Country work, nature study and recreation.

The local amenities of Schools and Doctors Surgeries are at full capacity now, and the addition of possibly several hundred new residents would be catastrophic for them and the area.

3 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 22nd November 2018  
Letter attached.

1 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 11th November 2018

Loss of Privacy - our Bungalows will be OVERLOOKED from Houses above and BLOCKS OF FLATS. Also passing traffic for much of the day will impact on our Bungalows.

TRAFFIC Oakhurst Rise is a development of Bungalows which are on ROAD LEVEL traffic noise is already a problem as there is no way of getting away from it especially if you have windows open.

ACCESS this was an issue at the last public meeting IT HAS NOT CHANGED steep narrow road

VISUAL IMPACT Loss of many mature Trees - and replaced with cheap nasty Laurel which is of no benefit to the local wildlife or our Beautiful View

WE NEED MORE GREEN SPACES not LESS in our Towns and Cities to combat Global Warming

34 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 6th January 2019

I object to this Application due to the effect of the proposed connection of the storm water drainage system to Charlton Court Road.

The proposed connection point is above the storm water balancing tank which is located under Charlton Court Road to reduce the effect of storm water in the River Chelt. The effect of this connection upon this balancing tank has NOT been taken account of in the letter from Severn Trent Water of 28th November 2016 in Annex F on Page 40 of the Flood Risk Assessment.

Presumably the size of the balancing tank was calculated in the 1970's to meet the demands of the existing estate and not to have the greater demands placed upon it at a rate restricted to 4.6 litres/second, the effect of a 100 year event and a 40% allowance for climate change. Disregarding this matter COULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT FLOODING OF CHARLTON COURT ROAD.

Furthermore, the drawings in Appendix E on Page 37 of the Flood Risk Assessment show that the proposed exit from the development of the storm water and foul water drains are amongst trees. From the drawings it is unclear whether these are existing trees or proposed new ones. If they are existing trees the digging of trenches for the drains COULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT UPON THEIR ROOT SYSTEMS.

39 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 11th January 2019

As a resident of Charlton Court Road, I am writing to you with a degree of disbelief and serious concern at the prospect of the proposed new housing development on the fields adjacent to the top of our close.

There have been repeated issues with the drainage and sewerage system, which have required Severn Trent to come and carry out emergency work involving diggers, pneumatic drills, etc in my back garden late into the evening, in their attempts to unblock and free up the current antiquated drainage system.

It has become evident to me that the present system is already struggling to cope with our existing sewerage and waste, so when I heard that there are now plans to link up a proposed 69 new properties to the existing drainage system in the close, I was incredulous.

THERE IS NO WAY THE EXISTING DRAINAGE SYSTEM IN CHARLTON COURT ROAD COULD SERVICE SUCH A LARGE SCALE INCREASE IN SEWERAGE AND WASTE AND IT UNDOUBTEDLY WOULD CREATE SIGNIFICANT DISRUPTION, PRESENTING A VERY REAL HEALTH HAZARD TO ALL THOSE HOME OWNERS CURRENTLY AND POTENTIALLY RELYING UPON IT.

In addition to the existing issues of inappropriate road access via Oakhurst Rise, damaging the existing ecology of the site and the interfering with balance of the already high water table, I sincerely hope the committee gives this issue of drainage into Charlton Court Road, some very serious consideration.

Thank you for reading and registering this new information. I trust that it will be added to the other letters of complaint visible on the council planning website. Please can you inform me when I can check for myself on the council website, that this letter has been successfully added to the other 100 or so complaints, as a previous email I sent regarding former plans by the developer, appears to have not been successfully added. Thank you. I look forward to hearing from you imminently.

15 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JS

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I am writing to you as a very concerned resident of Ewens Farm regarding the planned Oakhurst Rise development which I believed had been turned down.

I have been a resident of this estate for my entire life and I have watched over the years as traffic has increased year on year to very high levels during rush hour and is getting progressively worse both from a safety and environmental standpoint year on year.

I fail to see how anyone with any sense thinks that a further 69 house estate with only one access road isn't going to have a massive impact on Ewens Farm? That's likely a further 100 + cars minimum impacting on quality of life and environment and directly impacting negatively on us! Who actually thinks this is ok??

Local services such as Doctors are so over stretched that I often book appointments months in advance as waiting times are so high due to increased population. The schools are at breaking point capacity wise and the local transport system struggle to offer a reliable service now!

From a historic viewpoint the school has provided cross country for the community since 1957,. Also for as many years as I can remember the firework display is looked forward to year after year, in fact I now take my Grandchildren to an event my grandparents used to take me to. Aren't we allowed to retain any of our local character?

Having suffered extensive damage from flooding myself back in 2007 I don't think that flood risks have been adequately taken in to account nor researched, the large clay bank, streams and ponds currently afford some protection but these would be removed. It is at the top of a hill and water only runs one way.

As someone who worked at a wildlife hospital I have first hand experience of the affect house building has on our local wildlife. The local badger population, bats and amphibian would be severely impacted.

What about the ancient trees and hedgerows that will need to be removed?

I have lost complete faith in what we are doing to the environment and this is being echoed on a local scale to help the rich get rich and not give a damn about the already upset populace.

I believe this has been turned down a number of times already for many of the reasons mentioned above.

It is a well known strategy to come in with plans well over what is likely to be approved eventually reducing it to a lower number more liely to be accepted.

This is plain wrong!

Please take into account our opinions.

54 King William Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 7RP

**Comments:** 2nd November 2018

I wish to object to this further application for housing at Oakhurst Rise which I consider to be on the borderline of vexatious.



Admittedly, some work has been done to address some of the concerns about harm to some of the ancient trees and fewer houses are proposed.

This lower number will still nevertheless generate a likely 140 cars and the service vehicles and delivery associated with the 69 dwellings, all grinding up and down a 1:11 hill on a narrow road in all weathers vastly impacting on the existing small community of residents - as will the heavy construction traffic necessary over an extended period for the construction work should the application be approved.

I note that the Pre-Submission Cheltenham Plan which has now been submitted to the Inspectorate for Examination has included an allocation of 26 houses at Oakhurst Rise as feasible. A higher number is therefore not included in the Plan.

I also note that on 31st October, the Inspector Mrs Burden included in her initial letter to CBC the following statement under Allocation and Omission Sites:

"I will not ... consider the merits of any proposals for alternative or additional locations which are not put forward in the Plan as it has been submitted."

As the Plan is now so far forward, I would suggest that, as this application in contrary to the draft plan, it should not be considered for approval.

7 St Judes Walk  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 7RU

**Comments:** 7th November 2018

As a householder whose gardens were badly flooded by the Lilley Brook in 2007 threatening my house, after the flash flood, I am always concerned about any upstream development which reduces the natural flood plain. Therefore, I fully endorse the points made by the LLFA in their response dated 31/10/2018.

5 Coronation Flats  
Oak Avenue  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JF

**Comments:** 3rd November 2018

This development proposal is similar to the one rejected in July 218, namely 17/00710/OUT which was for 90 dwellings. This proposal is for 69 dwellings which is a reduction of merely 21 dwellings and the objections I raised for 17/0070/OUT still stand. As someone who would be adversely affected by the extra traffic caused I strongly object to this plan. I will concentrate on some of the main objections:

(1) Contrary to Cheltenham Plan

The new "Cheltenham Plan Pre-Submission Version (Regulation 19) February 2018" states under policy HD4 that the site for land off Oakhurst Drive would only be suitable for 25 dwellings. The proposed development represents 276 % of the Cheltenham Plan number.

(2) Increased Traffic effect on existing residents in the area

The small reduction in the number of proposed homes does little to change the fact that given 1 to 2 cars per family there will be significant extra traffic along the narrow residential approach

roads. Furthermore there will be traffic for the inevitable deliveries to those properties, not to mention the difficulties of larger vehicles such as refuse collection, emergency vehicles, post office vans and so on negotiating the narrow and steep approaches.

It is absurd to suggest that most residents would go on foot or use public transport to get to Six Ways, because of the gradients (especially on the return journey carrying heavy shopping up Beaufort Road). The only bus going past Oakhurst Rise has a 2 hourly frequency, so it is unlikely that anyone "popping out" to Sixways for a pint of milk would wait 2 hours to come back - clearly most would take a car.

In the Residential Travel Plan. Table 4.1 in section 4.9 clearly shows that the developers consider there will be 410 extra trips to and from the site in a single day. There is just one road that allows cars to enter Oakhurst Rise and just two ways to exit from Oakhurst Rise, so the residents of the surrounding roads can expect a substantial increase in the number of cars going up and down their roads.

The residents of the proposed site will not, themselves, suffer this passing travel perched on top of the hill in their cul de sac, it will only be existing residents who have to put up with this extra noise, sound pollution, exhaust pollution, danger and more inconvenience generally.

The access would therefore be at odds with saved policy CP4 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), adopted policy INF1 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017), and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

### (3) Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

This document states (section 6.2.10, page 48) referring to Staff and Students of St Edwards School "Receptors will typically be engaged in other activities limiting the degree to which their attention is focused on the landscape. Views are low value due to their location within an area without landscape designation.

This statement is arrogant in the extreme, suggesting that pupils and teachers should not be distracted by the views outside during lessons. It also completely ignores the fact that the landscape and visual impact of the surrounding provides a valuable lesson to pupils even at playtime

This fact is clearly seen in this video from St Edwards school showing the pupils talking and playing in the fields and in particular one girl saying how valuable the surroundings are.:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?sns=fb&v=UaZYwgi7GOY?p=desktop>

Thus the application site is located in an elevated position above the town, outside of, but in close proximity to, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The scale of the proposed development in this tranquil location would have a negative impact on existing landscape character, and on views into and out of the AONB. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policy CP3 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), and adopted policy SD6 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017).

### (4) Proposed housing density

According to the Battledown Estate site <http://www.battledown.co.uk/covenant.asp>, in the Deed of Covenants and Regulations, number 5 states "No person is to build on the Original Lots of Estate land more houses than in proportion of one house to each half acre of land". This Estate is adjacent to the site and the proposed density of the site (shown in the Design and Access Statement) is 16 units per hectare which equates to 3.2 units per half acre of land. This is considerably more than the allowed adjacent density of 1 unit per half acre of land.

I urge you not to grant planning permission and to also withdraw this land from policy HD4 in the Cheltenham Plan under consideration

St Edwards Infants And Junior  
School  
252 London Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NR

**Comments:** 5th November 2018  
Letter attached.

Tall Timbers  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NS

**Comments:** 13th November 2018  
Letter attached.

**Comments:** 8th January 2019

I wrote to you on 6th November 2018 detailing my objections to the development proposals for the 69 dwellings on land adjacent to Oakhurst rise. In my letter to you I detailed the various breaches in current design and safety standards relating to the junction between Oakhurst Rise and Ewens Road.

I note that a Stage 1 Road safety audit has now been published as part of the scheme documents. This audit does NOT address the issues that will arise at the Oakhurst Rise Ewens Road junction. I would urge you as Director of Planning and the Planning Committee members to ask why the developers have not sort to address the safety concerns that have been raised by many including the Planning Committee members at the July 2018 meeting.

**Comments:** 8th January 2019  
Letter attached.

Fremington  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NS

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

This application is merely a minor amendment to the previous application by the developers which was comprehensively rejected by CBC on 31 Jul 18. As such my previous comments and the reasons given for rejection still hold.

Specifically, I would like to mention the following:

- the proposed access via Oakhurst Rise is unsuitable, unacceptable and contravenes several planning policies;

- in addition to the difficult access, such a development would cause significant ongoing disruption to the local traffic situation which is already often choked at peak periods;
- the site hosts a number of protected species which would be negatively affected by the application contrary to further policies;
- the size of the development would have a negative impact on the existing landscape and views, also contrary to policy documents;
- the proposed development would have negative impact on nearby listed buildings, Ashley Manor and Charlton Manor, conflicting with several local and national planning policies;
- the proposed development would result in the loss of trees, including veteran and TPO'd examples.

As an example of inaccuracies in the application, mature trees shown in the field along the boundary with gardens of properties on Ashley Road do not exist. All the mature trees along this boundary are within the respective gardens;

- loss of amenity used regularly by local children and the local community;
- the local infrastructure (schools, GP surgeries, etc) is already overstretched and would not be able to cope with the additional demands of such a development;
- the application does not adequately address the significant flood risk that exists on this unique site with its sloping nature and natural springs;
- finally, the application contravenes the local housing development provisions in the recently approved Cheltenham Plan.

For the above reasons, many of which are explained in more detail by other 'objectors', I strongly object to this application, and would urge CBC to take note of the many objective, professional comments to reject it.

Charlton Manor  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NS

**Comments:** 19th November 2018  
Letter attached.

**Comments:** 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019  
Letter attached.

**Comments:** 21st January 2019  
Letter attached.

Savoy House  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NS

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I write to object to the above planning application as a local resident living in the area.

