

APPENDIX 5
Golden Valley Development Draft Supplementary Planning Document: Schedule of comments received and identified changes

This consultation response report includes a summary of all responses received together with the changes made to the Golden Valley Development Supplementary Planning Document. There are 2 tables;

- Table 1 provides the comments received from all statutory and non-statutory consultees, interest groups, developers and members of the public who submitted comments via email/letter/via Common Place consultation platform
- Table 2 provides the general comments received via the Common Place consultation platform.

All comments received were reviewed by an officer team representing both Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils together with the consultancy technical team. Where appropriate, changes have been made to the Supplementary Planning Document as noted in this report.

Please note, to comply with GDPR all personal details have been removed. Where a comment has been provided by an organisation or agent, the name of this organisation is listed.

Table 1

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
1	GCC	Smart Cities	The reference to smart healthcare in the Smart City principles (page 19) is welcomed and we would encourage the local authorities and developer(s) to engage proactively with local NHS commissioners and providers to understand opportunities to deliver this in alignment with the local strategy. There may also be an opportunity to consider how the Smart City principles could apply to the production and supply of nutritious food that has a lower impact on the planet	Supportive of smart cities narrative	Add additional reference to smart cities in relation to food production within C8	P38	yes
2	GCC	Wellbeing	The last bullet point on page 28 is an incomplete sentence – we would support the provision of social infrastructure to promote social and mental wellbeing but would want to see this point expanded/completed to give examples, e.g. drawn from the Barnwood Trust’s Social Sustainability Toolkit	Would like to see more on social infrastructure	Review bullet point p 28	P28	yes
3	GCC	Space Standards	Could the SPD make reference to internal space standards, alongside push for higher density development in section 7.2? – the space within a home can impact on physical and mental wellbeing in a range of ways, including overcrowding, inability to store and prepare fresh food, space to study, etc.	Would like to see internal space standards included	Too detailed for SPD and straying into policy formulation, but valid point to pass to JCS team for consideration in JCS review or a specific space standard SPD	N/A	n/a
4	GCC	Food Strategy	We strongly support the requirement for a food strategy on pages 30 and 38 and would recommend alignment with the developing Gloucestershire Food Strategy and its ambitions for the county. We think the SPD could include some further wording to increase its aspirations, encompassing the production of food, residential and commercial supply chain and nutrition. The Sustainable Food City principles could be a helpful reference point - http://sustainablefoodcities.org/keyissues.html	Supportive of food strategy	Add reference to Gloucestershire Food Strategy under C8	C8	yes
5	GCC	Validation Check List	JCS Policy SD14 requires a health impact assessment for strategic allocations – should this be included in the validation checklist on page 82? The Public Health team has already engaged with the JCS team to provide support and guidance around this.	Add detail to validation check list	Add health impact assessment to validation check list p82	P82	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
6	GCC Health	General Comment- Congestion	<p>There is a dense network of bus routes running through this area linking Cheltenham with both Gloucester and Tewkesbury, many at relatively high frequency. In addition to our service 94 and 97-98 corridors between Cheltenham and Churchdown continuing to Gloucester we should mention the 94X/94U and Pulhams service 99 using the A40 to run direct between Cheltenham and Gloucester. To this must be added local routes operating within the town, of which the most directly relevant is service 93 which is the Arle Court Park and Ride service; and the two main services operating in the Hesters Way/PE Way area: service A and C. The Draft SPD helpfully maps these services. The density of the network reflects the strategic location astride the main travel demands arising between the largest two towns in the County.</p> <p>All these routes are seriously affected by congestion-related delay and unreliability, despite bus priority measures in existence between Arle Court and Cheltenham town centre along the A40. Some improvements to the westbound bus priority were delivered in 2018. However, the measures in place are intermittent and partly as a result of this these difficulties continue to worsen.</p>	Supportive of improved bus services	Detailed comments provided by bus operators and being reviewed together with guidance from Local Highways Authority. No change to the SPD, but important factor for development management stage.	N/A	n/a
7	Stagecoach	Concern- Extension to existing bus routes	<p>Apart from the terminal loop of town Service C that runs alongside the eastern edge of the allocation at Fiddlers Green on Springbank Road, and the terminal loop of town service H at Pilgrove Way offered about every 30 minutes via a rather more circuitous route into town, the allocation lies considerably off-line of the main bus routes, despite the density of the local network. This paradox presents a serious challenge, as simple diversion of existing inter-urban services into an extensive site is not possible without entirely altering the service pattern and making journeys for existing users greatly slower and more circuitous. Extension of routes A, C and H looks superficially easier.</p>	Supportive of improved bus services	See comment 6. Relevant comments for Development management stage.	N/A	n/a
8	Stagecoach	Concern- Lack of action on proposed works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are clear measures already “shovel-ready” that can be implemented within the Public Highway, westbound on the A40 at Benhall (the Benhall Westbound Bus Lane) that had been funded through the LEP, but was withdrawn at a very late stage from the capital programme. This links together existing bus lanes between Lansdown Road and Arle Court, to create near-seamless continuous bus priority. This should be implemented at the earliest opportunity, and before occupation of any employment on the site. The very substantial traffic generated by the development will unavoidably seriously threaten the delivery of all the existing bus services in the area, and by extension, jeopardise the entire commercial bus network in the Central Severn Vale area, without the implementation of substantial, seamless bus priority allowing the routes to run efficiently and reliably whatever the conditions on the key routes concerned 	Concern about congestion and support for bus priority	Noted. Some of these elements are detailed points for development management process and/or linked to major West Cheltenham Transport Infrastructure Scheme, that is agreed and being delivered 2020.	N/A	n/a
9	Stagecoach	Suggested Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further measures should be taken at Arle Court to enhance bus priority and allow buses using the A40 Golden Valley Bypass to serve the Park and Ride. These works should include a substantial length of bus priority on the B4063 approach to Arle Court 	Improvements to Arle Court	Se comment 8	N/A	n/a
10	Stagecoach	Suggested Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope apparently exists to harden the verge within the Public Highway on Princess Elizabeth Way, to shift the vast majority of current on-carriageway parking into dedicated bays, without loss of trees or any detriment to amenity or existing walking or cycling infrastructure, allowing the creation of bus lanes along the entirety of that link in both directions. 	Improvements to Princess Elizabeth Way	Noted but outside direct focus of SPD, however relevant point to pull into future detailed development management discussions. Comments also relevant to Cheltenham West Regeneration proposals being led by Cheltenham Borough Homes. Comments passed on.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
11	Stagecoach	Phasing and transport links	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The phasing of the development and the completion of internal bus circulation routes at a suitably early stage, to a standard allowing efficient and reliable bus operation, will be essential to deliver a relevant bus service, whether by extension, diversion or creation of new bus routes. 	Supportive of phasing of the bus circulation routes	Add reference to phasing of routes D1	D1	yes
12	Stagecoach	Springbank- Bus only access advisable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principle of bus-only access at one or more points between Springbank and the eastern flank of the site is highly advisable to provide efficient bus routes that maximise patronage potential and is unequivocally supported. 	Bus only access at Springbank is supported	Support is noted. No change required to SPD	N/A	n/a
13	Stagecoach	General Comment- Support for pedestrian links	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principle of further filtered permeability for walking and cycling between the existing neighbourhoods to the east and the development is essential to maximise the potential to realise wider social and economic as well as transport-related and health benefits, while also further damping demands to access the site using single-occupancy vehicles. 	Supportive of pedestrian and cycle links between existing and new neighbourhoods	Support is noted. No change required to SPD.	N/A	n/a
14	Stagecoach	Concern- Lack of clear Commitment at this stage/ lack of housing to support additional bus services	No decisions have been made as to what bus services can appropriately be extended or diverted into the site. The 1100 dwelling quantum is not high enough to support a great deal of additional resource in our network. Even very high bus mode shares, linked to the rapid take-up of employment among other things, and successful implementation of a mode-shift strategy that doubled public transport use in the JCS area, would support, at best, perhaps 3 additional vehicles within the development scope of SA7. Should all the ADR come forward at Hayden this might increase by another 2 buses. However no party has been prepared to commit to a phasing and delivery strategy for the development. It would be inappropriate and imprudent to make any commitments to evolve the network in the shorter or longer term, without understanding network conditions (including the timescales for delivery of comprehensive bus priority), and the manner and timing in which components of the development will be brought forward.	A delivery strategy as part of the applications process will address this. It is clear that proactive engagement with relevant bus operators is required to understand the scale of the bus service that can be delivered	Noted but outside direct focus of SPD, however relevant point to pull into future detailed development management discussions.	N/A	n/a