I am saddened that an area nurturing nature in her bare element, with protected species, hedgerows and more is being considered for a housing development of such a large scale.

I feel that it is important to understand the art of ergonomics when designing and structuring a town and it is a beautiful thing to have such an ancient meadow in a regenerating town.

Therefore :

I object to the demolition of nature and her heritage.

I object to an obstruction of view and I have sought legal advice on this matter. I am told that there is an argument for this.

I object to such a high concentration of homes being considered for build in an area that has no infrastructure to cope with such.

Meadow View  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 15th November 2018

The previous application for 99 houses was rejected, this application for 69 properties should be rejected under the same grounds, namely:

- loss of significant trees
- impact on nearby listed buildings
- access would have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network and the amenity of local residents
- the impact to a number of protected species (the suggestions to relocate the badger set is ridiculous) and the negative impact upon biodiversity across the site
- the application site is (still) located in an elevated position above the town. The scale of the proposed development (now 69 properties) in this tranquil location would have a negative impact on the existing landscape and on views into and out of the AONB.

My objections to 17/00710/OUT still stand, this site has recently been used for the annual firework display, enjoyed by the whole community and for cross country enjoyed by all of Gloucestershire school children.

Please reject this proposal.

Newlands  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I needed to send in my objection (again) for reference 18/02171.

I still do not understand how or why the developers have come back so quickly with another plan without addressing the crazy, access issues which was the over powering reason for it being refused last time. How Charlton kings will cope with the massive traffic increase I do not know. I currently sit in traffic, sometimes with engine off, just taking my children to school (CKJ) not to mention taking them to brownies, popping to the shops, doctors, etc etc. The infrastructure is already struggling and is asking for trouble if we allow many more cars in the area, especially squashed into a tiny access point like that. I think it's got to be obvious to anyone looking at the situation that this is a disaster waiting to happen if this is even considered - I can't in my wildest nightmares imagine that professionals would agree this is viable or sensible -so I'm praying that they don't otherwise my family and I should imagine many others would be looking to move as far away from the area as they can and would certainly have to rethink our children's schooling and whether this is the best place to be bringing them up. It would be a travesty and will totally ruin Charlton kings turning it into a circus- surrounded by accidents and angry, tired, miserable and fed up residents.

Glenwhittan  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I write to object to the above planning application, in line with comments submitted on 20th March 2017 to the Cheltenham Plan (part one) Public Consultation (copy attached); and for other reasons.

#### Landscape and Environment

The first objection is that the application would allow serious over-development of high ground forming a part of the Cotswold escarpment. Ground contour levels on the site rise from about 100m AOD at the south end of the site to about 125m adjacent the rear of Birchley Road properties (on the north side of the site); whereas almost all major development in Cheltenham over the last 100 years or so has been limited to ground levels of about 105 - 110m AOD. As proposed in the attachment (Cheltenham Plan: Public consultation), there should be no development on ground above 110m, in order to protect the escarpment; which, from south of Gloucester to the north of Cheltenham (past Prestbury, Bishops Cleeve, Woodmancote, Oxenton, Teddington), remains an almost undeveloped, unspoiled landscape of great natural beauty. The only major development on the escarpment on the east side of Cheltenham is Battledown, which was planned and laid out about 150 years ago; and which has the significant requirement that every property should be sited on an half acre plot: this allowed most of the properties built to be planted with major trees, so that it is now visually a green tree-covered landscape with many properties part hidden when looking from the west (Gloucester, Staverton, Churchdown, Tewkesbury) eastwards. The properties proposed for the Oakhurst Rise development are generally on plots of limited size, which will not allow the planting of large trees (because of the disruptive effect they would have on the properties themselves).

In this sense, the proposed development is as undesirable and damaging to the landscape as development of the middle slopes of any hills, escarpment or coastline would be. It would also set a terrible precedent for higher level development of the south side of the existing village of Charlton Kings, below Daisybank Road.

This problem with the proposed development is compounded by the planned removal of parts of a major ancient hedgerow (which itself extends to an area of about 4,000m<sup>2</sup> - about 1 acre -

which as a consequence of its age and size currently shelters foxes, deer, bats, birds, especially owls and wood-peckers, and small mammals): the section between about contours 115 and 120 is removed to make way for the access road and housing; a second small wild hedgerow/wooded area (about 600m<sup>2</sup>) on high ground (levels 121-124) on the north side of an existing large badger sett is proposed to be removed entirely (including the badgers.)

There is really no planning or intellectual argument to justify this destruction, in the absence of confidence in the developer's willingness and determination to protect important features of the existing environment as it is now. In the developer's analysis, it is justified on the grounds that many of the individual trees are not of specimen value, not being individually planted and nurtured, i.e. being wild; overlooking the fact of the length and size of the hedgerow, that can be seen for miles around; and that for centuries it has been home to wild creatures in a natural environment without any human interference: the adjoining meadows are mown once a year, about a day's work with a tractor.

Though the main reason for the objection on these grounds is preservation of irreplaceable landscape undisturbed, (within a thriving community), the retention of natural habitat and ecology is also of great value, especially when available to a school, and through the school to other young people.

Access to site/Transport:

The road proposed for access to the site - Oakhurst Rise (OR)- is discussed in the transport assessment, paragraphs 2.6 and 2.7 (only); and its inadequacies are ignored in the discussion. In particular:

- the road gradients are too steep: almost 15% gradient for the upper length leading to the site entrance; and about 13.5% for the lower length joining Beaufort Road: both far in excess of the Glos. C. C. 'Highway requirements for development', which gives maximum gradients of 8% for access roads. The consequence is that the access road will be unusable by many vehicles after snowfalls, and will be hazardous in icy conditions; with a potential risk of accidents at the junctions, because of cars and lorries failing to stop in time, or sliding into or across the two T-junctions, one at the bottom of the upper slope opposite no. 17 OR, and the Beaufort Road/Oakhurst junction;
- the road may be too narrow (5.5m); the G.C.C. requirement is 5.5 or 6.0m (depending on classification);
- the pavements are too narrow: the G.C.C. requirement is 2.0m;
- it appears that OR could be classified as a minor access road (MiAR), but it does not comply with the physical requirements for a MiAR, and it would be serving nearly twice the number of dwellings for such a road (50 maximum);

The assessment of the effect of the development (i.e. 70 extra dwellings) on the local roads immediately affected is unconvincing. Aside from the unsuitability of OR as the access road to the site, a basis for considering the increase in traffic could be summarised as follows:

- number of current dwellings: Ewens Road 19  
Pine Close, Oakhurst Rise say 40  
Beaufort Road 41
- current total of dwellings 100;  
which would increase to 170 dwellings after development:
- i.e. there would be a substantial increase in traffic on the two roads leading away from the site: Ewens and Beaufort Roads;

on-street parking on these roads and Haywards Road (the next affected road for traffic towards Cheltenham) is repeatedly described as 'sporadic': definition "occurring only here and there , separate, scattered"; but the on-street parking is nearer constant and widespread than

sporadic, and already severely restricts vehicle movement on these roads, and also on Oak Avenue;

- all of these roads are residential roads, not suitable as transitional roads, and certainly not as local distributor roads: (a through traffic route suitable for moving traffic between different parts of the town).

In discussing overall design concepts the G.C.C. 'Highway requirements for development' recommended:

"The creation of large cul-de-sac estate layouts, where a large number of houses rely on one access road, and pedestrian access is similarly restricted, must be avoided." (My italics)

### Summary

As described above there are fundamental objections to the proposed development on grounds of access and transport.

There is no reasonable access to the site: the proposed access uses a pre-existing, very steep narrow road designed for about 25 dwellings, and the traffic generated by the development would feed into local residential roads which are also steep, narrow and are already congested.

Any standard risk assessment, which under CDM regulations 2015 is required to be carried out before any construction work and "as soon as designs which may be used in construction work in GB are started;" HSE guidance para 77: continues " it does not matter whether planning permission or funds have been secured;" would identify the proposed access as a serious hazard; both as an access for construction work and as a permanent access to about 100 houses (including those already in Oakhurst Rise), also to be adopted by the Council.

### Comments: 19th November 2018

My objection to the proposed development is on the grounds that it involves the destruction of irreplaceable green space.

It benefits the environment to have green spaces close to town. As a Cheltenham family we have greatly appreciated the town's parks, and the sensitively landscaped areas around Cox's Meadow and between the town centre and Waitrose, for instance. Its visual and aesthetic qualities are what make Cheltenham special, so to develop an ancient green space that is visible for miles around, and especially across the valley, would be to disregard respect for the environment and create a dangerous precedent for the green swathe that surrounds Cheltenham at a certain height, to be lost forever.

This field, so close to town, yet with ancient hedgerows and mature trees, is an important and unusual natural sanctuary for wildlife. Over the decades we have observed birds and mammals raising their young without interference. It is densely populated by a wide range of creatures including foxes, badgers, different species of mice, shrews, voles, hedgehogs, newts, glow worms, bats, bees, owls, woodpeckers. This field is only mown once a year. It takes a tractor about half a day and it never cuts close to the hedgerows.

For so many children at the nearby school to be able to observe an uninterrupted natural habitat and to respect it and learn from it is of critical value in an increasingly urbanised country.

For this field to be concreted over to provide the maze of small roadways, paths, drives, parking lots to accommodate high density housing with, no doubt, double the number of cars to houses, is a proposal showing complete disregard for the current peaceful environment of, and beyond, the field. The noise of constant comings and goings of domestic and service vehicles and of hundreds of people in a relatively confined space on the hillside will, inevitably, detrimentally affect the quality of life of all nearby residents.



The impact of the increased number of vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians on fairly narrow existing residential roads with steep gradients where, because of street parking, vehicle movement is already of a weaving and halting nature, is obviously problematic, inevitably stressful and even dangerous.

Green spaces with mature trees protect the wider environment against pollution. This proposed development would contribute to the problem of pollution by destroying mature trees and hedgerows, and filling the field with buildings and cars.

Because the houses would have small gardens, large trees would never be able to grow for future benefit. Owing to gravelled/tarmac drives and low maintenance exterior spaces, rain- water run-off would be a problem on a hillside development.

Why plan to erect higher dwellings (flats? Townhouses?) at the high point of the site, exacerbating the loss of vista to existing residents and drawing attention to the development from the other side of the valley?

1: 69 dwellings remains far too many for the proposed access through Oakhurst Rise (OR); see comments in my letter of 13.09.17, which generally still apply: ( the steep gradient of OR, and road dimensions, the single access, inadequate linking roads away from OR).

3: For retained trees, root protection areas should be established and observed in accordance with BS 5837: (in the case of T8 the protection area is a 15m radius circle).

4: See also objections on the grounds of Landscape and Environment in our letter of 13.09.17, which still apply.

29 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 17th November 2018

I object to the proposal for 69 dwellings on land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise. I objected to the previous proposal (00710) on this land for up to 100 houses, and my arguments and concerns are generally the same as before.

Access and traffic seemed to be top of the many concerns expressed by councilors at the July planning meeting. The developer has offered to buy one electric bicycle for each house to share to get to the local amenities. I hope it will be a powerful and robust bike, because the gradients on the return journey may burn out the motor! As a councilor so eloquently put it at the July meeting; "you can get yourself a haircut whilst waiting at the traffic lights at Sixways". Residents of the new estate will definitely be using lots of cars. The poor access roads make this proposal inappropriate.

Another very good point raised by the meeting chairman was the danger of granting outline planning permission for a scheme of such scale. Common sense tells us that this gives the developer carte blanche to subsequently do what he likes to increase his profit margins. There seems to be a critical loophole in the system.

I note that the badgers are still to be moved. Assuming they tolerate the move, they will then be fenced in. Are the developers not aware that badgers forage for food over a very wide area? They would quickly starve or most likely move on (perhaps down to St. Edwards School rugby field or into someone's garden?)

We do need more affordable housing in Charlton Kings, but this is not a suitable site. It is a site commercially suited to a few large, luxury houses as an extension to Battledown. The land is a floodwater sponge and a valuable haven for wildlife.

27 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

As residents near the top of Oakhurst Rise, we strongly object to the proposed development.

1. Building on this land at the top of a hill will lead to more flash floods of the River Chelt and the brooks/streams that feed into it. One small pond will not catch all the water absorbed by 10 acres of green fields and dozens of oak trees.
2. The proposed access via Oakhurst Rise would have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network, and the amenity of local residents. The volume of traffic from the proposed development would overwhelm the existing infrastructure of the estate. All of the roads feeding Oakhurst Rise are narrow and congested with on-road parking. The existing traffic flow throughout the estate is already chaotic and dangerous at the best of times.

Oakhurst Rise is a small, narrow and steep cul-de-sac with a blind junction leading into Ewen's Road. Oakhurst Rise is inaccessible in snow and residents resort to parking their cars further down the hill. How will the extra 140+ cars cope with snow/ice? And how will emergency vehicles access the development in snow?