15	Stagecoach	General Comment- Housing numbers	<p>To depart from recently adopted policy to nearly treble the size of the quantum to be planned for at this stage, demands the highest level of justification and evidence. Given the substantial evidential deficit with respect to transport that underlay the current JCS, and this Strategic Allocation in particular, the standard of evidence required to demonstrate that a further 1900 dwellings appropriately can and should be accommodated and brought forward sustainably on the ADR portion of the site, across a wide number of themes, is necessarily high.</p> <p>It is entirely unacceptable that this SPD should be explicitly framed at the outset to support what is claimed to be an adopted strategic policy position, which does not exist. For such a position to be altered requires the evidential deficit to be comprehensively, transparently and robustly addressed. An SPD is not the appropriate way to advance this evidence, especially given the scale of this additional growth and its likely impacts on the safe and efficient operation of the local and national transport networks.</p>	<p>Concern about the uplift in numbers and lack of transport evidence base to support this</p> <p>Suggests that such a position goes beyond the scope of an SPD</p>	<p>The SPD appropriately details the masterplan as it relates to the JCS Strategic Allocation (Policy A7). However, the masterplan has tested the efficiency in use of land, hence the uplift in housing numbers.</p> <p>JCS also provides for safeguarded land via JCS (Policy SD5). This is part of the statutory development plan and as such an important consideration when considering masterplanning of Cyber Central Garden Community to enable comprehensive development in line with garden community principles and sound plan making.</p> <p>Amend SPD to provide improved clarity on this point.</p>	<p>Updated vision</p> <p>Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers</p> <p>All Figs updated</p>	yes
16	Stagecoach	Concern- Car reliability and car focus	In the formal Vision Statement at 2.1, high levels of connectivity are repeated, but the only places to which this is explicitly intended to relate are out-of-County. "Located in the heart of the UK, and anchored between existing centres of industrial and academic excellence in cyber tech such as Bristol, Oxford, Bath, Cardiff, Malvern and Warwick. This significant site is in a highly accessible location with great connectivity." There is no part of the Vision that sets out to pathfind radically higher levels of active travel use (including public transport) and pursue a much more limited role for single-occupancy car use.	Concern there is no reference to active travel in vision	Add reference to active travel in vision	P11	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
17	Stagecoach	Concern- lack of feeding routes from existing community	Simply put, the development is seen as ultimately drawing from and feeding into the roads network and particularly the SRN. This reflects the political drivers behind the exceptionally strong political support for the site. There is no strong or clearly-articulated vision for the site apart from it to represent what in essence will be a nationally-significant technology-related business park on an out-of-town greenfield site, that is intended to relate principally to fast road links. It is conceived at the outset to be, as far as possible, to accommodate the highest-feasible level of personal car dependency.	Concern about potential car dependency of new development	The SPD is seeking a radical change in how we plan for and manage transport. This is reflected in the vision and objectives of the SPD. We do not accept that the SPD is planning for car dependency; the SPD is very much the contrary to this aligned with the principles of garden community. No change proposed to SPD.	N/A	n/a
18	Stagecoach	Framework for mitigation on a wider scale-concern that this has not been addressed in the SPD at this stage	Little or no attempt is made to look at the impacts of the development across a wider area, as the transport demands from the site no doubt will. No attempt is made to establish a policy framework to define mitigations and set out what is to be expected from the development in terms of delivery of these.	A wider scale transport strategy would be supported	Review strength of references to Connecting Cheltenham	Introduce cross ref to CC study in Chs 1 & 2	yes
19	Stagecoach	Suggested Route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extension of key routes to provide efficient seamless bus routings into the site, most notably Telstar Way across Fiddlers Green Lane. There is the potential to continue this across the Old Gloucester Road to the A4019, to complete a seamless route that would approximate to a logical driving route 	Bus through route between Telstar Way and OGR	Agree that this should be a key principle of the SPD. Review SPD to articulate that the route through the site will be primarily for public and active transport modes	D4	yes
20	Stagecoach	Suggested Route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creation of what seems to be a single logical spine route, running centrally through the development areas, maximising the hinterland from which any bus route could draw. It also offers a logically intuitive and simple route pattern. 	Supportive of central public transport route through the site	Support noted. It will be important to work with the relevant public transport operators through the development management process to make this successful.	N/A	n/a
21	Stagecoach	Suggested Route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creation of a bus-only connection to Springbank, broadly in the most rational place to site it off the northern limb of Henley Road. 	Supportive of bus connection to Springbank	Support noted. No change required to SPD	N/A	n/a
22	Stagecoach	General Comment-Supporting Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development principle B3 which states that: “A sustainable and deliverable range of housing tenures, including affordable housing and self-build, to meet local needs supported by community infrastructure” will be provided, including a policy compliant level of affordable housing at 35%. This mix will support the evolution of demand for public transport as well as achieving other policy goals. 	noted	Support noted	N/A	n/a
23	Stagecoach	Suggestion-Bus stop locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development principle B4 which states that: “Higher densities and a range of dwelling typologies which make the best use of available land.” However bold experiments in dwelling form and typology delivered by the public sector have had an extremely chequered history. We are concerned that the lessons of the past are not forgotten. We are also concerned that the amenity of higher density residential development is not compromised by inappropriate proximity to the bus route. A great number of design criteria should be applied but among these should be the amenity and internal acoustic environment and how this is influenced by immediate proximity to bus routes. We recommend an absolute minimum distance of 6m between habitable rooms and the gully line of a bus route, and ideally rather more. 	Recommends 6m between habitable rooms and bus routes. Noted.	Reviewing the comments there is a clear difference of opinion from those who are looking for detail to be specified in the SPD and those that see that as a barrier. Taking all comments on board we are of the view this detailed development management issue and can be appropriately managed at that stage. It would be too much detailed for a strategic level masterplan.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
24	Stagecoach	Concern- Car centred development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A great deal of development – and virtually all the residential development - lies greatly further than 400-500m from potential stops on this spine road, of the Springbank link. This is particularly true of the Area of Development Restraint at Hayden to the west. While residents might work on-site, and distances would be such that walking or cycling would present attractive options, this is highly unlikely to be true of all residents, even the majority. Those with off-site destinations are thus incentivised to drive as the bulk of residential development is not likely to be conveniently served by bus. 	Concern about car use given distance from bus stops	Detailed bus routes are yet to be defined but clarify that a cross-site through route will be discouraged through traffic management measures – thereby giving greater priority to active and public transport measures	6.1 & 6.2	yes
25	Stagecoach	Concern- Old Gloucester Road suitability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked to the above, land within the allocation along the Old Gloucester Road depends heavily on an entirely new bus route along that road. We have never indicated to any party that we believed that such a route is a likely way in which the bus network can and should be developed. This has been conjured up by architects as a “line on the maps” suiting only the internal logic of the Master Plan and in no way reflecting the principles of rational and effective bus network planning as they relate to this locality 	HYDROCK – review bus route along Old Gloucester Road	Edit proposed bus route plan and seek to agree a higher level plan or appropriate wording with Stagecoach	P45 and D1	yes
26	Stagecoach	Concern- lack of engagement in regards to specific routes	Discussions to arrive at decisions on the actual routing and extension of specific services has not been initiated by us or the respective client teams at any stage and would not have been amenable to agreement in any case, before a significant number of uncertainties are resolved. We are therefore somewhat perplexed and alarmed that the SPD makes clear statements of intent in this regard. The strategy set out is not endorsed by the Company and is not derived from us.	Concern about bus routes plan	See comment 25	P45	yes
27	Stagecoach	Concern- lack of engagement in regards to specific routes	We note that a map of bus service extensions and diversions is provided at page 45. We have had no discussions with any party that have given rise to any bus route commitments indicated on this map. Such decisions are within our exclusive prerogative under primary legislation. The strategy indicated on this map is quite presumptuous.	Concern about bus routes plan	See comment 25	P45	yes
28	Stagecoach	Concern- lack of engagement in regards to specific routes	However we can be clear that we see no grounds or business case whatever, on the evidence presented in the draft SPD or at other times, whatever to divert the core service 94, or its express variants 94X and 94U into the site at this or at any future time.	Unsupportive of commitments to specific bus route alterations / extensions	See comment 25	P45	yes
29	Stagecoach	Suggestion- spine road	<p>3.2.24: “The site is well placed to benefit from more strategic improvements in public transport between Cheltenham and Gloucester, including the ambition to bring forward a mass transit option. Development at West Cheltenham should take proper account of any such opportunities through the provision of interchange facilities as part of any such provision or other appropriate contributions.”</p> <p>However it must be made clear that the site lies some distance north and west of a logical rapid transit corridor along the A40, which is and will remain the strategic desire line. Feeding into an enhanced Interchange is thus likely to lie off-site, probably in the Arle Court area, building on the existing Park and Ride, unless some of the GCHQ site were to be relinquished for this purpose. Dependent on the way that land comes forward for development on a strategic scale at NW Cheltenham and beyond within Tewkesbury Borough, including sites that might be identified as part of the JCS Review, it is actually</p>	Support for improved bus services on A40/outside GCHQ	Flag potential for rapid transit corridor and need for improved links to nearby interchanges such as those at Arle Court. This is included in review to Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan and would support outcomes of Connecting Cheltenham.	Add ref in section 6, D1	Yes D1

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			likely to make more sense to incorporate the Spine Road into a bus rapid transport corridor between the town centre, the station and Tewkesbury, via Benhall and through the site towards Uckington, thence possibly, via greatly improved bus priority to Tewkesbury. Proper bus stop facilities directly associated with the A40/Telstar Way junction much nearer the entrance to GCHQ would be beneficial and we have made consistently clear that these should be pursued.				