Additionally, the steep incline within the cul-de-sac would fail to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and would likely result in a reliance on the use of private motor vehicles. Alternative potential vehicular access routes do not appear to have been fully explored.

>>> Policy CP4 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), adopted policy INF1 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017), and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

3. The proposed development would result in the loss of a significant number of trees within the application site, including a number of important TPO'd and veteran trees, the loss of which would fail to be outweighed by wholly exceptional reasons. The proposed layout would also fail to achieve the greater Root Protection Area (RPA) distances recommended by The Woodland Trust for the retained ancient and veteran trees. The site is also bordered by ancient hedgerows, protected by the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

>>> Policies GE5 and GE6 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), adopted policy INF3 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017), paragraph 175(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

4. The proposed site is a rare, organic wild flower meadow and should be protected as a matter of urgency - designation as a Local Green Space would be a good start. Protected species at risk include a large badger sett, 7 species of bat (of which 5 are designated as NERC Priority Species) and dozens of species of birds.

>>> The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, 2006.

5. The application site is located in an elevated position above the town, outside of, but in close proximity to, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The scale of the

proposed development in this tranquil location would have a negative impact on existing landscape character, and on views into and out of the AONB.

>>> Policy CP3 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), and adopted policy SD6 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017).

6. The proposed development would have a significant impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings, particularly Ashley Manor, an important grade II\* listed villa of more than special interest. The resultant 'less than substantial' harm to these designated heritage assets must be afforded significant weight, and this harm would fail to be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposal in the overall planning balance.

>>> Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, adopted policy SD8 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017), and paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

25 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 11th November 2018

I object to the revised Planning Application 18/02171/OUT on the following grounds:

1. Traffic approach and congestion on local roads
2. Risk of flooding
3. Local schools and GP Surgery are already over subscribed
4. Oakhurst Rise is unsuitable as the only access road
5. Lose of natural habitat

Having sat with many other members of the public in the balcony at the Planning Committee meeting in July on the previous outline planning application 17/00710/OUT for up to 100 dwellings and listened to the for and against arguments, it was nearly unanimously rejected for several reasons.. One of which was the only access via Oakhurst Rise. Before the meeting many of the committee members walked the length of Oakhurst Rise and said that it was totally unacceptable. So I amazed that this new application, although with a reduced number of dwellings has been submitted with Oakhurst Rise as still the only access.

The Residential Travel Plan looks alright on paper but in reality is not practical as not many people will be walking or cycling to and from the site up a steep hill especially in bad weather and at the moment they are predicting over 400 journeys per day, so how many journeys will be made? At the present time from my home we get approx. 8 journeys past our house per day, with the exception of the odd delivery van and the ambulance to collect our neighbour. To go from 8 to 400 per day is totally unacceptable.

There will still be considerable disruption to the Wildlife with up to 69 dwellings being built on this site.

As this is only for Outline Planning Permission again, who is to say that it will end up anything like the proposed plans on this planning application.

23 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

This application is just as detrimental as the last one it's still not taking into consideration all the same problems as before. Oakhurst Rise is a busy road now with some residents having to park on road cos their drives are too steep or they have two cars or more . The road is already jammed up now sending more cars up the road is ridiculous. Also some residents have to have special drop down bus for their wheel chair to be able come and go places and the bus needs to park in middle of the road whilst doing so why should these people be made to feel bad because cars are going to be queuing to get pass . The wild life and protected species is still there as are the natural beauty of the place . The local Dr surgery schools and other amenities are struggling without this adding to the problem .All the roads in and around this site is chaotic already everyday and weekends . Also where are they all going to park at the bottom of the hill when the snow and ice stops them getting up the hill .

16 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 17th November 2018

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed residential development of up to 69 dwellings on land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise, Cheltenham (application reference: 18/02171/OUT). I hold grave concern that the construction of and inevitable increase of traffic to the local infrastructure will create a health and safety risk to pedestrians and road users in the area. Access to road users is already severely restricted due to parked cars in the road network leading to Oakhurst Rise; Tight corners leading out of King Alfred Way; In effect due to the road markings leading out of the Churchill Drive one-way system, regular disruption due to vehicles facing in opposing directions on the available road; All of this is before vehicles enter Oakhurst Rise with its steep incline and two right-angle bends. With national average number of vehicles per household in the South-West of England in 2015 being 1.31 vehicles and historical trends only moving upward, the expected addition of 90 resident cars, plus service vehicles and the frankly frightening prospect of construction traffic accessing the site through Oakhurst Rise all contribute to a concerning prospect.

The housing proposed, will overshadow St. Edwards Preparatory School which in my view would be a concern for any prospective parent rationalising their choice of school for their child. This would put a school central to local community at risk.

Finally, and certainly not least the proposed development will destroy a widely valued green-space with an extensive and thriving wildlife eco-system.

I sincerely hope you will pay serious consideration to the fore mentioned genuine concerns when reviewing this inconsiderate application.

29 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

Letter attached.

Little Orchard

Charlton Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8ES

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

Planning for a scout hut at the end of Oakhurst Rise was quite rightly refused because of traffic issues. To therefore even considering access for 69 dwellings at the end of Oakhurst Rise is illogical and dangerous.

At the previous planning committee regarding this site, these issues were properly discussed and the planning application was comprehensively rejected. The same criteria should apply.

Traffic density in this part of Cheltenham is becoming critical. There is also the issue of upstream development. Statutory flash flood defences do not work. £20 million spent on the Chelt flood prevention scheme still did not work. Large upstream developments such as this, even with provisions, increase the risk of further punishingly expensive flash flooding to Cheltenham.

6 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I object to this development proposal.

It really passes all understanding that this persistent applicant should have the nerve to raise his voice yet again.

It is being argued that we are desperately short of 'affordable' housing, but reducing the number on this plot to 65, or thereabouts, is sheer nonsense since in this case the houses would each have a plot size (than the previous plan), thus becoming more costly and less 'affordable'.

At any rate: the traffic problem remains the same and ought to be the main obstacle to this bizarre scheme.

Also, as far as housing shortage is concerned: are we allowed to know just how many houses are at present standing empty and waiting to be bought in and around Cheltenham?

4 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

Land at rear of my property.

Very concerned reference lack of privacy and disruption by excess traffic

32 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire

GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

We strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons:-

- Loss of privacy - we will be overlooked by the development.
- Pressure of traffic throughout the Ewens farm estate and local access roads. These roads are already very busy and frankly dangerous at times, especially during rush hour. The 20mph limit is rarely observed by motorists using it as a rat run from London Road/Hales Road and many cars are parked on the roadsides. It is already hazardous and unpleasant to walk on these streets at busy times.
- The access road in Oakhurst Rise is highly inadequate. The approach is steep, narrow and with limited visibility. It would be dangerous to have an additional 100+ cars using it as an access road. Any attempt to make an access road from Charlton Court Road would also be unfeasible as it would remove essential parking spaces. Some houses have 2 or 3 vehicles. It would create insurmountable problems with parking and congestion. Also, with a very steep gradient, these roads are unusable during icy weather. They are not gritted and are equally unsafe and unusable in icy conditions.
- The density of the proposed development is not in keeping with the area.
- Risk of flooding - the present infrastructure will not cope with the additional runoff water from the site. There are springs and documented flood problems on the site and adjacent to the site. The application does not take into consideration the significant flooding in the surrounding area and downstream in central Cheltenham. Drains in the area already struggle to cope with heavy rain.
- Pressure on local services - doctors and schools. Schools in the area are already oversubscribed.
- Loss of wildlife habitat, hedgerows and trees. Badger sets may be extensive. Deer also inhabit the area, together with bats, woodpeckers and owls.
- Loss of a rich biodiverse site, green space, sports amenity and community amenity to Charlton Kings.
- The 1984 proposal was rejected on the grounds of drainage for considerably less acreage of development. More recently, Tim Fry had an application for development rejected on the grounds of volume of traffic. This is the very same route people would take to the proposed development
- Detrimental to the visual impact of the town and an unsightly blot on the landscape. The site is visible for miles around.
- Air pollution. The London Road is already cause for concern with high levels of pollution. Yet more cars using the road can only make things worse. There seems to be no plan for traffic impact. The traffic survey taken by the developers is flawed.
- The local plan says a maximum of 26 homes should be built on this land. A 69 house estate is being proposed in a completely unsuitable location. It has been rejected 4 times in 40 years

25 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I wish to register by objections yet again to the planning application referenced above. I cannot believe that this is still being considered after the meeting in July when the previous application was turned down on so many grounds

The access to the site is totally unacceptable The damage to the wildlife would be considerable The increased level of traffic both at London road and Ewans Farm will be unacceptable. The

results of the traffic tests in July did not take into consideration the change in demographics that The development will bring.

The local schools are oversubscribed already and although both Holy Apostles and Balcarras have offered to increase their numbers on role the access to those sites will also be unacceptable and dangerous this has not been mentioned in the application.

I live in Charlton Court Road so will be affected by this development.

I would also like to say that I have tried to register my objections on the planning portal but it is down this evening!

19 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 30th November 2018

This application should be rejected for the same reasons as the previous application.

The issues of traffic density, drainage, social infrastructure ( GP's, schools etc) and environmental impact have not been addressed nor mitigated by the revised application.

Simply reducing the number of houses ( outline proposal numbers) doesn't fix the problems.

Any further applications should be full and detailed not outline to protect our environment against developers "moving the goalposts" should this ever be approved.

I am very concerned that surface water run off is to be directed into existing Charlton Court Road drainage given previous issues with flooding further down the hill.

21 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 13th November 2018

Drawing title Drainage Strategy sheet 2 of 2

Drawing Number C21505-SKO2 Insert A.

The above drawing omits both the St Edwards School boundary line and the 5 houses within the Charlton Court Rd cul-de-sac, giving the incorrect impression of an open and undeveloped area. In the event of planning permission being granted, it is proposed to direct the surface water drain from the Oakhurst Drive development through this cul-de-sac. It is noted the proposed foul water drain connection is to be made within St Edwards School grounds. The most direct route for the surface water drain would be directly to the water course at the bottom of the incline within St Edwards School grounds. This would eliminate the unnecessary disruption and upheaval such a major undertaking would make within the Charlton Court Road cul-de-sac and the inevitable stress and anxiety such works would have on the health and well-being of the three households of senior citizens who live within this cul-de-sac.

22 Charlton Court Road

Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 12th November 2018

All my previous comments stand.

Access and transport for 'only 69' dwellings remains a huge problem with the access uphill through the relatively narrow Oakhurst Rise and associated roads.

The 1984 application for development of an adjacent part of the site was refused on grounds of access and increased vehicle activity. This far worse.

The 800m walking distance quoted seems to me to be 'as the crow flies'; most will not walk but drive. The developer's figures are highly optimistic !

The average width of footpath might well be 1.8 m but there are sections in Charlton Court Road of only 0.8 m.

Flood risk assessment para 9.4 - noted that Severn ~Trent recommend foul sewer connection to St Edward's system and NOT through Charlton Court Road, and to minimise work outside the site. Similar for storm water sewer. Planners please resist access to Charlton Court Road!

Local facilities - schools, doctors etc are stretched already. 69 houses would give more overload.

15 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 3rd November 2018

My objection is on the following grounds; Significant disruption of access for construction vehicles and associated noise. Approx 140 vehicles would occupy this development, if approved ,and this imposes immense pressure on all access roads and entry points to main roads. Wildlife suffer yet again ( do developers really care! ).

Doctors, schools,etc. do not have the capacity to cope with the size of the proposed development.

20 Churchill Drive  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JJ

**Comments:** 17th November 2018

The access roads are not adequate and it will cause a lot of traffic and congestion, not to mention the added air pollution. Imagine the recycling lorries having to go up the steep hill. And what about when that hill becomes very icy in winter? I would not like to live at the bottom of that hill!

And what about the disruption and mess which will be caused during the building periods when construction vehicles will have to go up and down those narrow roads?



Loss of green land and wildlife habitat. Ancient trees will have to be cut down and it will take many decades for the new ones to recreate the current ecosystem.

The area is used for district cross country, fireworks, and many other school events which benefit the local area.

Sixways Surgery: it is already full and it already takes two weeks to make an appointment. Where are all the new patients going to fit?

36 Cudnall Street  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8HG

**Comments:** 7th November 2018

Although the revised application is for up to 69 dwellings there is still the fundamental problem of access to the site from Oakhurst Drive. The traffic problems this would cause would be considerable with many of the vehicles trying to join the London Road and adding to the congestion. I therefore object to this application.

71 Southgate Drive  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 7QR

**Comments:** 31st October 2018

I am very concerned about the above planning application. As a lifetime Cheltenham resident in this part of the town I object to the application on the following grounds

1. TRAFFIC

The traffic created by the occupants of 69 houses (working on the Office for National Statistics projection for 2021 of 2.7 vehicles per household) will be completely untenable at the bottlenecks of Hales Rd traffic lights and Sixways traffic lights. The traffic delays at both of these locations in the increasing number of busy periods are barely tolerable at the present time and a further 186 cars cannot be contemplated.