30	Stagecoach	Concern- lack of engagement in regards to specific routes	There is no clear sense of what is required of public transport provision, much less a driving vision for the role it could or should play, other than contributions will be sought to achieve “the expansion of existing bus services across the site” among many other things, a good many of which including improvements to pedestrian and cycle links to Cheltenham Spa Station, are likely to be quite costly. We note at objective D2 for example that “A continuous and high quality off-carriageway link to Cheltenham Rail Station will be provided linking from the site using the southern access and via Telstar Way and the A40.” This in and of itself will represent a substantial capital project. It is entirely unclear, once the radical increase of off-site highways capacity, cycle links, and the internal circulation infrastructure is paid for, that there will be any funding remaining within the constraints of over-arching development viability to pump-prime new or extended bus services into the site, especially if policy-compliant affordable housing mix is delivered. Our extensive experience in other parts of the Country including the City of Oxford, strongly suggests not.	Concern about cost of off-site highways improvements and cost of extending bus services	Comments noted and viability will be a consideration at the development management stage. No change to SPD otherwise we are watering down the ambition and the principles of garden communities.	N/A	n/a
31	Stagecoach	Concern- lack of engagement in regards to specific routes	We would urge the Councils and its partners Attempts to work with us to identify a technically and economically rational strategy to decarbonise passenger transport to and through this site. This is best taken forward in a manner that does not lead to sub-optimal or perverse outcomes in the round. We are pleased to confirm that we have already done a great deal of work to examine the potential to deploy electric buses within the Cheltenham town network. This is feasible but there is a substantial additional cost involved of about £230,000 per bus in capital expenditure, assuming an initial 14-bus deployment. This gap would need to be funded in some manner.	Funding gap for electric vehicles	Noted	N/A	n/a
32	Stagecoach	General Comment	The discussion and requirements at Objective A5 Mobility are simultaneously extremely broad, very wide-ranging, all quite desirable in and of themselves, but entirely in specific, reflecting the continuing inability or unwillingness of stakeholders to arrive at a transport and mobility vision driven by clear evidence of the current challenges faced on the network, and the best estimate of the travel demands to which the development will give rise. As far as the SPD is concerned, it is much less Policy Framework fleshing out the specific transport requirements needed to allow the development to be brought forward sustainably, and much more a vague but aspirational prospectus. This being the case, the SPD can only be considered unjustified and ineffective and thus in the sense set out in NPPF 2019 paragraph 36, unsound.	SPD is unsound because is not justified	This is not supported. It is important, in the context of the garden community principles that the SPD sets out an ambitious strategy for mobility. The detail of Objective A5 will be tested at the development management stage and this will be the time when detailed evidence is presented. This representation links back to comments 15 and the uplift in numbers and the corresponding demands on the network. This will be tested through the development management process.	Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers	yes
33	Stagecoach	Support for high quality design	The document overall is heavily weighted towards place-making and urban design principles to steer detailed design within the site. To a great extent it reads as the basis for a Design Code, and at times comes close to acting as such. Stagecoach recognises the very positive role such an approach can play to support the creation of high-quality places.	Supportive of urban design approach	Disagree that the SPD is working as a design code. The SPD has been specifically pitched at a strategic level. It is wholly appropriate that a site of this strategic importance plays a key role in place shaping and consider the SPD delivers 34the appropriate levels of guidance. Detail will be addressed at the development management stage.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
34	Stagecoach	Suggested-rapid bus transit	As we allude earlier in this response, the main north-south link between Telstar Way and Old Gloucester Road, then extending beyond off-site towards the Tewkesbury Road, needs to be considered as a potential part of a wider quality bus network. Indeed, if the wider JCS vision and that in the emerging Local Transport Plan Review are to be achieved, something closer to Bus Rapid Transit levels of service are probably not only warranted, but necessary.	Transport links	Clarify that a ‘through road’ across the site will support public transport ‘rapid bus’ or ‘bus quality’ network alongside and ‘active’ modes – but no priority given for private vehicles	Recast text for D4, pg 46	yes
35	Stagecoach	Concern-deliverability of bus service on suggested transport link through site	The SPD as drafted equivocates with regard to this kind of outcome. Rather, the document sets out proposals to achieve an attractive central boulevard, but not necessarily one that will offer the facilitation of region-leading levels of bus service delivery and use.	Concern that the document delivers an attractive boulevard not a successful bus route	See comment 34		As above
36	Stagecoach	Supported elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active frontage, with easily legible links for pedestrians and cycles • Signalised junction with Fiddlers Green lane. This should give N-S movements along the Telstar Way-Boulevard priority over the side arms, which are currently rat runs. • Bus pull-in, to facilitate both set down and pick up of large numbers when busy; and also allow for buses to lay over should local links terminate here, which is possible. It is possible several bays – and at least two - will need to be provided to accommodate more than one service. • Mixed uses, including hotels, residential and leisure and A-class uses, adding vitality and animation throughout the day and evening. 	Supportive of elements from the vision	Review part D to ensure reference is made to these positive suggestions	Part D	yes
37	Stagecoach	General comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stand-offs of built frontages from the kerbline of this busy thoroughfare will be sufficient to avoid amenity issues arising between passing buses and residential and D2-class uses, especially on first floors. It is vital to appreciate that current, proposed and likely future approaches to the conservation of heat and power in nationally-binding Building Regulations make it increasingly likely that windows will be kept open at night to purge surplus heat gains arising during the day. Multi-storey buildings and single-aspect dwellings are especially prone to this, even under current Regulations. The internal acoustic environment is likely to be adversely affected by traffic noise without a significant standoff, possibly exacerbated by a canyon effect. The illustration on page 62 seems to indicate kerb-frontage distances of less than 6m. We recommend this as an absolute minimum. Ideally a distance of 8-10m is recommended, that could incorporate other features including swales, incidental parking, street trees and enhanced circulation and public space. In any event, the frontage treatments would benefit from comprehensively considered approaches that holistically consider the inter-play between thermal performance, acoustic and amenity impacts of built form and design, both for public and internal spaces. 	Detailed comments about design acoustics and kerb distances which we would disagree with	See comment 23		n/a
38	Stagecoach	Concern- Old GR as service route	We do not necessarily envisage bus services ever using Old Gloucester Road. This is not an attractive or particularly rational route. It cannot be assumed that this will perform a function as a bus route at any stage in the future. As we point out elsewhere, many dwellings look likely to be outwith nationally accepted guidance of a 300-400m walk of stops, set out in the CIHT Guidance Document “Buses and Urban Developments” (2019). This is unlikely to support the highest levels of public transport use.	Concern about use of Old Gloucester Road as a bus route	See comment 25	P45	As above
39	Stagecoach	Concern- Old GR as service route	The approach proposed says little about vehicular speeds on Old Gloucester Road. The implication is that the current limit for a rural road will remain in place. Without any intermediate junctions it will be hard to limit traffic speeds in any event. If traffic speeds are likely to exceed 40mph, this in turn demands that bus stops are sited in lay-bys to make them safe.	Concern about traffic speeds on Old Gloucester Road	Add a reference to improvements that would be needed on Old Gloucester road, traffic calming etc.	D1 and D6	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
40	Stagecoach	Welcomed elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The acknowledgement of the importance of properly balancing a significant movement function with its place-making function. This will be challenging. It is important that the likely volumes of traffic are properly understood, to inform the ultimate design approach. We welcome that the client's consultant team has access to a very broad range of potentially-appropriate design precedents. We would be pleased to discuss this in more depth as optimising the design is certainly going to require a very well-informed multi-stakeholder approach. That bus priority measures will be incorporated along the route. This might include a bus/cycle land or lanes along its length. This may appear to be costly in terms of both land take and the impact on the sense of place. It will also be costly to provide and maintain. Therefore, it is important that the role of the Main Street in the wider public transport network across the JCS area is properly understood so that the approach finally taken is fully justified. We would suggest that if any BRT-style level of service is to be delivered - and there is certainly a good case for this – then dedicated bus lanes the length of the corridor are likely to be necessary. That parking will be provided along the street. Visual renderings and indicative plans strongly suggest off-carriageway bays. These will be essential to permit efficient flow of bus services. It is important that provision is made for deliveries and visitor parking on street, such that this does not impede the free flow of buses. 	Supportive of elements of the vision – and of Bus Rapid Transit scheme through the site as a whole	Support welcomed.	N/A	n/a
41	Stagecoach	Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our concerns regarding the treatment of built frontages carry across from section 7.4. The approach to managing the throughput of traffic is quite a sensitive area. Adequate signalised pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities are important. However a proliferation of side street junctions risks significantly impeding the movement function of the street. We would suggest strongly that direct frontage vehicular access is restricted, and that the number of side street junctions for vehicles is very carefully considered with a view to reducing these, and minimising right-hand vehicular turning movements across the street. Until Hayden STW is brought forward much of the Main Street will be single-sided development. While this is inevitable, in particular if the Main Street is to best serve the whole area in the long term, it has to be pointed out that this presents very sub-optimal bus stop hinterlands along much of the street. 	Detailed design comments regarding bus stop locations and junctions	Detailed Development Management, not for inclusion in SPD. See response to comment 23	N/A	n/a
42	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 8, 1.2.3	Can we check numbers	clarification	Numbers corrected	Page 8, 1.2.3	
43	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 8, 1.3.1	Policy SD5 para needs to make reference to JCS review- currently ongoing	clarification	Make reference to JCS review- currently ongoing	Page 8, 1.3.1	yes
44	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 11, 2.1	First para notes 'great connectivity' - this contradicts 1.1.6	clarification	Disagree SPD establishes a vision for great connectivity this is picked up again at 1.1.6	N/A	n/a
45	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 12, 2.2.1	Objective E 'good' urban design. Plus is there scope for another objective regarding tackling deprivation, inclusion, regeneration	Request for additional objective	No change – this theme is incorporated into many of the existing objectives and key deliverable of social sustainability. However add in wording to inclusive growth and the	Page 48 7.1	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
					benefits to objective E		
46	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 14, 2.3.1	Objective A. Potential for lower energy bills for residents... needs to be much more ambitious carbon zero or carbon positive	Stretch zero carbon agenda	Agree, para 3.1.1 needs additional wording, currently only references CBC climate emergency. CBC and TBC have both declared climate emergencies and discussion on carbon zero is very live in consideration.	Page 16 3.1.1	yes
47	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 21, 3.2.13	Poor air quality – suggest that we are specific on A40 corridor	Air quality	In part a detailed development management issue, review references to air quality. Mitigation would focus on ensuring additional trips are as low as possible, also moving the road away from the houses would help (segregated cycle paths can have this effect). Given the absence of monitoring along the A40 and the size of development it would be prudent to do some monitoring. 3 months is the minimum period.	A3 & 3.2.13	yes
48	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 22 3.2.20	No mention of further and higher education	education	Add reference to higher education needs outside of the site by existing, however add additional reference to opportunities within cyber central either insitu or through partnership relationships.	Page 22 3.2.20	yes
49	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 27 B2	Just clarifying – page 5 mentions 50ha and this 5ha	Check employment areas	Allocation is 45Ha of employment but safeguarded land would provide 5Ha. SPD updated to reflect that SPD relates only to the strategic allocation, safeguarded land provided for context. Vision updated, new appendix added detailing Hayden works with the detail removed from the SPD	Vision, Page 27 B2	yes