2. DRAINAGE

There are serious questions to be raised about the capacity of the existing (ageing) drainage systems coping with the increased runoff and effluent output of such a number of houses. Although I, personally, avoided flooding in 2007 I experienced problems insuring my house for several years following this disaster. Most meteorological predictions warn of increased numbers of extreme weather events in view of global warming.

3. HABITAT LOSS

This land boasts a unique habitat containing mature oak trees and ancient hedges, not to mention a number of rare and endangered species of animals - including bats, slow worms and newts. As a child I took a great interest in the natural history of this and adjoining areas and would urge a proper full survey as a matter of immediate necessity. Once species have been displaced or exterminated it is too late!

On these grounds I would ask you to refuse to consider the above application any further.

Oak Lodge

Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

Im writing to object again the 69 dwellings on land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise as this is not the right place for that amount of houses to be built as this is going to create to much traffic up and around the area.

My mother inlaw lives at Oak Lodge just in on the left and already has trouble with the cars that come fast up the road as the road just isn't wide enough its going to be mayhem if they have lorries and contractors up and down that road.

Highcroft  
Oakley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NZ

**Comments:** 5th November 2018

I have considered this new application for a reduced in number (69) housing development on this site.

My previous objections are sustained , in particular on the following grounds :-

- 1) Adverse impact on AONB , resulting in a direct loss of more of our open local green space .
- 2) The loss of the veteran trees and irreplaceable well-established habitats on this site and the associated adverse impact on local biodiversity.
- 3) Adverse impact on the setting of nearby properties , including listed buildings being designated heritage assets.
- 4) Intolerable further strain on the already over-burdened local road network . The steepness of the narrow access proposed to this site , both during construction and once in beneficial use, is unacceptable on grounds of health and safety. This concern relates to not only the increased vehicular traffic (residents and visitors)which will be generated by this development but also to the extra cyclists and pedestrians which are being directly encouraged by this development proposal .
- 5)Adverse impact of the proposed development (notwithstanding the proposed attenuation measures) on the local drainage system with a real risk of increased flooding in surrounding areas given the natural gradients affecting this site.

Please ensure these points are all put before the Planning Committee when it makes its decision on this new planning application.

14 Pembridge Close  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6XY

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Development of field at St Edward's School Charlton Kings Planning application 18/02171/OUT  
Regarding the latest planning application for 69 houses on the school's field I am against the proposal for the following reasons

1. It is the thin end of the wedge to be selling off land which belongs to the school for development. Any land used by Primary schools should be retained for the use of the pupils for their health and well being. It should be sacrosanct otherwise it will be regretted in later years when everything gets built up. Access to open land is beneficial for education.
2. This particular piece of land is in a very awkward position with poor access so that building so many houses will have an impact on the local area and traffic flow through Ewen's Farm which is difficult already especially getting out of it on to main roads.
3. The field has been a local amenity for many years with valuable trees and wildlife and is a safe place for local children to use without crossing busy roads. The freedom of local people will be curtailed by such a development and not enhanced.
4. Streams running through the land when diverted could be a source of flooding for homes nearby.

18 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JT

**Comments:** 3rd November 2018

I strongly object to the new updated planning application for the following reasons:

1. Increase traffic of surrounding areas,
2. Compromised road safety
3. Unsuitable road access
4. Increase risk of flooding
5. Loss of green area
6. GP oversubscribed
7. Schools already oversubscribed

18 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I wish to register my objections to this planning application.

The traffic plans are simply not viable.

The local infrastructure is unable to accommodate this development.

The considerable ecological and environmental benefits afforded by the site of the development will be permanently lost.

Faringdon  
4 Langton Grove Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JA

**Comments:** 4th November 2018

I would reiterate the comments I made in connection with the previous application for planning permission.

My main concern relates to the unacceptable increase in the level of traffic through the Ewans farm Estate on to the London Road opposite the Langton. The traffic levels on the London Road at this point are already at unacceptable levels and the increased traffic emanating from any new development within the area will undoubtedly result in increased traffic congestion. Increased traffic will also lead to increased noise levels pollution and disturbance to the residents within the existing residential areas.

The increased levels of residents resulting from 69 new dwellings will require increased numbers of pupil places at local schools which are already oversubscribed and also at the doctors' surgery once again where patient numbers are already at a higher than acceptable level.

35 St Georges Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 3du

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

There are particular reasons to object to the approach that is being taken by the apparent PR campaign in support of 18/02171/OUT (the majority of the comments supporting the site have been generated in the last 24 hours, and through on line commentary):

1. The claims that there will be much needed social housing on this site. That's not credible to assess balance of harm and local benefit. There is no detail on what type of housing will be provided (elderly, student, low income, family housing or flats, social or affordable) in the application. And no indication of whether 'local' rates will be established against a baseline of Ewens Farm or Battledown - there is not an insignificant difference (of a couple of £m or so per property). So no-one can yet claim that this is a site that delivers to Cheltenham's suggested affordable housing deficit for first time buyers or those in rented accommodation (if indeed any such exists once the local plan is finalised). And it isn't obvious whether or not any development in Cheltenham in the last decade has delivered on the national criteria for affordable housing (this was lamented on in planning committee when the previous application was rejected) - is it credible that an expensive green field site on a steep clay bank next to the Battledown estate, given its potential vast profits as a luxury development, will be the exception to that rule?

2. The claims from the school trustees that they have a commitment to the freehold (once full planning permission has been granted - this is only outline, so anything is possible between now and then). That would of course be valuable to them in securing their financial future. But it cannot be credible grounds to assess balance of harm and local benefit, otherwise every charity and every independent school in the area has a free pass on planning - because of course it benefits them and helps with their financial future and therefore they are good local citizens in providing their considerable assets for public use. Except that is what they have to do under Charities Law. No other landowner can claim that improving their financial position is in the public benefit - it is arguably inappropriate and at least deeply regrettable that the various charities involved have been drawn into the debate in such an unbalanced way. To claim that the financial future of St Edwards school, and therefore its charitable support to the county and its provision of education services, will not be sustained unless the council supports a planning application is outrageous and shouldn't be permitted to influence the decision. No-one can explain how such a contract could be constructed before planning and finances around the site are finalised - so it is pure assertion that such a position will be concluded. Such a deal is subject to assessment by the Charities Commission given the conditionality around the original sale of the land to the Carmelites for the purposes of Catholic Education. We've asked the charities commission, who confirm that no such checks and balances have been forthcoming. Such a deal would need,

presumably, to be notified in writing to the parents of St Edwards School. As a parent in both schools, no such communication exists. So CBC are being told that a developer and a charity can gain financially and that is in the public interest - but there is absolutely nothing in that assertion that transfers, with any credibility, into assurance that the build will be as claimed, or with the benefit to the community that is necessary for the application to proceed.

Any decision to support this application in its current position will be turned over to judicial review given it is so comprehensively unsound; I presume that isn't the intent of CBC or the developers.

It is therefore in the interests of the whole community that this application goes forward with some credible, factual, evidentially based material. At the moment we do not have any of the above, and therefore further detailed comment doesn't appear to add value, on a wholly inadequate application that breaches national planning policy at every turn and fails to address the reasonable and considerable objections of the community and of CBC planning committee just 4 months ago. We concur with all the points raised in the community objection posted by the Friends of Charlton Kings.

It is perhaps unfair to be suspicious that despite nearly 3 years of debate, in just 24 hours a raft of personnel have mobilised in support of one site in Cheltenham (claiming to be parents, ex trustees of the school, arborists, social housing dependents - pretty much each and every tick box comment to counter existing points of objection). None of those addresses are to be found in support of social housing in any other application that has come to CBC in the last 5 years. If they really are so passionately committed to social housing in Cheltenham, why only this site? And why only as this application closes, not in support of e.g. 17/00710/OUT?

I hope CBC investigate the validity of the comments raised as this application closes. I presume it is possible to check the IP ranges and time stamps of the submissions. If any are found to be false, I would hope that this counts against the application as a fundamental abuse of the planning system by those pushing it forward, with commensurate consequences if and when this comes in front of the committee.

Ash Tree House  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 23rd November 2018

I strongly object to this planning application.

This development proposal is similar to the one rejected in July 218, namely 17/00710/OUT which was for 91 dwellings, and the objections I raised previously for 17/0070/OUT still stand.

In my view, the reduction to 69 dwellings does not constitute a material difference to the application. The scale of the planned development remains completely inappropriate for this site and very much out of character with the local area. The local plan states a maximum of 26 homes should be built on this land. Access to the proposed site is restrictive, with a very steep aspect to the approach and narrow roads that are in no way adequate for such a development. The site is located close to the AONB and is an extremely valuable resource for the school, local community and wildlife. The new documentation does not attempt to address or resolve any of the issues already recorded by the previous CBC refusal decision regards the previous application, nor in the many common comments submitted online.

Coversdown  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL526NY

**Comments:** 21st November 2018  
Letter attached.

60 Bouncers Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 5JN

**Comments:** 12th November 2018  
I strongly object to the new updated planning application for the following reasons:

1. Increase traffic of surrounding areas, the surrounding area is already struggling with the traffic and this will make things much worse
2. Compromised road safety
3. Unsuitable road access
4. Increase risk of flooding
5. Loss of green area and the wildlife
6. GP oversubscribed in the area
7. Schools already oversubscribed in the area
8. The loss of the sports facilities for school children

29 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018  
Letter attached.

46 School Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8BD

**Comments:** 21st November 2018  
I would like to register my objection to the above planning application.

I do not believe this application is in keeping with planning guidance and in fact goes against many of the principles of current planning policy.

This site is a wonderful open space where the local community enjoys nature walks. It is also used for annual community fireworks and inter-school cross-country by many youngsters in the county. There are ancient trees in the location that need protecting for future generations. Badgers, foxes and other creatures live in this habitat and would be displaced by any proposed construction on this site to the detriment of this local amenity.

If the site were to be built on, local roads that are already congested, would become grid-locked at peak times. The local schools and doctors surgeries are already over-subscribed and any building in this area would make the situation worse.

As an open space, this site soaks up rain helping protect houses below from flooding.

Building on this land is completely inappropriate for all the reasons stated here and should be refused completely and indefinitely.

26 Churchill Drive  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JJ

**Comments:** 1st December 2018

I wish to object for the same reasons as per the previous application which are:

Access to the site - steep, dangerous, poor visibility, narrow. Oakhurst Rise was never designed to be an access road to a larger estate with potentially an 100 additional cars using it daily.

Ewans Farm is already used as a shortcut by people avoiding the traffic lights on the London Road. Drivers ignore the 20 mph speed limits and trying to get out onto the London Road or Hales Road takes ages currently at peak times. Any additional traffic will cause huge problems. The transport plan is not realistic, most households in the area have 2 cars, people generally need to drive to work, cycling or walking are not an option.

There will be a huge loss of wildlife.

Local schools, doctor's surgeries are already over-subscribed.

Potential flooding once roads and houses are built.

Meadow View  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

Meadow View response to 18/02171/OUT related to 4th 17/00710/OUT

So yet again, the stakeholders and neighbours involved in the Oakhurst Rise proposed development need to respond to now the 1st submission of 18/02171/OUT, after the refusal of planning on July 19 of the 4th variation 17/00710/OUT - the developer's and the Carmelite Charitable Trust's ambition to destroy a natural habitat for their personal enrichment.

It is deeply disappointing that this is a new planning application and as such there has been no stakeholder engagement at all. The argument from the developer is that 18/0217/OUT is virtually the same as 17/00710/OUT, hence there is no need for any consultation. However, the developer is also arguing that this is fundamentally a different application now for 69 houses. This is inconsistent and illogical and probably a way of reducing developer costs for what is a now a project that has lost all credibility.

Where the proposal by the developer fails catastrophically is on the access route via Oakhurst Rise. At the Planning Committee Meeting in July, this point was discussed extensively and virtually all members of the Committee commented that the access was a major problem. The comment from the refusal letter stated.

The proposed access via Oakhurst Rise would have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network, and the amenity of local residents. Additionally, the steep incline within the cul-de-sac would fail to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and would likely result in a reliance on the use of private motor vehicles. Alternative potential vehicular access routes do not appear to have been fully explored. The access would therefore be at odds with saved policy CP4 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), adopted policy INF1 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017), and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

If we look at the latest proposal from the developer, he has not come up with an alternative access point or points, his only concession is a reduction in the number of dwellings from 90 to 69, or 23%. This is immaterial to the problem and as such the new application is still "at odds with saved policy CP4 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (2006), adopted policy INF1 of the Joint Core Strategy (2017), and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018)."

I also see that due to extreme gradients on the site, the developer is going to "give" the first residents of the development an electric bike. This is one of the more ludicrous things I have heard. Is this really going to change the transportation habits of the residents? Absolutely not! As such if 17/00710/OUT was rejected, so to should 18/02171/OUT on this failure alone.

However, there are multiple other failures with this application, linked to the previous refusal notice.

- There is still the issue of the proximity of the development site to the Grade 2 listed Ashley Manor, the modification to the layout does not change this. Refusal point 2.
- The plans for the re-settlement of the wildlife are poorly considered and as likely to be effective as giving residents electric bikes. Refusal point 4.
- The site is still extensive and highly visible from the AONB. Refusal point 4.

There are other numerous failures in the application. As a simple example, on the land bordering my property, Meadow View, there is a pond. The ecologists have failed to understand or even question the function of this pond. I have stated in previous responses to 17/00710/OUT that this pond is a fundamental part of the drainage of Battledown, but the developers have refused to acknowledge the importance of this pond and it looks like it will sit in the back garden of one of the properties bordering my property. This will be a safety hazard if left alone. If it is filled in, will result in a change to the drainage of Battledown area with unknown consequences. Again an example of "experts" being paid to write what the developer wants.

I am also concerned about the professionalism and independence of Michelle Payne the Planning Officer responsible for this application and 17/00710/OUT. At the July Planning Committee meeting, it was obvious she was frustrated by the rejection of "her" application and her recommendation to accept was clearly rejected by the collective and majority view of the committee. If she remains involved in the assessment of 18/02171/OUT, I would hope that her recommendations are not as biased, illogical, inconsistent as previously and this time she follows the CBC saved policies.

Finally, I would yet again re-iterate my previous proposal that the application is rejected on numerous grounds and the site should be listed as a Local Green Space (see note below - a concept pioneered by Martin Horwood) for future generations to enjoy and for preservation of the flora and fauna.



60 Horsefair Street  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8JH

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

Access

The revised application, reducing the number of houses from 90 to 69 will make very little difference to the wholly inadequate proposed access along Oakhust Rise. This is narrow and steep, and already difficult for residents, let alone an additional burden of 100+ cars.

Traffic

The existing traffic situation throughout Ewens Farm, Hales Road and the London Road at Sixways is already appalling at peak times, with traffic often at a standstill. In addition, the roads at Ewens Farm are heavily parked, with poor visibility and are difficult to navigate for pedestrians. This situation will be exacerbated enormously by the addition of such a large number of new homes.

Flooding

The 10 acre development site is very steep, and the introduction of large areas of impermeable surface will increase the risk of flooding to surrounding areas.

Amenity

The development site is well used by children from ALL the local schools as the route of two of the four annual Cheltenham Schools cross country events, and the site of the Gloucestershire schools cross country championships. The idea that it isn't 'in use' is misleading.

Visual amenity

The proposed development is in an elevated position and will be clearly visible from many places around Cheltenham, including Leckhampton Hill and the Cotswold Way at Lineover Wood. There is insufficient existing vegetation to offer any significant concealment.

Ecology

The site currently is an attractive series of green fields with ancient hedgerows and a large number of mature and veteran trees. It is home to a variety of wildlife, including badgers, bats, deer and many species of bird, all of which will be forced out by the development and will be unlikely to re-settle on site. The ecology report relies very heavily on the idea that the type of habitat it provides is readily available elsewhere nearby, but this is inaccurate. Adjacent land is managed more intensively, for sport, or as mown parkland, horse grazing or allotments and is very largely bordered by roads, so lacks the peaceful setting that enables wildlife to thrive here.

Proposed mitigation measures - in particular the proposed badger re-location - move the animals right across the site, bringing them into close contact with small back gardens, mown parkland and the school, where they are likely to be seen as a problem. The replacement sett has no coherent green corridor to the animals' established feeding grounds within the upper part of the site. In addition, the hill top location of the sett has been replaced with a much wetter site at the bottom of the hill, designated for public open space and it seems possible this will affect the uptake of the replacement sett as well as again, making the presence of the animals unwelcome.

Local Plan

The proposed development is contrary to the policies set out in the Charlton Kings Parish Plan and many aspects of it are contrary to the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan and other Council policies.

Local facilities

Local schools at Charlton Kings, Holy Apostles and Balcarras School are already under huge pressure, with increasingly tight catchment areas. The local surgery at Sixways is also heavily over-subscribed, and the large additional number of houses would increase the pressure on waiting times.

For the above reasons, I object strongly to the proposed development.

12 Lyefield Road East  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8AY

**Comments:** 7th November 2018

I object to the planning application on several grounds.

- loss of local amenity - as previous objectors have stated, the loss of the field for both the benefit of the local community fireworks display which raises funds for the school, and for the numerous cross country races held for all local schools cannot be quantified. It is staggering that yet another publicly accessible green space is being swallowed up by financially motivated development to the detriment of our children.
- as a parent at the prep school, the planning document (section 6.2.10, page 48) refers to Staff and Students of St Edwards School "Receptors will typically be engaged in other activities limiting the degree to which their attention is focused on the landscape. " My choice of school was based partly on the outside space available for children, and to say that they are not aware enough to enjoy the views out of their classroom and playground is arrogant in the extreme.
- traffic - increased level of traffic on already congested access roads
- destruction of protected habitat
- noise and disturbance from the development

I strongly object to this development.

Glenwhittan  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I write to object to the above planning application. The land in question forms part of the Cotswold escarpment and, if developed, would set a worrying precedent for further development of other parts of the escarpment.

The impact of the development would have a detrimental effect on the landscape; the green band is visible for miles around and contributes to the beauty of the Cotswolds. The preservation of urban green space is important for protecting the local ecosystem, and the proposed site is also used as a cross country course for school children across Gloucestershire.

There is one approach road to the proposed development which is windy and very steep; you weave pass parked vehicles as it is, and any additional traffic would cause congestion and potentially be dangerous.

The William Morrison Residential travel plan refers to distances from the site to amenities, as being 'easily accessible by walking (and cycling)', but the reality is that the proposed access roads are very steep: the approach road is far too steep for most cyclists and especially children on bikes/scooters (difficult to go up and dangerous to cycle down), very hard for pedestrians with any shopping, mothers with buggies/prams or anyone infirm, and unsuitable for bus access.. Therefore there is poor availability of alternative modes of transport to and from the site, other than by car.

If weather conditions are poor, for instance icy, the access roads would become extremely treacherous. If it snows or is icy, 4x4s have difficulty accessing houses on Oakhurst Rise, and other vehicles have to park on Ewens Road and walk to their houses. As it is Ewens Road becomes extremely crowded, and would not cope with an increased number of vehicles.

"Large scale development may offer an opportunity to include sustainable measures to provide alternative means of travel other than travel by car." This site does not fulfil that, there are other more suitable sites that could.

In numerous documents I have read (for instance Vehicular Access Standards, Advice documents for the Planning Service) they refer to daily traffic volumes. "The volume of traffic requires particular consideration when total flow on the minor road exceeds 500 vehicles per day (i.e. serving more than 50 dwellings)." So 69 houses would dramatically increase the total flow on the small access roads, potentially to 1000 vehicles per day.

If, on average, c 32%of households have two or more cars, 69 dwellings would dramatically increase the number of vehicles using the small access roads.

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

In respect of access to the site there are fundamental objections to the proposed development;

- 1) in relation to planning, there is only one road access to the site. In addition it is an unsuitable access using a pre-existing, very steep and narrow road designed for about 25 dwellings, and the traffic generated for the development would feed into local residential roads (Ewens and Beaufort Roads) which are also steep, narrow and already congested.
- 2) In respect of safety, the whole development is subject to the CDM regulations 2015, which require the appointments by the client of a principal designer (and principal contractor), failing which the client must fulfil the duties required by the regulations. (the designers duties apply as soon as designs which may be used in construction works in Great Britain are started....it does not matter whether planning permission or funds have been secured...;HSE guidance para 77.

Because of the very significant variation of the actual road for amateurs of the proposed access, from the recommended parameters e.g. gradients, any risk assessment which has been carried out should identify the proposed access as a potentially serious hazard, both as an access for construction work and as a permanent access to about 100 houses.

- 3) therefore the applicant should clarify the measures they propose to take to control these risks, using the principles of prevention set out in the regulations.

High Grove Greenway Lane  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6LA

**Comments:** 7th February 2019

I wish to object to this proposal on the grounds of adverse visual impact, as I have objected to its two predecessors. I would not be directly affected by this proposal as I am not an immediate neighbour and the site is not visible from my house. Nonetheless, I value enormously the sight of green Battledown Hill from various vantage points across the south-east of this town. This place is a uniquely beautiful feature of the town, and must not be covered and blighted by a dense housing project. Cheltenham's urban green open spaces are an invaluable asset for generations to come, and we should not be guilty in our time of wanton destruction of beautiful and irreplaceable townscape.

Should the Planning Committee approve this proposal to turn lovely Battledown Hill into a concrete and masonry staircase, looming grotesquely over St Edwards Prep School, they will be remembered by future generations for vandalism of an extreme order. This magnificent, prominent green slope can be seen and enjoyed for miles around and it is one of those several vital features which make Cheltenham such a beautiful town.

Cheltenham needs the same level of resolve now from our present Planning Committee as that shown when their predecessors in office were faced with horrendous proposals to erect enormous residential tower blocks in Charlton Park.

Battledown is far too important an asset to ruin for the sake of meeting housing targets, which can readily be met elsewhere.

25 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JS

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I object to this planning application because:

1. Road access

Oakhurst Rise is not acceptable as an access road as it is a narrow, steep and is often lined with parked cars. The additional cars using this route will only exacerbate existing issues. This same argument applies to the other potential access road (Charlton Court Road).

2. Increased flooding risks

My understanding is that, due to the steepness of the site and the fact that the moisture absorbing field will be replaced by tarmac and other impermeable materials, this will simply mean that developments at the bottom of the hill could be subject to a greater flooding risk.

3. Traffic flows

The proposed development will clearly increase traffic along Ewens, Beaufort and Hales Roads. You only need to stand on any one of these roads during early morning rush hour to realise the impact this development will have on already busy and tight roads with parked cars.

4. Loss of green field site

My understanding is that this is a site that is home to a significant range of wildlife that will simply be lost to the area.

#### 5. Access to public services

Without corresponding increases to GP and school funding/places surely this development will only add to existing challenges for the area.

For the above reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development.

41 Ryeworth Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6LG

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I have coached a junior school cross country team for 8 years, and have been to many cross country competitions at St Edwards school. The sight of hundreds of children running this course is wonderful, and the benefits to their current and future physical and mental health as a result of training for, and participating in, this sport must be underestimated.

There is no course like this in Cheltenham, and the development of the site for housing would mean a loss to children of the town and county which cannot be replaced.

I urge the planning committee to refuse permission to develop the field, thus enabling future generations of children and young people to use the land for their benefit rather than letting a few individuals profit from destroying it.

Newlands  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I strongly object to this application.

The application was refused at the Council planning committee meeting in July, on the grounds that Oakhurst Rise is unsuitable as an access road to the site. This was referenced as falling short of Policy CP4, in accordance with Safe and Sustainable Living as part of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan. This has not been addressed in the new plans; I, therefore, don't see how this proposal can be supported when the access road remains the same.

The councillors unanimously agreed that the development would detrimentally affect the environment (Policy CP 3: Sustainable environment). The development would only be permitted where it would not harm the landscape character. It was agreed that the loss of veteran trees, the harm to heritage assets, the badger set and character of the site would all be negatively affected and simply do not adhere to the criteria set out in this policy. In addition, Policy CP 3 clearly states that development will be permitted only where it would not harm the setting Cheltenham (note 1), including views into or out of areas of acknowledged importance. The space in question is directly visible from an acknowledged AONB, therefore, this development should be not be supported on this basis.

The same policy states that development would be permitted only where it would not harm landscape character and conserve or enhance the best of the built natural environments, and safeguard and promote biodiversity. Digging out badger sets, cutting down veteran trees, killing

wildlife and wiping out rare flora and fauna, to name a few, is again, justifiable rationale to not support this proposal.

Policy GE6 Trees and development. Causing permanent damage to trees of high value. Policy GE5 Protection and replacement of trees would be resisted. We will resist the unnecessary felling of valued trees on private land. It was stated that these trees are valued in their setting as they contribute to the natural setting of the area and should, therefore, be preserved.

Policy GB3 Mature trees to be retained and existing landscape to be retained and enhanced. Disturbance of significant habitats to be avoided.

Policy CP5 Sustainable transport. Sixways and Hales Road Traffic is a significant issue with both junctions under severe strain at rush hour and key periods of the day. The distance to the shops from the proposed development is 1100 meters, not the distance recorded by the developers and as a result, people will drive. Additional cars, plus the impact on local amenities will be devastating.

I vehemently oppose this development as it goes against a vast number of the clearly defined policies of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan.