50	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 29 B4	Should we mention heights/storeys – referenced on page 50 but this seems the ideal place too	Height of development	Add refernce to building height ranges	Page 29 B4	yes
51	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 34 C2	Can we check view – and reference Malverns too	views	Add add ref to Malverns to west and Cotswolds to the east	Page 34 C2	yes
52	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 37 C5	Reference European Water Quality Directive	Water quality	Reference European Water Quality Directive This is not something we would normally reference in a flood risk and drainage assessment and would be picked up in an environmental statement by its own chapter given it crosses many disciplines. That said, the document recommends the use of greener SuDS features to provide water quality benefits where required.	Page 37 C5	n/a
53	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 46 D4	Support street for people but how to enforce. Also contradicts page 70 7.6.1 ‘busy road for traffic’	Contradictions in how we are describing ‘main street’ – busy for traffic...or not?	Amend 7.6.1 Bullet 1 to remove ref to busy road – and confirm the road will not be a through-road etc.	Pg 70	yes
54	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Page 70 7.6.1	review phrase ‘ busy road for traffic’ – don’t feel like a ‘street for people’	Contradictions in how we are describing ‘main street’ – busy for traffic...or not?	See comment 53		yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
55	Gloucestershire Airport	Building Heights	The proposal for up to 7 storey buildings in the SPD for the Cyber Park would impinge on take-offs and landing approaches at the Airport. Cyber Park where a 7 storey building would almost certainly penetrate into area of airspace, not necessarily by much, but enough to cause a problem. I would not want to see a blanket acceptance of 7-storey high rise building in the park from an aviation safety point of view.	Review aviation safety zone – no building heights of up to 7 storeys?	Agree that additional text would be helpful. Add new text: The aviation zone of Gloucestershire Airport will also need to be taken into account when considering the height of new buildings. However, do not consider CGI should be removed, this is helpful in articulating the vision.	E1	yes
56	Gloucestershire Airport	Building Heights	Localised terrain undulation at the proposed site will affect the maximum heights of buildings. For example, if the terrain is higher in a certain area it may mean any buildings require to be shorter in height so as not to penetrate our protected surfaces.	Review aviation safety zone	Noted. Add ref to airspace relating to Gloucestershire Airport operation	E1	yes
57	Highways England	DS7	Scenario DS7 assumed the traffic generated by the allocated West Cheltenham site as per Policy A7 but did not include the safeguarded land as per Policy SD5. Given that the draft SPD identifies ‘the site’ as supporting up to 3,000 new homes and over 50 Ha of employment land, this means that the site is potentially delivering approximately 1,900 more homes and 5 Ha more employment land than what has been tested through DS7. We note the reference to Policy A7 and Policy SD5 in paragraph 1.3.1, and that the trigger for the assessment of development impact and any necessary mitigation for land covered by Policy SD5 will be through the JSC review. We recognise that a number of the plans shown and referenced in the SPD distinguish between the allocated site and the safeguarded land, but we note that as presented there could be some confusion over the status of the safeguarded land and the necessity for further assessment through the JCS process.	Concern about the housing numbers reference in SPD and transport evidence base to support this	The SPD appropriately details the masterplan as it relates to the JCS Strategic Allocation (Policy A7). However, the JCS also provides for safeguarded land via JCS (Policy SD5). This is part of the statutory development plan and as such an important consideration when considering masterplanning of Cyber Central Garden Community to enable comprehensive development in line with garden community principles and sound plan making. Amend SPD to provide improved clarity on this point. Vision updated, new appendix added of Hayden works and detail removed from SPD	Ch1 Updated vision Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. 1.1.7 New appendix added detailing housing numbers All Figs updated	yes
58	Highways England	DS7	DS7 included a northern access only between the West Cheltenham allocation (Policy A7 and M5 J10 via a new Link Road. The DS7 assessment did not have a junction with the B4634. The purpose of this was to direct vehicles north towards the improvements at M5 J10. It is understood that the subsequent work undertaken by GCC for the HIF submission for funding to develop an all movements M5 J10 included a junction on the B4634 but did not allow access to Telstar Way. The draft SPD introduces an additional southern access from the development site, creating a ‘principal vehicular route’, also called main street or spine road in the documentation, through the development site from north to south. This could lead to more pressure on the SRN south of the development, on the A40 and M5 Junction 11. Allowing an access to the south will allow traffic from the West Cheltenham allocation to access the A40 and M5 J11. This will result in a change to the traffic distribution from the West Cheltenham allocation from that assumed in DS7 and the HIF submission. It will have knock-on implications for the distribution of traffic from other development allocations in the JCS (notably North-West Cheltenham) and for existing traffic movements. Thus, with a southern access, the West Cheltenham allocation is likely to become less reliant on M5 J10 and more reliant on M5 J11, putting greater pressure on M5 J11 that may require mitigation. However, as no transport assessment of this new access	Main street puts pressure on the motorway	We are now working on the assumption that the main street should be opens to public transport but not to general traffic. This will be subject to further modelling and testing at the Development Management stage. Amend Ch 6, 7.4 & 7.6 accordingly	Ch 6, 7.4 & 7.6	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			arrangement has been presented in this SPD, it is not possible to conclude whether there would or would not be an adverse impact at M5 J11. Furthermore, it is equally not possible to conclude where there will be a potential need for mitigation at M5 J11, which would therefore go beyond the mitigation package set out in DS7. In conclusion, both DS7 and the HIF submission have not tested the impact on the SRN for the southern access road now included in the draft SPD. This is of concern to us.				
59	Highways England	HIF	<p>We would also highlight that the appendices contain inaccurate references to Highways England's involvement in the M5 J10 Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid to Homes England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix A2.6.18 describes the funding bid to have been made by "Gloucestershire County Council supported by Cheltenham and Tewkesbury councils together with Highways England"; Section 1 of the Technical Design Note prepared by Hydrock refers to the "Gloucestershire County Council / Highways England M5 J10 HIF bid"; Section 3.3 of the Technical Design Note states that "Gloucestershire County Council together with Highways England has made a bid to Homes England...As part of the Highways England bid and extensive traffic modelling exercise has been undertaken". <p>We are happy to acknowledge that we have worked extensively with Gloucestershire County, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils regarding the transport infrastructure requirements for the planned strategic growth at West Cheltenham. We also provided a letter of support to Homes England regarding the HIF bid following review of the traffic modelling work that was undertaken specifically for that submission.</p> <p>We would also request that note be taken of our concerns regarding the promoter HIF bid and that the bid has been made by Gloucestershire County Council. Therefore the above cited references in the draft SPD that suggest that Highways England is a part of the scheme promoter should be removed.</p>	Some highways baseline inaccuracies	<p>Support welcomes. Appendices to be updated following Government announcement on 11th March 2020.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p> <p>Appendix A2.6.18 to be updated, to remove the text <i>"together with Highways England"</i>. At the end of the para, the following text could be added (optional): <i>"Highways England provided a letter of support to Homes England regarding the HIF bid following review of the traffic modelling work that was undertaken specifically for that submission."</i></p>	P132 of 152 in appendix	Yes
60	Cheltenham Development Task Force	Comments on A40 upgrade	Both the SPD and HE are 'blind' to the £22m A40 upgrade which starts May 2020	Highways works	Noted. Incorporate mention of the £22m upgrade of the A40.	P40	yes
61	GCHQ	Comments of support	<p>GCHQ supports the overall objectives of this development which can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective A -Embracing the highest standards of development. Objective8–AnewanduniquededicatedcampusfortheCyberTech Industry. Objective C -Working with the natural landscape. Objective D -An integrated and connected extension of West of Cheltenham prioritising sustainable modes of transport. Objective E -Promotingthehigheststandards of design andmakingeffectiveuse of land. 	Supportive of objectives	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
62	GCHQ	Recommendations	<p>Thought should be given to: Ensuring sufficient space is allowed within the development for future proofing to allow for new and emerging technologies and new ways of working and living:</p> <p>(a) Flexibleandadaptablespace sinandwithinbuildings–so uses can grow, adapt or extend</p> <p>(b) Mix of short,medium,long term leases –to allow for a variety of styles of start-ups and projects</p> <p>(c) Ease of laying or adapting services –e.g.space for providing new fibre optics, 5G etc.</p>	Points to emphasise	Review objectives to ensure these points are incorporated	Objective B	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			<p>(d) Space and the ability to use electric bikes, scooters, autonomous pods etc. within the proposed dedicated cycle network</p> <p>(e) Clearly linking the existing sustainability and natural landscape objectives with the health agenda; with space for creating a healthier greener living environment; where walking/cycling are designed to take priority; and this objective becomes a unique selling point of the Cyber Central Garden Community.</p>				
63	GCHQ	Car Parks	Car Parks – recommend the proposal for decked car parking for the Cyber Park is expanded on further –so that staff and visitors to this area are encouraged to park at the earliest opportunity on entering the development. Then staff and visitors can proceed to complete the remainder of their journey on foot, electric bikes etc. The core Cyber Park campus environment can then be designed from the outset to be car free and serviced easily with public transport. This should also help resolve existing and future car parking problems related to the commercial office spaces taking place in nearby residential streets.	Add emphasis about interceptor car parks and low-car public realm	Add emphasis about interceptor car parks and low-car public realm	P56 and D7	yes
64	GCHQ	Landlord control/owner ship	Future land ownership and control –some of the best examples of other science /tech parks are where the landlord retains control of the site and are able to influence future development, the mix of uses and work in co-operation with the living and working community and neighbours of the site. This also allows greater control over design, materials, phasing, landscaping and the natural environment and options to create and support community spaces.	Landlord retains control of site	Comments noted.	N/A	n/a
65	GCHQ	Traffic Modelling	Traffic modelling, Travel Planning and Phasing – there are clear traffic capacity issues that GCHQ have previously highlighted within their own recent Transport Statement in relation to the existing access arrangements in Telstar Way / Hubble Road / the A40. The rollout of the development should be planned to ensure the proposed highways solutions as stated within the SPD are appropriately matched to phasing of the development. The development, after the proposed highway solutions and sustainable measures have been put in place, shouldn't result in greater traffic problems than at present. The current Hubble Road / Telstar Way roundabout layout does not allow traffic to turn right and travel northward from Hubble Road into Telstar Way. The development should include measures to alter this existing roundabout to allow vehicles (especially buses) a direct link from Hubble Road northward into Telstar Way to avoid the lengthy current diversion.	<p>Concern about negative traffic impact on surrounding area.</p> <p>Buses should be able to go from Hubble Road to Telstar Way.</p>	Strengthen reference about impact on surrounding area; this also reflects issues raised by the local community. Important point for consideration at development management stage	P40	yes
66	Bloor and Persimmon Homes	Housing numbers	Section 1.1 of the draft SPD sets out the key requirements for the West Cheltenham allocation but incorrectly states that the site is allocated for 3,000 homes. This should be amended to clarify that the site is allocated for 1,100 homes. The potential for delivery of a further 1,900 homes on safeguarded land cannot come forward without a development plan review.	Concern about the uplift in numbers	See comment 57	<p>Vision</p> <p>All figs</p> <p>appendix</p>	Yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			The site is a strategic allocation with potential cross boundary environmental, social and economic impacts. Consequently, consideration of a proposed significant increase in the delivery of housing units cannot be dealt with through an SPD, for which there is only limited scrutiny. The proposed housing numbers must be dealt with through the appropriate strategic planning framework: in this instance, the review of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy. In addition, 2 the Sustainability Appraisal required to support the Joint Core Strategy would no longer be adequate to support site capacity enhancement of this scale.				