Tall Timbers  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NS

**Comments:** 14th November 2018

I strongly object to the application for a number of different reasons:

- 1) Unsuitable access and increased traffic: the roads surround ewens farm and oakhurst are already crowded and dangerous hence the 20mph speed limit. A higher volume of traffic through this area is not suitable or safe especially for the high number of cyclists and children who use the route to get to the local schools.
- 2) The effects to the environment. The area proposed for development is a large field which homes lots of wildlife including newts, bats and badgers and also contains protected trees.
- 3) The unfactual inaccurate documents supplied by the developers. There are many errors and manipulative inaccuracies among the papers supplied. I ask the council to fully investigate all documents at the cost of the developers and get an independent view on all documents supplied.
- 4) The increase in flood risk. As a local resident we were affected by the local flooding in Cheltenham. The field holds a huge quantity of water when there is heavy rain and helps reduce this risk.

29 Charlton Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8DH

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

We are the owners of Dalswinton, Birchley Road, Battledown GL52 6NY and we strongly object to this application. The previous application for 90 houses was rejected by the Planning Committee and this application should be rejected for the same reasons:

#### 1. Road access

Whether there are 90 or 69 houses, the proposed access along Oakhust Rise is still totally inadequate. This road is a narrow, steep cul-de-sac and the gradient and narrowness of this road make vehicular access to a further 69 houses completely unsuitable.

#### 2. Increased traffic

The proposed development will considerably increase traffic along Ewens Road, Beaufort Road and Hales Road. Hales Road is often already at a standstill as is the London Road at Sixways.

#### 3. Increased Flood Risk

The 10 acre development site will be largely covered in impermeable material leading to an increased flood risk. We have witnessed flash flood streams running down Birchley Road.

#### 4. Loss of green field site

As stated in our previous objection, the site currently is an attractive green field area with ancient hedgerows and mature well established trees and is home to a variety of wildlife, including badgers, bats deer and many species of bird. All this will be lost if the development goes ahead.

5. The proposed development is contrary to the Charlton Kings Parish Plan and many aspects of it are contrary to the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan and other Council policies.

#### 6. Visual Impact

The proposed development is in an elevated position and will be a blight on the landscape being visible from many places around Cheltenham, including Leckhampton Hill and the Cotswold Way at Lineover Wood.

#### 7. Lack of amenities

There would still be a huge impact on the Balcarras School catchment area and other facilities such as Sixways Surgery. Both are already heavily over-subscribed,

For the above reasons, we strongly object to the proposed development.

Wadleys Farm  
Ham Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NJ

**Comments:** 23rd November 2018

Letter attached.

32 Copt Elm Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8AH

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I object on the grounds that this site is unsuitable for 69 new homes. The access road to the site is totally unsuitable, too narrow and steep. The extra volume of traffic trying to use this road would be intolerable for residents already living in the area. The loss of Another area of Outstanding Beauty destroyed for profit. The wildlife that is within the area will be lost. More artificial street light spoiling the night skies. Where are the extra hospital beds coming from to

cater for all the new builds around Cheltenham. School places and doctors surgery appointments are already stretched with long waiting times.

I have also noticed that some support for this build has been entered twice from the same address, is that allowed?

Also the minority amount of support entries have only appeared since the previous application was turned down, funny that.

16 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I'm disappointed to learn that there is yet another planning application on the land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise - particularly so soon after a previous application was refused, on numerous grounds. Thus far, every application which has been proposed on this land has been refused, which surely illustrates that there are multiple factors of concern which make the area unsuitable for development.

Of primary concern are the following points:

The road transport infrastructure in the area is already struggling. It will not cope with additional vehicles. Already, it can be difficult to navigate access to and through Oakhurst Rise due to the number of vehicles; additional cars will make this issue worse. Additionally, we don't have the public transport services we used to have, which in turn pushes people to have their own vehicles, which perpetuates the issues above.

There are numerous veteran and ancient trees, many of which are not protected. It would be abhorrent for these trees not to be protected and allowed to flourish. Cheltenham prides itself on its vibrant and rich diversity of trees. Cheltenham Council's own website states that they are 'committed to maintaining' the legacy trees across the town.

And this is before mentioning the wildlife - two types of deer, badgers, foxes, bats, tawny and barn owls, two type of woodpeckers, numerous rare birds, reptiles - who have made their homes in those fields and will be displaced, or worse, culled.

The area is already saturated, with schools, doctors and dentists over subscribed.

The claims for social and affordable housing claims are not credible.

The residents in this area have been under a ridiculous amount of stress due to the ongoing debacle of previous applications. This is our home locale. We just want to live here peacefully and stress-free. All we ask is that common sense is applied to protect one of Cheltenham's vibrant green spaces. If this development goes ahead, the lives of those in Ewens Farm and Oakhurst Rise will be adversely affected on a protracted basis.

And finally, there's the imminent flood risk. Run-off in the area is already heavy, with storm drains pushed to maximum on rainy days. The field floods and clogs already and I'm doing so protects the whole of the downstream area from flooding. Building on it will introduce flood and subsidence risk for hundreds of homes in the Oakhurst / Ewens Farm area.

Given the extensive investigations which went into the recent application before it was declined, I put my faith in my local council that protecting our environment and common sense will prevail over short-term commercial gain.



32 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I object to these plans for the following reasons:-

- As before the proposed development has access only from Oakhurst Rise. This was one of the reasons for rejecting the previous planning application. There are no other obvious or viable alternatives for access. The access road in Oakhurst Rise has blind bends and a steep gradient. The approach is narrow and with limited visibility. These roads are not gritted and are unsafe and unusable in icy conditions. The gradient suggests that few people would walk to local shops, so creating yet more local traffic.
- The local plan says a maximum of 26 homes should be built on this land.
- The traffic and transport plans are also not credible. They do not reflect actual use of surrounding roads. There would be greatly increased pressure of traffic throughout the Ewens farm estate and local access roads. These roads are already very busy especially during rush hour. The 20mph limit is rarely observed by motorists using it as a rat run from London Road/Hales Road and many cars are parked on the roadsides. The lives of those in Ewens Farm and Oakhurst Rise will be badly affected by vastly increased traffic and construction vehicles.
- Badgers, bats, reptiles and rare birds all lose an organic meadow habitat
- Veteran and ancient trees are not protected
- Springs and ponds are affected on a steep clay bank; currently this field protects the whole of the downstream area from flooding. Building on it will introduce flood and subsidence risk for 100s of homes
- Charlton Kings schools and doctors' surgeries are already over capacity
- This development would also mean the loss of a rich biodiverse site, green space and sports amenity to the community Charlton Kings.

Woodlands  
Oakley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6PA

**Comments:** 5th December 2018

Please take into account my previous listed objections to the proposed (now revised) development on Oakhurst Road.

As previously stated I object strongly to this new attempt to cover our precious green spaces in yet more housing particularly when Cheltenham's future housing needs have now been met until 2031.

To re-emphasise Mike objections to the current application I am particularly concerned for the following items all of which have stated in previous objections:

1. Severe traffic impact
2. An outline planning application is not acceptable under the current circumstances particularly when planners have asked for detailed plans. I believe this is a Trojan horse to exploit planning laws.
3. I'm told that 40% affordable housing claim is fake news as there are issues currently under consideration and concern for our local councillors concerning this issue.

4. Again I raise the issue of our built environment and the impact on drainage and added flood risk.
5. It is a well-known fact that our schools, doctors et cetera are hopelessly oversubscribed, additional housing would further exacerbate this problem.
6. I appeal to our planning committee to take real consideration of Richard Attenborough's appeal to the international summit on climate change earlier this week. Civilisation, particularly our decision-makers in planning and consents, have a very real responsibility to think very carefully about the impact of such planning applications on our natural environment.
7. I understand that dozens of single sentence emails sent from development companies far and wide have been received in support of this planning application. Such use of our modern media should not be permitted. I appeal to the planning committee to consider the voice of the local people who along with future generations will have to live with the decisions made by our current planning committee.

Please do not let this valuable greenfield site become covered in concrete.

Field House  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6PH

**Comments:** 22nd November 2018  
Letter attached.

14 Ewens Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JP

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

This isn't complicated (& is not connected with the welfare of trees or otherwise); there is simply not enough space to accommodate more traffic piling through what would be a huge bottleneck at the entrance of Oakhurst. It is narrow, steep, and is proposed as the only entry to the new development, not to mention the already busy Ewens/Beaufort Rd.

It won't work.

1 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JS

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

As a resident of Beaufort Road at the junction with Oakhurst Rise I continue to strongly object to outline application that has been submitted and the shoddy evidence that supports it.

This site provides a valuable green field amenity for many local activities which would be lost if the development were to go ahead including the annual fireworks event at St Edwards School, enjoyed by thousands of visitors. The outline application does not see meet the conditions

outlined in paragraph 93 of the National Planning Policy Framework that would allow building on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields.

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF confirms that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment generally including protecting and enhancing "valued landscapes" while paragraph 175 c states "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists;". There appear to be no exceptional reasons for the loss of veteran trees on this site nor a suitable compensation/offsetting strategy.

Access available to the site is grossly inadequate to support the significant volume of road traffic that would be generated by so many houses in this location. Oakhurst Rise is accessed by a sharp bend from Beaufort Road with a gradient steep enough to be impassable when icy. This road will not be able to handle the extra few hundred car movements every day. While HGV traffic will also find access very difficult during construction causing further disturbance and inconvenience to local residents.

Beaufort Road and Ewens Road are used as rat runs for commuter traffic travelling from Hales Road to London Road. Despite traffic calming measures, a 20mph speed limit and on street parking, cars still travel at great speed on these roads. Adding further traffic to these roads with sensitive junctions will affect the safety of school children and dog walkers. A recent planning application for new houses to be built on brownfield site in 'Tim Fry' area was rejected, one of the main reasons for this was due to impact on the local traffic.

The proposed development makes no contribution to local services with local doctors and schools already over capacity.

9 Ewens Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JW

**Comments:** 29th November 2018

I wish to once again object to this revised planning application.

The situation regarding increased traffic volume and associated pollution will still exist if this development goes ahead. The local roads are already too busy with traffic speeding through attempting to avoid the London Road congestion.

Six ways doctors surgery is already oversubscribed, it's now almost impossible to book an appointment to see a doctor. This will only add to the load.

Another reason for objecting is the loss of yet more precious green space, adding to the pressure on wildlife, not to mention the associated flooding risk from concreting over green space such as this.

24 Castlefields Avenue  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6YR

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

The proposed access route is inappropriate given that it is unsuitable for the volume of cars involved and very steep. The site is well used by the local community for both an annual bonfire celebration and regular cross country competitions by local and county schools, as well as being part of the regular lessons for St Edwards' pupils. Losing this amenity would therefore be a great loss. There will be an unacceptable detrimental impact on the local environment, including habitat loss for wild animals such as badgers, bats, foxes and an increased flood risk. Local infrastructure (schools, doctors surgeries, roads) will be put under unreasonable strain. I strongly object to these proposals.

8 Pine Close  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JR

**Comments:** 15th November 2018  
Letter attached.

8 Pine Close  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JR

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

I would like to object to this planning application on the grounds of public safety. I've been a firefighter for 30 years, working for Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service. I've also lived in Pine close for the last 17 years. Every year when there is snow on the ground, I watch from my window, the vehicles that struggle to get up ewens road and onto beaufort road, in fact quite often they are unable to get up the road, so have to slowly reverse back down to the bottom or even abandon the vehicle. I can confirm on days like that it would be impossible to get a 17 ton fire appliance up the road. I do worry and hope that on days like this that we don't have an house fire in pine close or oakhurst road. So to build even more houses at the top of oakhurst road would only increase the risk of having a house fire and therefore risk to life.

5 The Gables  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6TR

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

As a former pupil of St Edward's Preparatory School and Secondary School I am in support of this application as the school are being gifted the land meaning they are able to raise funds to improve their overall facilities.

Furthermore the planning includes affordable housing which Cheltenham needs especially for the younger residents wishing to be home owners.

263A Old Bath Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 9EF

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

Assists Cheltenham Borough Council to fill the shortfall they currently have in the provision of both "Affordable" and "Private" housing stock.

17 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I once again wish to object to the above planning application, as per the last application I stress that the access is simply not suitable or safe. Most evenings Oakhurst Rise has around 10-15 parked cars on it, this would be most chaotic if there were to be through traffic and inaccessible to bin lorries and emergency services. Earlier in the year during the snow only those with 4x4 vehicles could get their cars off the road, the residents of the proposed development would be similarly stranded and faced with a skating rink to get out. The documents suggest the location to be within walking/cycling distance of the town centre, I challenge anyone to go shopping in town and walk/cycle back with their purchases to the top of Oakhurst Rise! There are plenty of accessible sites around Cheltenham far more suited than this prominent Greenfield site.

Many thanks for your consideration

Sisson Road  
Gloucester  
GL2 0RA

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

People have to live somewhere! and especially Affordable housing is needed in this location. I have realised this personally from having to move from the area due to no affordable housing.