67	Bloor and Persimmon Homes	Suggested amendment to key	Figures 2 and 3 should clearly outline the allocated site and the safeguarded land in line with Figure 1. It is also noted that for Figure 3, a site boundary is shown on the key but not marked on the plan itself.	Clarity on status of safeguarded land	See comment 57. Review all plans to show site boundaries Fig 2 – add clarity over safeguarded land	Updated vision Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers All Figs updated	all plans amended
68	Bloor and Persimmon Homes	Clarity on policy	Part (ii) of A7 requires that all development should be employment led; delivery of housing must be in tandem with employment development. The enhanced housing element now appears to dominate the development and it is hard to comprehend how this element of Policy A7 can be met.	Too much emphasis on housing	The important point of iii of policy A7 is that housing should be in tandem with employment. The SPD addresses all land use aspects of Policy A7. Without specific proposals which will arise through the Development Management process this relationship between housing and employment cannot be tied down at this point.	N/A	n/a
69	Bloor and Persimmon Homes	Policy A7	Policy A7 (iv) – (xii) include requirements for a comprehensive masterplan for the site along with details of vehicle accesses, public transport and good design, The draft SPD is a high level document which acts as a strategic masterplan and provides only limited detail on how these criteria will be met. As it is only a strategic document, it should clearly set out the Councils’ requirements for the further masterplanning work that is required for the site, including the need for a comprehensive masterplan including essential site access details - i.e. how the site will be accessed from the Old Gloucester Road and how it will link to the M5: an element which is fundamental to site delivery -. and accompanying supporting studies such as an Environmental Statement.	Add detail that further detailed masterplanning work will be required	Add detail that further detailed masterplanning work will be required through the planning applications process – being clear that this will need to be done by developers	P82	Chapter 1 and 9 updated inc validation req
70	Bloor and Persimmon Homes		The draft SPD contains references to ‘ Elms Grove ’, for example, Section D6, page 47. These references should be amended to refer to the correct site name of ‘ Elms Park ’.	Clarification	Amend to Elms Park	P22, 47,	yes
71	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	Cycle Infrastructure	<i>D2. “New pedestrian and cycle connections will be created with existing routes and paths in neighbouring communities. These walking and cycling routes will be direct, safe, well lit, comfortable and attractive.”</i> <i>“Other points of pedestrian and cycle connections will be provided around the remainder of the site perimeter to take account of Public Rights of Way,</i>	Objection to shared cycle and pedestrian paths Objection to on-street parking	Detailed street design will come forward as detailed proposals are made – but priority for cycling provision is clear and should be retained, if anything with a reduction in the level of detail of how this should be delivered	Review and revise D2 accordingly	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			<p><i>footpaths and other desire lines.”</i></p> <p><i>“The site will have both commuter and leisure trails for cycling. Routes adjacent to main streets will have segregated walking and cycling infrastructure, including a 3m wide segregated cycling lane. Leisure routes linking urban areas within the site would have a shared footway / cycleway width of 3 metres”</i></p> <p>The attitude here is welcoming but we would strongly suggest against the use of shared paths that mix pedestrians and cyclists. It's unsafe where there are significant numbers of both users and only suitable for low-speed cycling. Such shared paths will inherently invite conflict that could easily be avoided by putting the cycle paths in parallel to footpaths.</p> <p>It should be pointed out that whenever separate off-road facilities are provided for cyclists this should not be in lieu of adequate on-road facilities. Slower and less experienced cyclists will always need segregated infrastructure whereas the more experienced rider will more often choose to cycle on the road itself as they are confident and fast enough to mix with traffic.</p> <p>It is also unclear where the main streets with segregated cycle lanes are. We presume it does not refer to the ‘Main Street’ discussed below. There are multiple references to the provision of on-street parking. As such we are keen to see how the street designs incorporate these segregated routes and on-street parking without conflict. We generally would recommend against significant on-street parking provision. It reduces pedestrian visibility, is potentially hazardous for cyclists and can be an eyesore. Alternatively, providing parking to the rear of properties opens up the areas in front and creates pedestrian and cyclist friendly safe spaces and routes.</p>		remove reference to 3.0 metres, and instead state that “a high quality of pedestrian / cycle infrastructure will be targeted. Where possible, this should meet or exceed optimum design guidance.”		
72	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	Main Street	<p><i>D4. “This ‘main street’ should not be viewed as a high speed direct route through the site, but as an integrated part of West Cheltenham, with mixed use development providing frontage activity along its length. It will be designed to slow vehicle speeds through the site and encourage walking, cycling and public transport through the provision of footways, 3m cycleways and bus priority measures along its length. Subject to detailed design and capacity constraints, the main street should be a single carriageway road with a design speed of 30mph and straight sections would be of a short length to assist in enforcing low vehicle speeds. Frontage activity and side junctions will also assist in reducing vehicle speeds. It would incorporate at-grade pedestrian crossings and bus stops.”</i></p> <p>The idea of Main Street not being used as a high speed thoroughfare is encouraging. However, it would appear from the illustrations that cars are to be given much more of a priority than cyclists. Given the proposal also talks of deliberately slowing down vehicles that pass through, we think a 20mph limit would be better and more consistent with this philosophy. Provided suitable traffic calming methods are employed, this could potentially reduce the need for segregated cycle routes.</p> <p>On this note the proposed 30mph limit on the Main Street is the only reference to an actual speed limit in the document, despite the repeated references to low traffic speeds and emphasis on prioritising walking and</p>	Support for 20mph on main street	<p>Current position is that the main street will not be a through route for general traffic</p> <p>Consider revisions to main masterplan drawing on pg 13 to indicate no through road - however the hand drawn views convey the right sort of intent / messages</p>	Amend masterplan on pg 13 to suggest no direct through road other than for non-car modes	Edits to show bus gate

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			cycling. At this point we would suggest that a 20mph limit be adopted throughout the site. The advantages of 20mph zones are well known and are being considered elsewhere in Cheltenham. A forward thinking and progressive development such as this should lead the way in this regard.				
73	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	Housing	<p>8.2.3 “New dwellings will be supported by vehicle charging points, which will be designed to have dedicated space for bicycle storage and will have access to the use of environmentally friendly vehicle hire schemes.”</p> <p>E1 “Block types: Typically two storey houses with three storey roof popups and corner blocks. Corner blocks consisting of flats with their own front door to the street, generous lobby for prams and bikes and private balconies.”</p> <p>This is good. The provision of secure cycle storage at properties is essential for it to be considered a viable option for residents. However, care needs to be taken to ensure that this storage is easily accessible at the property. Many developments fail in this regard by forcing the residents to take their bikes through narrow alleyways and towards the back of the garden for example. A similar design to the example in Figure 6, where the bikes are stored under a canopy at the front of the house, would be welcomed. Notice also how there is no on-street parking. Cars are parked on the property itself, and do not block the road or produce a hazard for those using it.</p>	Support for cycle storage	Support noted	N/A	n/a
74	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	Schools	<p>D6. “Safe routes to local schools will be delivered through the network of walking and cycling routes within the site and numerous connections to the existing areas. These routes will provide dedicated, safe, direct, overlooked and well-lit routes which connect externally to the Springbank Primary Academy, St Thomas More Primary School, All Saints Academy as well as the required new primary school within the West Cheltenham site and the planned new secondary school at Elms Grove to the north.</p> <p>Where access across main roads is required, good quality dedicated controlled crossings will be required.”</p> <p>This is encouraging. The ability for children to be able to cycle to the new schools that are proposed is essential for reducing congestion from dropping off and picking up at peak times. A network of safe routes are needed for younger children wishing to make that journey.</p>	Support for safe route to schools	Support noted	N/A	n/a
75	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	Public Transport	<p>D1. “Existing bus services will be diverted through the site and frequencies increased to serve new residents and employees as well as improve services for existing residents. This will encourage a modal shift to public transport for existing and potential future residents.”</p> <p>“To mitigate against the threat of rat-running on local streets, the use of bus gates (or similar) should be considered, particularly in the vicinity of Henley Road.”</p> <p>We fully support extending bus services to the site as it is crucial to help keep traffic levels as low as possible.</p> <p>Figure 31 suggests that there would be bus gates on site access points along the eastern boundary with Springbank. This is welcomed and important to</p>	Support for bus gates to prevent rat-running	Support noted	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			<p>ensure that traffic volumes are low on local streets.</p> <p>Regarding rat-running, it is unclear whether the northernmost vehicular access point in Figure 2 (see below) would be used by regular vehicles. If it is there is potential for rat-running in this neighbourhood. Otherwise, the design of the site seems to make many efforts to keep neighbourhood traffic down, which again is encouraging.</p>				
76	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycle Campaign	Links to surrounding area	<p><i>D2: “The site will facilitate improved connections to Springbank and Hester’s Way, Cheltenham Station and the town centre beyond, in accordance with the Connecting Cheltenham strategy. A continuous and high quality off-carriageway link to Cheltenham Rail Station will be provided linking to the site from the southern access and via Telstar Way and the A40. Signage and road marking improvements for cyclists will be considered within existing residential areas to further encourage and facilitate sustainable travel via direct routes.</i></p> <p>The off-carriageway link via Telstar Way along the A40 is much needed and we fully support its inclusion. However, whilst it may be of high quality we anticipate that the majority of residents will likely not use it to access the station to and from the site as the most direct route would involve exiting to the east, travelling through Fiddlers Green and Coronation Square. This presumably is the more direct route referred to above. The signage and road marking improvements promised are therefore very important to ensure these routes are attractive, safe and easy to navigate.</p> <p>Although not covered in detail in the SPD the cycle campaign has been shown preliminary plans of the Telstar Way / A40. We have some concerns over the current proposals. Firstly, that the east/west crossing at the junction itself does not prioritise walking and cycling in that it will require three phases of lights to cross. We suggest that this be changed, ideally to single phase, to reduce the crossing time and inconvenience. Secondly, the requirement of access from Hatherley, across the A40, to Telstar Way, has been missed and should be included.</p> <p><i>D5: “The key junction at the southern end of the site will be designed to give priority to pedestrian and cyclist movements. The walking / cycling routes will continue onto Telstar Way and provide a continuous pedestrian / cycle link between and within the site and onto the A40 and the wider area. “</i></p> <p>Ensuring that the walking and cycling provision is continuous is important in order to present them as the most attractive option for residents. Care should be taken in their design to give these routes priority at side roads.</p>	Concern about detailed re-design of Telstar Way / A40	Comments noted – detailed designs outside remit of SPD, to be picked up at development management stage.	N/A	n/a
77	Severn Trent Water	CPO	<p>You explain in your letter that both council ls (Tewkesbury and Cheltenham) are considering the use of compulsory purchase powers if needed to assemble land to ensure realisation of the Cyber Central vision n. We understand that this is an option that you have to consider with a project of this size and importance but this would be something we would have to object to if it risked the undertaking of our statutory responsibility to customers.</p>	Concern re CPO references due to statutory responsibilities	Noted – CPO is outside the remit of the SPD. Both Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils are actively working with Severn Trent Water.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
78	Severn Trent Water	Hayden Works	As is noted within the SPD the relocation of a sewage treatment works is a far from straight forward operation involving considerable design considerations, technical challenges, land acquisition issues, planning considerations, environmental impact and of course total financial cost. It is also noted that the allocated land could come forward whilst the works remains in place and this of course raises questions over potential odour issues. Suitable water and waste infrastructure will of course be needed to serve the entire development and the solution for this will of course be an important consideration in any decision made about the existing works and a replacement of it.	Comments emphasising the challenge of moving sewage works	Noted. Ongoing engagement with Severn Trent Water	N/A	n/a
79	National Grid		No comments	noted	N/A	N/A	n/a
80	Swindon Parish Council	Lack of integration	The proposed Cyber Central Garden Community represents a significant development that will impact wide areas of West Cheltenham, including the Parish of Swindon. As a council we have carefully considered the proposed scheme and its impact on our Parish. We believe that the scheme's lack of acknowledgement and integration with significant neighbouring developments in North West Cheltenham will, on balance, result in a detrimental impact on residents of our Parish. To ensure the scheme realises its potential, it is essential that the combined impact of these developments are considered by the proposal. Such an approach will ensure the benefits of the Cyber Central Garden Community span far wider than the development itself.	Concern about impact of development	<p>Give greater emphasis on the need to acknowledge NW Cheltenham</p> <p>Add NW Chelt boundary to Fig 1</p> <p>Linked to transport impacts - This is subject to assessment at application stage. The following wording should be included. <i>At an appropriate stage, a full and comprehensive Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required in support of the proposals, where transport strategies are developed and the cumulative impacts of the full site along with other committed and/or allocated sites are considered. The assessment will need to be scoped with all relevant authorities, with locations and methodologies agreed at that stage. The need (or not) for mitigation at any location is to be informed by the assessment results.</i></p>	Amend Fig 1 and p40	yes
81	Swindon Parish Council	Congestion	The proposal includes only two connections with the existing road network; one connecting Fiddler's Green / Telstar Way and one connecting to Old Gloucester Road (B4634). The B4634 is the primary route providing direct links to South Cheltenham and North Gloucester from Swindon Parish and the proposed Elms Park and Cheltenham Meadows developments. Considering this, we believe the combined impact of the Cyber Central development, will result in the B4634 experiencing traffic far beyond its designed capacity, resulting in heavy congestion which will have a considerable negative impact on Swindon and Uckington parishes.	Concern about congestion and impact on Swindon and Uckington parishes	See comment 80	P40	yes
82	Swindon Parish Council	Congestion	The approach of managing out cars by design does not reflect the current or near future situation. The approach that relies on incorrect assumptions regarding modal shift (see 2.6) and ignores the impact of the proposed Elms Park and Cheltenham Meadows developments. This will result in significantly greater congestion and result in the undesired increase in emissions (see 3.2). Furthermore, we believe that this will limit the potential uptake of employment opportunities by residents in neighbouring North West Cheltenham due to the difficulties in community by car. With the UK's government recent announcement of the acceleration of the ban for the sale of new petrol and diesel cars, we believe that this ambition is not only unrealistic, but also short sighted.	Concern about congestion and impact on Swindon and Uckington parishes	It would be inappropriate for the SPD in light of Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils declaration of a climate change emergency together with direction of transport policy as set out in the review of the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan and Connecting Cheltenham. There needs to be a step behavioural change in the way we move and it would be contrary to garden community principles if we did not enable a modal shift through the delivery of West Cheltenham. No change to SPD	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
83	Swindon Parish Council	Transport Concern	We note specifically that Appendix A2.6.22 states: “A considerable amount of transport work was done in order to promote the site through the JCS process. Modelling was undertaken, junctions designed, and a network of roads was envisaged to provide access across the site a s [sic] whole.” However, we voice concern as we are aware of the issues in the compilation of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Transport Plan. Given the lack of confidence in this essential underpinning assessment, we expect that the updated traffic modelling and assessments will be subject to full public and independent scrutiny, including all modelling assumptions that are made.	Request for full public scrutiny of transport modelling	Future modelling as part of the Development Management process will be made available for consultation in the usual way.	N/A	n/a
84	Swindon Parish Council	Transport Concern	We note that Appendix A2.6.21 with reference to the Elms Park proposal states “the key focus of their transport strategy is to encourage sustainable travel and a modal shift to alternative modes for existing users. The majority of mitigation proposals are therefore for sustainable transport improvements”. This statement makes assumptions which are highly speculative and very sensitive. This cannot be assumed to be accurate with regard to road use impact in this wider area. It is our view that the proposed infrastructure does not meet the combined impact needs of the three developments, and will result in a significant increase in congestion and journey times while reducing journey reliability.	Concern about congestion and impact on Swindon and Uckington parishes	Detailed transport assessments will be fully assessed at the Development Management stage.	N/A	n/a
85	Swindon Parish Council	Existing offsite network	We also note that A2.6.17 sates “The Arle Court roundabout scheme does not, however, deliver any improvement in capacity on Fiddler’s Green Lane. Traffic management measures will be required to direct traffic to access the site via Telstar, although this may have implications on the capacity at the Telstar Way / A40 junction.” This route is proposed as a key trunk route for traffic originating from the Elms Park development. As such, it is vital that the combined impact of the traffic from all developments. It is our view that to avoid worsening the already significant congestion it will be necessary to provide direct access from the A40 Golden Valley to Cyber Central without utilising existing infrastructure.	Suggests direct access from A40 Golden Valley direct to Cyber Central without using existing roads	See response to comment 84	N/A	As above
86	Swindon Parish Council	Transport concerns-model shift	While, as a Parish Council, we fully support and endorse efforts to achieve net-zero emissions, we are concerned by the proposals unrealistic assumptions regarding modal shift that experience has shown are unlikely to be achieved. We note that the recent experience of increased congestion as a result of the expansion of Bishops Cleeve. North West Cheltenham has experienced a marked increase in through traffic (travelling from Bishops Cleeve to south Cheltenham / Junction 11 of the M5). The anticipated model shift has not been achieved resulting in significantly worsen journey times and journey reliability, while also impacting local air quality. The scheme must include robust traffic modelling that considers the combined impact of all neighbouring developments and includes realistic sensitivity analysis to endure incorrect assumptions regarding modal shift do not result in cliff-edge congestion effects.	Do not believe in modal shift assumptions	See response to comment 84	N/A	As above
87	Swindon Parish Council	J10 note	We fully support the proposal for a dual direction junction at Junction 10 of the M5 to provide direct access to the Cyber Central Development and alleviate congestions from Elms Park. We emphasise that this scheme is vital to support the increased traffic as a result of the proposed developments.	Support for J10 link to cyber central	Support welcomed. HIF bid successful as announced 11 th March 2020 in budget statement	N/A	n/a
88	Swindon Parish Council	Opportunities for further links	We note the proposed development provides limited links to neighbouring areas including Swindon Parrish and the Elms Park and Cheltenham Meadows developments, except for a pedestrian link to the new school at Elms Park. We believe this is a missed opportunity. The scheme should consider the routes beyond the immediate vicinity to ensure interconnectivity with other local neighbourhoods.	Consider further pedestrian routes to the north and west	Review potential for further connections/emphasis on plan	Fig 31	yes
89	Swindon Parish	General	A significant opportunity to provide effective links to Elms Park, Bishops	Suggestion for new route linking to Elm	Noted, but this is outside the scope of the SPD.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
	Council	comment-Road	Cleeve and beyond has been missed. A new transport corridor, originating from the proposed dual carriageway to Junction 10 of the M5 / B4634 intersection, would head north to an intersection with the Tewksbury Road. It would continue through the proposed Elms Park development, providing direct links to Cyber Central, and then head east towards Bishops Cleeve. This corridor would provide opportunities for high-frequency mass transit solutions as well as private commuters. Such a scheme would provide the necessary infrastructure to support both developments, as well as alleviating existing congestion in the area.	Park from J10			
90	Swindon Parish Council	Air Quality	Appendix A27.4 is far too vague a statement on Air Quality. A detailed assessment considering the wider area, specifically adjacent areas of low air quality (e.g. Princess Elizabeth Way) must be provided and subject to public and independent scrutiny.	Further detail on air quality needed	To be considered as part of future more detailed masterplanning and related development management The Air Quality information at this time is based on the due diligence stage only. At the next stage it will require the undertaking of a 'detailed assessment' of the site, so will include any areas that have been requested.	N/A	n/a
91	Swindon Parish Council	Air Quality	We are concerned that the existing infrastructure plan will lead to significant congestions that will have a detrimental impact on already highly polluted transport corridors, both within our Parish and those surrounding it. We note that many of these transport corridors are densely populated by residential dwellings.	Concern about congestion and impact on Swindon and Uckington parishes	Comments noted. Detailed transport assessments will be assessed at Development Management stage.	N/A	n/a
92	Swindon Parish Council	Drainage	We request that drainage plan is designed in conjunction with Elms Park and Cheltenham Meadows to consider the wider impact of all schemes on the existing water courses, particularly the River Chelt	Further detail on drainage required	As part of future planning applications	N/A	n/a
93	Swindon Parish Council	Schools	We request further clarity regarding the two proposed primary schools including their sizing and scheduling of construction and opening. We understand that the proposal includes no provision for a secondary school. The proposal makes references to the new proposed secondary school at Elms Park, which will serve the development. However, we understand that the Elms Park development (including the school) will not be completed in time to support the needs of this development. This will put additional strain on neighbouring schools including All Saints Pitville and Bishops Cleeve which in turn will create additional traffic through Swindon Parish. The proposal must include well planned provision for students. Suitable mitigations of the resulting additional traffic must be demonstrated	Further details on schools required and concern about pressure on existing	As part of future planning applications	N/A	n/a
94	Swindon Parish Council	Facilities such as GP	There is no specific mention of Doctors' surgery provision and other local amenities. Such provision must be specifically included within the proposal and subject to proper public scrutiny.	No reference to GPs	Add reference to need for GP practices and other services for new community	Add to objective B	yes
95	Swindon Parish Council	Carbon Neutral general comment	As highlighted at the stakeholder meeting, the profile of climate change has increased in terms of media presence, public scrutiny and general awareness. It is now generally accepted that we face a climate emergency. Tewkesbury and Cheltenham Borough Councils have both declared a climate emergency, like many other Councils in the UK, and all those within Gloucestershire. Both Councils have committed to achieving carbon neutrality by 2030. This commitment should be reflected in all the Councils' strategies, policies and plans.	Strengthen reference to climate emergency	Agree, See comment 46	Add to 3.1.1	yes
96	Swindon Parish Council	Opportunities	In terms of opportunities, by positioning itself as a Cyber hub, West Cheltenham offers the chance for real innovation in the field of climate change mitigation and adaptation. Cyber Central needs to be a key driver for new technologies so as to attract skills and jobs. It has the potential to	Showcase solutions to the climate emergency	Noted – this emphasis exists	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			showcase renewable energy projects and carbon neutral products and manufacturing, along with the latest tech and cyber solutions to the climate emergency. Facilitating this approach should be a central thread of the SPD.				