133 New Barn Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 3LQ

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

This is one of the few remaining sites left within Cheltenham. The minimum benefit it currently offers is hugely outweighed to what it gives in terms of much needed housing - affordable homes for younger people together with 41 new homes desperately needed in Cheltenham. The site is perfectly sustainable, the scheme is very sympathetic and if housing doesn't go here we will just see the town continue to expand outwards. This scheme should be supported.

Nutfield Ridge  
Stanley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6PE

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

An amazing proposition for St Edwards. I fully support the application as it will secure the school's longevity at zero cost. The proposed development will provide a significant number of much needed affordable homes for younger people. Greater certainty over the retention and preservation of this attractive parkland area within Charlton Kings.

Ash Tree House  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 26th November 2018

I wish to strongly object to this 'new' planning application. This application is merely a minor amendment to the previous application - 17/00710/OUT, which was comprehensively rejected by CBC. None of the reasons for refusal contained within CBCs own decision letter, have been adequately addressed by the latest application so this application should also be rejected. This application also directly contravenes the provisions contained within the Local Housing Development Plan for Cheltenham, approved by CBC within the last few months.

In my opinion, the scale of the planned development with 69 dwellings remains completely inappropriate for this site and very much out of character with the local area. Access to the proposed site is restrictive, with a very steep aspect to the approach and narrow roads that are in no way suitable. Therefore, with regards to the above concerns and my comments submitted against the previous application - 17/00710/OUT, it is respectfully requested that planning permission for the above development be refused.

36 Suffolk Parade  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2AD

**Comments:** 17th November 2018

I have lived in Cheltenham for over 50 years and have seen the ability of the young people of this fine town struggle to rent and buy their own home become for and more of a struggle.

This application will provide many the opportunity to get on the property ladder in the rented and part ownership sector.

Cheltenham also has a shortfall in its housing land supply that this application will go some way to relieving that situation.

St Edwards school will benefit from the gifting of the freehold of the school and buildings to them that will secure the long term benefit of its pupils. I ask all Cheltonians to support this application.

40 Pilley Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 9ER

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I see no reason for this to be rejected as my children have had to move away due to lack of affordable housing in the area.

Flat 4  
Cameron House  
Glencairn Park Road Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2<sup>ND</sup>

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I firmly object to the latest planning application for a housing development situated off Oakhurst Rise.

## ACCESS

During the last planning application process, serious concerns were raised regarding the plans to use Oakhurst Rise as an access point for the new site - nothing has been done to address this issue.

As discussed heavily during the initial plan, the gradient of Oakhurst Rise makes it an incredibly difficult road to navigate with the situation as is. When entering the road by making a left, it is difficult to catch sight of any on-coming traffic. More often than not, visitors turning in too quickly fail to spot another car leaving the road. I have witnessed on many occasions fast-breaking and near misses. Add the many winding, narrow roads into the equation which surround the Ewen's farm area and you are asking for trouble - especially when tripling the number of vehicles that pass through these hazardous roads.

Residents often park along the junction leading to Oakhurst Rise which restricts access further. Again, this leads to several near-miss incidents as drivers turn into the road without awareness of the issues. During the winter, access is often impossible for residents and visitors alike. When visiting my parents in icy conditions, I am often forced to park at the bottom of the road so as not to put myself or others at risk.

Luckily, many of the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise are retired and may not require constant use of their cars - however, a major development like the one suggested - tripling the number of vehicles - would no doubt give rise to accidents along what can be a very treacherous road.

Clearly, Oakhurst Rise is an unsuitable access point and many residents are finding the persistence of the developers incredibly upsetting. The lives of those living in the Ewen's Farm area and Oakhurst Rise would be negatively affected should the development go ahead.

## HABITAT AND OVER-SUBSCRIPTION

It is hard to ignore the huge environmental damage this development would undoubtedly result in.

Notably, 5 out of a possible 7 NERC Priority Species of bats were found on site. This is an area of outstanding beauty, where badgers, reptiles, rare birds and ancient trees can be found. Even deer can be found roaming around the area - something that the councillors can attest to as they were lucky enough to make a sighting on their last visit!

Acting humanely and destroying this wild habitat cannot run in tandem here.

Finally, Charlton Kings schools and doctor surgeries are already over-subscribed. It cannot be a responsible move to further increase the population of this neighbourhood. The additional housing is simply not required and neither the site nor the road can handle the proposed development.

Willoughby  
1 Suffolk Square  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2DR

**Comments:** 11th December 2018

This development should proceed on the pure basis that it achieves so much in securing the Schools longevity and sustainability, along with much needed housing numbers including affordable homes for the younger generation desperately needed in the Cheltenham area. It also protects the surrounding wildlife habitat. This is surely a win win situation for all concerned and should be approved accordingly...

Flat 5  
Cameron House  
Glencairn Park Road Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2<sup>ND</sup>

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I wish to oppose the updated planning application for a housing development situated off Oakhurst Rise.

**ACCESS**

My primary objection is that the road network of the Ewans Farm estate are extremely narrow and winding. I've been stuck in traffic on many occasions due to the nature of the roads - with lots of cars parked on the road, it hazardous for road users during peak times.

The situation is worse during the winter months, parking is really risky when the roads are icy - the steep gradient and high number of cars keen I've seen a significant number of crashes between cars parking/leaving. I imagine it's even worse for the significant number of elderly residence that live in the area.

If this planning application is approved, it would make it extremely difficult for residents to use their cars/driveways in the winter. I imagine that over time, this could lead to a large number of accidents/insurance claims, pushing the cost of car insurance up for local residents.

**HABITAT**

I do also share the concerns raised regarding the permanent loss to the environment this development will cause. The important green space is much used by dog walkers and local children. I'm told that it is also a very ecologically diverse area, home to rare species of bats, birds and badgers. I find the destruction of defenseless animals habitats very upsetting.

**SOCIAL HOUSING**

I don't think that the allocation of affordable housing is creditable. I think the developers have shown a great deal of cynicism in the split between properties that could be affordable to low/middle income families, compared to executive homes that will only be in budget for the elite.



1 Prinbox Works  
Saddlers Lane  
Tivoli Walk  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 2UX

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

As a former Trustee of the School I write in support of the application which secures the long term future with provision of the freehold of the site.

Brereton House  
Stow Road  
Andoversford, Cheltenham  
GL54 4JN

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

As a former pupil of the school, this is a hugely beneficial application to support. It gives them their future. The added bonus is the housing which will also help the local Sixways area.

2 Imperial Square  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 1QB

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I would like to support this application. Cheltenham is in need of more affordable homes and this application provides a further 28 such houses. The development also generates employment opportunities for the town. The development site is within the town boundary and is suitable for development.

216 Leckhampton Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 0AW

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

A long term habitat for the wildlife, trees, flora and fauna within the development itself but most importantly within the 30 acres of "Parkland" transferred to the School.

Southern Lawn  
Ashley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NU

**Comments:** 7th December 2018

I travel to work very often going through the Ewens Farm Estate most mornings and evenings, via the Battledown Trading Estate. The traffic along the route that goes along King Alfred Way, Churchill Drive, Ewens Road, Beaufort Road and Charlton Court Road is already very congested, and can be dangerous with aggressive drivers trying to get through small gaps. The restricted

road access system and speed bumps, with traffic speeds already restricted to 20 mph, is already overcrowded at peak times.

Many house owners also park their vehicles on these roads on both sides, making driving along these roads very fraught when one has to weave in and out all the time. Battledown Trading Estate is already overcrowded with many workers' vehicles parked along both sides of the roads named above. Many are 'illegally' parked all day in the small playground car park at the far North Eastern end of Haywards Road, which means that vehicles taking small children to the Queen Elizabeth II Playground cannot park in the reserved area as intended, and have to park elsewhere causing more obstructions to be navigated. The fact that children are now having to get in and out of cars on these very busy roads simply to go to the park, will present a serious danger, again making driving very difficult, especially with the many vans and small lorries that take short cuts using this route.

The volume of houses proposed and the associated number of vehicles that will be making school runs as well, will cause unacceptable jams.

Air pollution will also dramatically increase as a result of the many vehicle stop / starts that will ensue.

Flat 4  
35 St Georges Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 3DU

**Comments:** 21st January 2019  
Letter attached.

40 Pilley Lane  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 9ER

**Comments:** 20th November 2018  
I don't see why this application doesn't go through. Young people like me need to get a foot on the property ladder especially in Charlton Kings.

**Comments:** 4th December 2018  
I fail to understand the objection from Outwards, Ashley Road referring to the point there is supposedly enough affordable housing until 2031. There is currently over 2500 people in Cheltenham on the list waiting for affordable housing. One of those waiting is myself.

14 Henry Crescent  
Walton Cardiff  
Tewkesbury  
GL20 7TN

**Comments:** 20th November 2018  
There is a real need for affordable housing in the local area to allow younger people to get a foot on the property ladder. There is a real shortage of affordable housing in the local area and this development will provide a significant amount of this much needed affordable housing.

Sunnyhill  
Stanley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6QD

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I would like to support this application as it will help solve the problem Cheltenham faces regarding the lack of housing in the Charlton Kings area.

19 Glenfall Street  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2JA

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Cheltenham has a greater need for more affordable housing for people like myself who are currently forced to rent and would like to be in the position whereby they can own a property within the area. This development would encourage younger people, people with families and single professionals, those in employment and seeking employment to be on the property ladder. The development in turn would increase employment within the area and encourage footfall for local businesses.

The development will provide protection to the badgers, preservation of the parkland and surrounding areas which is essential in benefitting the local area, community and sustaining the environment.

29 Galileo Gardens  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0GA

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

As a Cheltenham resident I would like to express my opposition to planning application 18/02171/OUT, for the following reasons:

- veteran and ancient trees are not protected
- heritage assets are harmed
- traffic and transport plans are not credible
- the lives of those in Ewens Farm and Oakhurst Rise will be badly affected
- the "social / affordable" housing claims are not credible
- Charlton Kings schools and doctors surgeries are already over capacity
- Gloucestershire loses a cross country course that has been used by primary school children since 1957
- badgers, bats, reptiles and rare birds all lose an organic meadow habitat
- springs and ponds are affected on a steep clay bank; currently this field protects the whole of the downstream area from flooding. Building on it will introduce flood and subsidence risk for 100s of homes (just ask those below the Oakley build what that looks like!!)

5 The Gables  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6TR

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I fully support this development for several reasons:

As a former parent at St Edward's Prep and Senior Schools, I appreciate the incredible gift to the Prep School of the Freehold. This will free up school funds that can be used, amongst other things, to improve sporting facilities not just for St Edward's School but also for other local schools.

This development will provide desperately needed new homes in the area, to include 28 urgently needed affordable homes.

There are many small businesses in Charlton Kings and these businesses would benefit hugely from increased footfall.

Not only will all, bar one, of the veteran trees on the land remain, a further 170 will be provided.

I wholeheartedly believe that this development will benefit the whole area of Charlton Kings

12 Malleson Road  
Gotherington  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 4ER

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I have been looking for property in the Charlton Kings area and having moved away from the area some 10 years ago I am surprised by the lack of availability and the high prices in the area. Surely some good quality new homes will only benefit the area and with the provision of some form of affordable homes this can only go to benefit the area as a whole. I would love to move in to a house in this area

65 Malleson Road, Gotherington  
Cheltenham  
GL52 9EX

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I support this application. Firstly an area of 30 acres of parkland will remain therefore still allowing wildlife to flourish, not something that many developers do. More importantly though it provides 28 affordable homes. Being a mother of 2 young adults soon hoping to look at joining the housing ladder this may give them a chance to buy in their home town !!

Flat 3  
67 Shurdington Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 0JG

**Comments:** 19th November 2018

I strongly object to this proposal mainly on the basis of significant increase in traffic in the area. Apart from using the A40 frequently, that area is on the traffic news on a daily basis. In addition to that, green spaces are very important for the eco-health of any area and in the Cheltenham area they are disappearing at a frightening speed.

Spinnaker House  
Spinnaker Road  
Gloucestershire  
GL2 5FD

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

The scheme offer a balanced mix of housing on land that appears suitable for development and complies with policy which will assist the local community and Cheltenham in general.

The application should be considered, supported and permitted for those that work and need homes in the area that are the silent majority and not refused based on the views of the NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) objectors.

153 Prestbury Road  
Cheltenham  
GL522du

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

It would be great to have the opportunity to get a foot on the ladder of such a desirable area to be nearer to my family, therefore, I believe that it should be approved.

31 Charlton Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8DH

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I am writing to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

- veteran and ancient trees are not protected and badgers, bats, reptiles, birds and other animals will lose valuable habitat
- traffic and transport will be significantly affected by the increase in cars accessing the site
- schools and doctors surgeries in Charlton Kings are already over subscribed
- Gloucestershire children lose a long established cross country course
- the local plan says a maximum of 26 homes should be built on this land. A 69 house estate is being proposed.

I have been unable to submit my objection via the online planning portal. Please do not make my name or email address public.

The Villa  
Great Witcombe  
GL3 4TS

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

Against the proposal

I strongly object to this proposal. I regularly visit Battledown and find the access to the area extremely difficult due to the current weight of traffic. I understand this application has been previously refused - not so long ago - and I wonder what has changed for it to be re-submitted. The amount of new building occurring in Cheltenham and the surrounding areas - particularly with the major access roads to the town is very concerning. The disappearance of remaining green recreational areas in built up areas is also a detriment to Cheltenham.

Pelham Lodge  
Back Lane  
Malvern  
WR14 2HJ

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I strongly support this application. Cheltenham desperately needs more 'mid-range' and affordable dwellings, not to mention further employment opportunities within the town itself.

22 Charlton Court Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JB

**Comments:** 21st November 2018

I am trying to submit a comment on the proposal ..... by today's deadline. Your website is not responding. I will continue to attempt to access your website, but in case it is still not working by the time the deadline for submission passes, am copying my comments here, below:

It is utterly incomprehensible that it should be thought acceptable to foist this ill-thought out development on the local residents and unique environment in Battledown / Charlton Kings. There is already a serious problem with flooding, experienced in the last two years by residents of Charlton Court Road. This has not suitably addressed in the revised proposals. The facts need to be believed and dealt with appropriately, not swept aside because they are uncomfortable. Nobody has contacted residents of the road to enquire as to this, in spite of the reported problems. How then can an informed decision be taken, without having ascertained the facts from the people who already live there? Has it been taken on board that elderly residents have had to turn out in storms to dig trenches so as to avert flood waters pouring down St. Edward's field and in to Charlton Court Road? Development of land above this would only exacerbate this problem.

The noise and disturbance from this developed to both the natural environment and local residents would be such that the neighbourhood would be radically changed. The amount of increased traffic is unsuitable for the roads (Oakhurst Rise, Charlton Court Road, Ewens Road). The reduction of proposed dwellings from 90 to 69 appears to me to make no real difference to the problem of too much traffic and impact on the environment.

The visual impact would be a serious degradation of what is now a semi-rural environment. This inappropriate development would radically change the quality of the day-to-day lives of local residents, changing a quiet neighbourhood into busy thoroughfares.

It is laughable to suggest that the development will enhance the lives of the children at St. Edward's School. It will detract from what is now a beautiful, healthy and safe environment, changing the landscape irrevocably for the worse.

The initial proposal was rejected on the grounds of the lack of suitable access. This basic fact is still the case. Such a large development would put pressure on local doctors and schools. At

heart this is a proposal to make money for a few individuals, with no regard as to the impact on the environment or to the residents of Charlton Kings.

163 London Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6HN

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

As a Parent of two former pupils at St Edward's I totally support the scheme for the benefits it brings to the school, namely, the very generous gift of the freehold to the school (taking them away from the existing lease), which will greatly enhance the school and protect it's environment forever more.

According to the current government more houses no matter what are essential. Less NIMBY

1 Oakhurst Rise  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JU

**Comments:** 18th November 2018

I strongly object to the application for a number of different reasons:

- 1) Extremely unsuitable access area and increased traffic which is not sustainable for the small roads, ageing and family populations: the roads surrounding Ewens Farm and Oakhurst Rise are already over-crowded and dangerous, especially the ascent up Oakhurst Rise off the one-way system, which is a blind corner, hence the 20mph speed limit. A higher volume of traffic through this area is not suitable or safe especially for the high number of cyclists and children who use the route to get to the local schools, which are all full at present, not to mention doctor's surgeries and lack of parking.
- 2) The effects to the environment. The area proposed for development is a large field which homes lots of wildlife including newts, bats and badgers and also contains protected trees. Pollution levels will also impact massively on surrounding populations, which include elderly people.
- 3) The documents supplied by the developers, I am given to understand, are more than a little un-factual: i.e. there are errors and manipulative inaccuracies among the papers supplied. I would urge the council to investigate all of these, at the cost of the developers, and maybe get an independent view on these.
- 4) The increased flood risk. Local residents were affected by the local flooding in 2007 and 2017. The field holds a huge quantity of water when there is heavy rain and helps reduce this risk. Any housing development would need to take into account the environmental risks, and combat flooding risks, which would mean less profit for the developer and may render the project fruitless for them.

This is not the place to build. Cheltenham needs no more traffic, flooding risks, expensive homes in unsuitable areas, and we need to leave the precious little green space we have alone. This town attracts people because of its natural beauty. Let's leave this how it is. This proposal is nothing more than a money making scheme, which will have no positive impact on anything or anyone.

26 Bracken Way  
Malvern  
WR14 1JH

**Comments:** 16th November 2018

The proposed scheme will provide 28 critically needed affordable homes and 41 new homes desperately required in Cheltenham.

Enabling residential development will also mean the school is gifted the freehold, instead of continuing via an insecure leasehold arrangement. This will ensure the school's longevity and sustainability.

Greenacres  
Madresfield Road  
Malvern  
WR13 5AS

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Im looking to move to Cheltenham, this is a development and area I would like to live in

77 Denman Avenue  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 4GF

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

There is already a major lack of affordable housing, as myself and my family have had to move away from the area, so know this only too well. This project gets my full support

Ash Tree House  
Birchley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6NY

**Comments:** 23rd November 2018

I strongly object to this proposal for all the same reasons that the CBC Planning Committee cited for it's refusal of the previous application on this site, namely 17/00710/OUT, which was only recently rejected by CBC in July 2018.

This application is merely a minor amendment to the previous application by the developers which was comprehensively rejected by CBC. From CBCs own refusal decision letter, five key reasons were recorded. None of these reasons have been adequately addressed by the latest application so this application should also be rejected.

15 Selkirk Street  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2HJ

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

We wish to support this development which will assist in securing the long term future of St Edwards school where we are considering sending our children.



45 Eldon Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6TX

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

This is an excellent site for much needed affordable dwellings, the development of this site is long overdue and will give young families the opportunity to purchase homes which would give access to good schools and amenities. To leave this site as a toilet for people's dogs and undeveloped would be a tragedy when homes are so desperately needed by so many.

7 Bath Mews  
Bath Parade  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 7HL

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

My belief is that this application should be permitted for the following reasons:-

1. It helps to address the identified shortfall in social and open market housing within Cheltenham.
2. It offers the school an opportunity to expand and improve its facilities, to the benefit of its pupils, pupils elsewhere in the town, and the local community.
3. By enhancing the assets of the school, it helps to sustain the school's offer and hence its contribution to the town in general.

Smith Barn  
Bentham Lane  
Cheltenham  
GL51 4TZ

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Much needed housing, looks like a great development. somewhere I would like to live.

15 Castle Street  
Worcester  
WR1 3AD

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Perfect area for a good affordable development

77 Denman Avenue  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 4GF

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I have wanted to relocate my family into this area for a number of years now and have found the housing market to be slow and stagnant. I appreciate that people currently living in the area do

not want to move away but a project like this will give me the opportunity to purchase a house here and take advantage of the local area and excellent schools available to my young children. I whole heartedly support the application.

1A Pine Close  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JR

**Comments:** 28th November 2018

I wish to object strongly to this application and am surprised and dismayed that another application has been made so soon after the previous one was rejected.

I can only re-iterate the common-sense points that other objectors have raised. Particularly the impact to traffic around that area, which is already unmanageable, and the impact to the schools and GP places. Sixways surgery is already significantly over-burdened.

The affects on the local environment, including increased risk of flooding and the effect on wildlife must also be taken into account.

I can only hope that developers eventually tire of hearing the same opposition to the same planning request!

11 Wimborne Close  
Up Hatherley  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 3QP

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

I support this application as it provides 28 affordable houses, which are needed in this area of Cheltenham for young people.

This also secures 30acres of parkland transferred to the school.

84 Church Road  
Leckhampton  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 0PD

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

1. As an Arborist I strongly support the retention and protection of Veteran Trees and with the additional 170+ planting of new trees, this gains my support.
2. With securing the School's ability to carry out improvements, this will not only benefit the School but the local community, and that can only be a positive in my eyes.
3. I am also pleased to see consideration taken for the Badgers, providing a location which can ensure their future and further generations in a safe haven.
4. Finally I welcome the much needed affordable and private housing in this area, to satisfy the ever increasing demand.

75 Drayton Gardens  
London  
SW10 9QZ

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

Finally a development in an area that is affordable. More are needed like this in Cheltenham

111 St Georges Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL50 3ED

**Comments:** 20th November 2018

looking through this application I feel this proposal has reached all planning criteria and in fact seems to have a surprisingly small amount of housing for the size of the plot. Chalton kings is crying out for more housing in general!

33 Hales Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6SL

**Comments:** 4th December 2018

The increased risk of flash flooding is of concern to those living in the neighbourhood. The proposals to deal with surface water are inadequate and the issue has not been addressed.

The access to the site is a major objection and has not been addressed. Submission of only an "outline" plan for a development of this scale and profitability is unsatisfactory and suggests contempt for the planning process.

Building more affordable homes would be a good objective, but when the council have turned down other local schemes to build on brownfield, it would be wrong to progress a scheme that concretes over fields and is so loose than any 'affordability' gestures can quickly be erased by the developer.

5E Deer Park Business Centre  
Eckington  
Pershore  
Worcestershire  
WR10 3DN

**Comments:** 30th January 2019

Comments attached.

31 Churchill Drive  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JN

**Comments:** 29th November 2018

The proposed new houses would cause huge disruption in the area for residents; local roads are already often dangerous due to the estate being used as a rat run to and from the London road. This is a heavily residential area and cannot support further development.

This meadowland is a small but important habitat to all kinds of wildlife, the land and trees provide/ support drainage that if disturbed will increase flood risk in the area. Site traffic would be a nightmare for local residents first and foremost but also for traffic that use the roads as access in and out of Cheltenham. The already heavy traffic at Sixways will be impacted, a main artery in and out of Cheltenham.

23 Beaufort Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JS

**Comments:** 7th December 2018

This is a follow up to my original objection. I stand by all my original comments. The reduction in the number of houses has no bearing. The road infrastructure has not changed to facilitate such a development. Main roads from this proposal would mean entering London Road and Hales Road. Both these roads are already extensively used and frequently grid locked at peak times. Currently it is extremely difficult driving from Ewens Farm Estate into town at the Holy Apostles lights as the road can be tailed back from Hales Road. Oakhurst Rise is totally unsuitable as an access road due to the steep incline and parked vehicles at the junction with Beaufort Road. The latter is a two way road and with on-road parking can make it congested and difficult to leave one's driveway. Vehicles currently use Ewens Road and Beaufort Road as a rat run especially during school days. Vehicles including buses already treat the road as a race track. I believe it is officially a 20mph zone but traffic generally exceeds 30mph.

I note that supporters of the scheme live nowhere near the proposed development so have no comprehension of the issues.

Therefore I respectfully request that this be refused and not even consider any development until a road infrastructure is built which I consider most unlikely.

2 Ewens Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6JP

**Comments:** 1st December 2018

All the previous reasons for objecting to the 'revised' planning application still stand. The amount of traffic coming through the Ewens Farm estate has not reduced since the last application, and the increase in traffic the proposed development will cause is unsustainable, not only to the estate but also further on into Sixways and the London Road and beyond.

Oakhurst Rise is a cul de sac and access into and out of it is therefore from one end of the road only, on a fairly sharp bend in the road it joins and up into a steep hill, which is often treacherous and impassable in winter and could not possibly sustain the inevitable further traffic that the development would bring, considering there is no provision in the plans for further access from any of the surrounding roads.

The risk of flooding to the homes in Oakhurst Rise has not been addressed, this is a real cause for concern for not only the residents in Oakhurst Rise but also further into the estate. There are

already some areas which are almost impassable by car when there is heavy rain, as the drains cannot cope. This would obviously get worse with the run off from the area above Oakhurst Rise that would inevitably be caused by the development. At the moment the area above Oakhurst Rise is like a natural sponge, preventing run off and limiting the amount of water which the drains have to cope with, this would be lost and environmentally would be a disaster.

Furthermore the infrastructure of the surrounding area could not sustain the proposed development since the doctors' surgery and local schools are already oversubscribed.

29 Haywards Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6RQ

**Comments:** 12th January 2019

We object to this development as currently proposed on this site.

It does not satisfactorily address transport and support services (i.e. schools and GPs) considerations for either the new or existing residents. We are also concerned about drainage - this area is renown for flooding (or at best a long drainage time after heavy rains) and we cannot see anything in this proposal that adequately addresses the increase in this risk that this development will create.

Town planning / new homes development has got to start to build sustainable homes and services that function for the residents over the longer term, not squashing too many new homes into small parcels of land that they are not suitable for.

SF Planning Ltd  
12 Royal Crescent  
Cheltenham  
GL50 3DA

**Comments:** 12th January 2019

Letter from agent attached.