97	Swindon Parish Council	General statement	If considered early enough in the planning process there is significant potential for new development to capitalise on the natural assets of West Cheltenham and deliver carbon neutral development that runs on renewable sources. We would also recommend consideration of opportunities for retrofitting of renewables within the existing building stock alongside/in tandem with new development. The SPD is a significant opportunity for a step-change in policy to embed renewable energy in new and existing communities which would represent significant socio-economic and environmental benefits.	Embed renewable energy	Noted – this emphasis exists	N/A	n/a
98	Swindon Parish Council	Sustainability Objectives comment	The draft SPD contains some excellent sections on climate change/sustainability/ net zero carbon, and we are fully supportive of these aspects. In particular section 3: ‘Embracing the Highest Standards of Sustainability’ (note the contents page lists this section as ‘environmental sustainability’ but this appears to have been taken out elsewhere in the report which is appropriate as sustainable development also encompasses social and economic factors no just environmental). This has due regard to the climate emergency and the commitment to zero carbon by 2030. It includes flood risk, biodiversity, renewable energy and prudent use of natural resources, waste minimisation and the circular economy. There are hints within this section of retrofitting of existing communities, as well as in the Objectives, but we would welcome if these were made more explicit. However the above elements tend to appear within this section of the SPD but do not permeate throughout the document as well as they perhaps could. We therefore consider there is more the SPD could do in response to the climate emergency.	Supportive of emphasis but strengthen retrofitting of existing communities	Add reference to retrofitting of existing communities	Objective A	yes
99	Swindon Parish Council	Climate Change Emergency (linked to comment above)	For example the phrase ‘climate change’ only appears twice within the document: Within C10 (“The strategy should be designed to plan and design for a low maintenance landscape, with reference to climate change and low resource inputs.”), and at paragraph 6.1.5 (“New development will help to deliver real behaviour change to tackle both local air quality and global climate change issues and the design will positively embrace and drive a modal shift from car use.”). The latter is welcomed, but the former is considered insufficient. Generally we feel the SPD could be stronger in terms of requiring developers to deliver on the climate agenda, rather than just being encouraging. We have the following suggestions for improvement:	Strengthen references to climate change	add bullet point here on climate change and zero carbon development	1.1	As above
100	Swindon Parish Council	Climate change	In the Introduction, at paragraph 1.1 “A Unique Opportunity”, whilst we welcome the inclusion of bullet points relating to sustainability and environmental protection and enhancement, there needs to be a bullet point here on climate change and zero carbon development. It is crucially important that this is a central theme within the Introduction, the Context and the Vision, and that this continues throughout the document.	Strengthen references to climate change	See comment 99	1.1	yes
101	Swindon Parish Council	Climate change	In the Key Mixed Use Principles section, this would be a suitable place to reference climate change mitigation and adaptation related technologies.	Strengthen references to climate change	Add reference to climate change in Part B	Part B	yes
102	Swindon Parish Council	Climate change	In section B3 there should be mention of net zero carbon homes.	Strengthen references to climate change	Add reference to aspiration for net zero carbon homes	B3	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
103		Climate change	Where reference is made to electric charging points for vehicles (e.g. at D7), it should be stipulated that the electricity source is a renewable one, not a carbon-based one.	Strengthen references to climate change	Add reference to desire for renewable energy sources	D7	yes
104	Swindon Parish Council	Climate change	Hayden Sewage Treatment Works – paragraph 8.2.1. should include that any development of the HSTW site must be net carbon neutral; i.e. “The latest technologies should be employed to reduce water and energy consumption of new development and deliver net carbon neutral development, and the Smart Cities objectives within this SPD should be considered incorporated for the HSTW site.”	Strengthen references to climate change	Make suggested change	8.2.1	yes
105	Swindon Parish Council	Climate change	We recommend that the Validation checklist at 9.1.4 also includes a carbon neutral strategy / climate change mitigation and adaptation strategy. Also, if this list is meant to be exhaustive then we would expect to see other reports listed here such as Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment, Waste Management Strategy, Ecological Reports, Blue and Green Infrastructure Strategy, Land Contamination reports, Water Use Strategy, etc	Strengthen references to climate change	Review list of documents at check list	9.1.4	yes
106	Swindon Parish Council	Assessment of applications	We welcome the inclusion of the Assessment Matrix and Design Review. Where we have made suggested additions above, and below, we recommend these are also incorporated into the matrix as appropriate.	Review table for opportunities to reference climate change	No change – these are objective headings	Review table	No
107	Swindon Parish Council	Water efficiency	We welcome the positive references to water efficiency and water quality within the document. It also has some excellent points on biodiversity and green infrastructure. We consider the document could include greater reference to biodiversity net gain and environmental net gain. In section 5 relating to landscape, the grey box on page 30 has some excellent content relating to SuDS (e.g. we fully support a site wide SuDS system as opposed to a piecemeal approach which does not work as effectively. However under 2, where it states “the potential for Suds features to maximise amenity and habitat should be explored” – the word ‘explored’ is not strong enough – these aspects should be built in as standard. Furthermore it should be amenity, habitat and water quality. The word ‘explored’ I also used in number 3 re habitat creation. We suggest using ‘incorporated’ instead of ‘explored’ in both 2 and 3.	Supportive, add greater reference to biodiversity net gain and environmental net gain	Review objective A - greater reference to biodiversity net gain and environmental net gain	objective A	yes
108	Swindon Parish Council	SuDS		Edits to SUDS box	Make specific wording edits suggested	P30	yes
109	Swindon Parish Council	Water management	At C1 re green infrastructure, the last bullet point should be altered as follows: “existing streams, ditches and water bodies, including culverted watercourses to be opened up.” Furthermore, we recommend referring to “green and blue infrastructure” throughout the SPD.	Changes to reference green and blue infrastructure	Make specific wording edits suggested Need add ‘where possible’ on the opening up of culverts Action as agreed as written but it is unlikely that Culverts can be opened up, for example those running under adjacent buildings/highways or other cross overs	C1	yes
110	Swindon Parish Council	Flooding and Climate change general comment	C5 re flood risk and drainage is welcomed. However it should make reference to all sources of flooding, including fluvial flood risk. Currently the majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1 (i.e. not in the fluvial floodplain), however there are small areas of Flood Zone 2 (medium probability floodplain) and some Flood Zone 3 (high probability floodplain) along the banks of the Hatherley Brook that borders the southern edge of the site (up to 60m in places). This does not include an allowance for climate change which would need to be factored in. Furthermore there may be small floodplains associated with the ditches and ordinary watercourses that are located within the site, and these will need to be modelled. Development in areas of fluvial floodplain should be avoided.	Strengthen references to all types of flood risk	Make specific wording edits suggested The original report referred to all sources of flooding that are required for a Flood Risk Assessment and in line with NPPF. The assessment from each risk was based on readily available information. For climate change policy states that this is to be applied to the 100year event only. At the	C5	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			Furthermore any opportunities to deliver off-site flood risk improvements should be taken (we welcome the inclusion of this within Objective A.).		time of writing, this information has not been made available and would be subject to confirmation through further works as the scheme/site progresses. The flood outlines available are limited to watercourse that have a catchment area of greater than 3km ² . Any watercourses with a contributing area below this will not have been modelled – this would apply to the onsite minor watercourses. As such, an assessment has been made using the available surface water mapping for the purposes of this report.		
111	Swindon Parish Council	General comment	Whilst we recognise that SPDs do not require an evidence base in the same way as Development Plan Documents we would welcome discussion with you regarding whether any evidence documents are intended to be produced by the Councils for this development. For example a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Drainage Strategy would serve very well to assist in the way development proposals come forwards in the event that multiple developers approach the Council in a piecemeal fashion. The same would apply to a site-wide energy and waste strategy.	Further evidence base	No change – further work at planning application stage / detailed masterplanning	N/A	n/a
112	Swindon Parish Council	General comment- Hayden	With regards to Hayden sewage treatment works, we would advise that the SPD needs to be flexible in its approach as it is not yet know what the future of the facility will be. If it is to remain in situ then development close to it will need to be well-planned and designed to avoid any nuisance from the sewage treatment works.	Impact of sewage treatment works	Noted – the document takes account of this	N/A	n/a
113	Swindon Parish Council	Water quality	There are potential water quality improvement benefits that could be realised if the works is to be altered/re-located in future. The current overall status of the receiving water body ('River Chelt – M5 to confluence River Severn') is 'Poor'. It is therefore failing the Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirement for 'good' status. The following elements are failing; phosphate, BOD (biochemical oxygen demand) and macrophytes are all recorded as 'Poor'. All these indicators would link in with the fact the treatment works discharge just upstream from this point. The main issue is likely to be that there is very little dilution in the River Chelt. The addition of another 10,000 plus houses into the works is a concern and something Severn Trent Water (STW) will need to plan for in their asset planning. Whilst this might not feature in any evidence base for an SPD, it will need to be well covered within the JCS and its supporting evidence base (e.g. the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)) to ensure any new/upgraded infrastructure comes on-board in a timely manner to meet development needs.	Concern about water quality	No change - further work at planning application stage / detailed masterplanning	N/A	n/a
114	Swindon Parish Council	Environmental Permit comment	Therefore it is welcome that you are considering the works currently and discussing with STW. Any new works would have tighter consent limits (i.e. it would need to meet better standards than the current Environmental Permit allows), and if a new location for the works is being considered then a key factor would be considering where it would discharge to in order to get greater dilution. Consideration should be given to the future location and strategic growth and development planning. For example if a location closer to the Severn is a possibility there may be merit in considering this in combination with the Gloucester works at Netheridge. Depending on the timeframe being planned for, it could be beneficial to investigate a combined	Consideration of future Hayden Works	Noted	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			works to serve Cheltenham and Gloucester, and this might link in with the Gloucestershire 2050 work that has been done to date. At this stage the advantages and disadvantages of such a scheme are unknown and consideration of any positive and negative environmental impacts of this would need to be undertaken.				
115	Swindon Parish Council	Flood Zone 2 (and limited 3) along the banks of the Hatherley Brook that borders the southern edge of the site (up to 60m in places, not including climate change)	Opportunity to address this- Flood Risk betterment (i.e. at Ashville Business park on other side of M5 where B4634 road and businesses flooded in 2007, such as Sarfan/Messier Doughty); making space for water; floodplain reconnection. (e.g. under road bridges at Hayden Lane and Old Gloucester Road)	Flood Risk betterment	noted	N/A	n/a
116	Swindon Parish Council	Flood Modelling/ data -	To be addressed by- Improved and up to date flood model to inform this and other developments, incorporating climate change	Flood Modelling/data	No change - further work at planning application stage / detailed masterplanning	N/A	n/a
117	Swindon Parish Council	Watercourses	To be addressed by- Open up small sections of culvert on ordinary watercourses/re-profiling of channels to more natural/sinuous Blue/Green infrastructure SuDS Wildlife corridors Wetland creation River restoration Species protection and enhancement (otter, water vole and fish including eels)	Watercourse improvements	Add references to C5	C5	yes
118	Swindon Parish Council	Culverts	Restoration of the small lengths of culvert present to open channel	Watercourse improvements	Add references to C5 with the caveat of 'where possible'	C5	yes
119	Swindon Parish Council	Waste and energy infrastructure	Opportunity to provide district wide renewable energy and services including waste management. (Potential for Anaerobic Digestion with STW?)	district wide renewable energy	Noted – see 3.22	N/A	n/a
120	Swindon Parish Council	Climate change	Use latest technologies to address matters of climate change (e.g. innovative SuDS, waste management and energy use). Consider future users – e.g. telematics? No gauges currently in Hatherley Brook, but could be of use in future?	Strengthen references to climate change	Review reference to technology	3.1 and A1	n/a
121	Hesters Way Forum	General comment of support	The Hesters Way Forum is generally in support of the SPD and is particularly keen on the proposals which involve biodiversity, passive house designs as exemplified by the RIBA winners in Norwich and by the cycle, walking and public transport aspirations The forum has held several meetings to discuss the SPD. The feedback responses given below have emerged from those discussions and reflect the views of the whole group.	Generally supportive	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
122	Hesters Way Forum	Buffer zone	Buffer zone. All agreed that the buffer zone of at least 80 metres between houses backing onto Fiddlers Green Lane, Beverley and Juniper Courts and the Cyber Hub buildings is key to the success of the project as far as local residents are concerned. This should be a landscaped area with screening trees and shrubs and include good access to the development for walking and	Suggests a buffer zone of 80m along length of boundary	We are not proposing a buffer zone; however acknowledge the concerns of local people and the need to use space to help connect places together.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			cycling. The closest buildings on the cyber site should not be visible from the residences which back onto Fiddlers Green Road and should definitely not loom over them. The references to a buffer zone in the document should include Fiddlers Green Lane as well as Henley Road and Old Gloucester Road. There is a good description of the views of the group in the HW masterplan on p24. Any careful planning of the boundary buffer zone should include close collaboration with the HWF.		The purpose of the SPD is not to screen new development. But we do need to ensure that the new development is of a good quality and provides wider benefits. No change to SPD		
123	Hesters Way Forum	Routes through to existing community	Fiddlers Green Lane (FGL). The traffic on FGL should be reduced to a minimum and if possible be limited to a walking and cycling route. If vehicles do access the road that should be limited by either bollards to restrict width located at the brook near to Meadow Close on FGL (as at Caernarvon Road in Hatherley) or using weight restrictions. If traffic is permitted to use the road then chicane parking as shown in the masterplan on p22 should be used. Further narrowing could be installed at the junction of Niven Courtyard with FGL allowing safer walking and cycle crossing and access to the development through the hedgerow.	Concern about impact on FGL	Add a reference to improving this route in D2 See response to comment 81	D2	As above
124	Hesters Way Forum	Building heights	Building heights. Building heights should be restricted in the vicinity of the housing on FGL and Beverley and Juniper Courts and should definitely not loom over properties on these roads as may be the case with the proposed “mid density mixed use” buildings. The proposed entry to the site at the FGL / Telstar Way roundabout should abide by the proposals regarding the buffer zone presented above. Buildings on the site should gradually increase in height with distance away from FGL. Some views from FGL to the west to be retained. An explanation of the need for greater densities would be useful as would the number of taller buildings above 3 stories.	Concern about building heights along the eastern boundary	Review wording about building heights and need for sensitivity on Fiddlers Green Lane	P50, 57, b4 – p29	yes
125	Hesters Way Forum	Public Art provision	The public art section should reference the CBC Public Art strategy;	Public art	Add reference the CBC Public Art strategy	C9 p39	yes
126	Hesters Way Forum	Access- roads	Transport access (bus and car) Access to the development should encourage bus and cycle usage. Bus access should be agreed in the document and not simply described as “potential”. Some access to the development should be via the current residential areas. E.g. Henley Road and Springbank Road. M5 Junction 10 developments should be completed prior to the site development. If this isn’t possible construction traffic should have no access to FGL. Park and ride facilities should be proposed and implemented prior to the site opening. All possible opportunities should be taken to ensure that the main road through the development is not used as a direct through route between the Tewkesbury Road/M5 junction 10/Old Gloucester Road and Telstar Way/FGL The document describes a modal shift in transport; clear evidence of how this will occur should be included.	Concern about traffic impact, order of infrastructure delivery and reality of modal shift	Review bus access wording – context of ‘potential’ Review wording about impact on FGL	6.1 and D1	yes
127	Hesters Way Forum	Management and role of community facilities	Community facilities. The role, management and objectives of the Innovation Centre should be clarified. The community facilities described in the plan are minimal; will there be a community centre building? What services will it supply and how and by whom will it be managed? The local school could be relocated to the centre of the residential area so encouraging walking and cycling rather than car use especially at the busy peak commute times. Sports and recreational facilities seem to have been omitted from the plan and yet are included in the HW strategy drawings. What will be provided and where will it be located?	Community facilities	Strengthen wording about community services and sports facilities	B1 and B2, C3	As above
128	Hesters Way	MSCP	Multi story car park. Whilst its accepted that decked parking needs to be	Concern about location of multi storey	Add reference to vegetation and indicative	P57	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
	Forum	provision	provided the location of the multi-story car park adjacent to housing and assessed from a bend on FGL is not suitable or safe. This car park would better serve the area nearer the centre of the cyber provision	car park on drawings adjacent to Fiddlers Green lane	nature of sketch/multi storey car park location to be tested and designed through more detailed masterplan / Planning applications		
129	Hesters Way Forum	Underground / decked parking	Parking proposals Further underground parking at offices and apartments will be required to ensure overspill to nearby residential streets is minimised. A better explanation should be given for the “flexible and innovative approaches to the provision of residential parking” and ‘flexible approach to the application of parking standards to ensure development promotes modal shift’ – what do these phrases mean in practice? Considering the current parking issues would a decked car park at the current GCHQ alleviate some of the current pressure and address future concerns.	Suggestion for underground car parks. Concern about use of ‘flexible’ car parking	Clarify use of word ‘flexibility’ in relation to car parking	Part D	yes
130	Hesters Way Forum	Wildflower meadow/ hedgerows	Concerns were raised regarding plans to build on the wildflower meadow in the fields next to FGL – what mitigation is proposed? The hedgerow at the top of FGL has been removed; this may be necessary in order to create the new road and the open spaces around the entrances to the site. Where possible hedgerows should be retained, and new habitats created for the species affected.	Concern about building on designated meadow at Fiddlers Green Lane. Concern re removal of hedgerow	Review hedgerow drawing where removal is referenced. Amend SPD to add reference to re-provision of meadow habitat elsewhere	Fig 16 and p30 point 8	yes
131	Hesters Way Forum		The SPD describes potential development at Coronation Square; what will this depend upon?	Coronation Square	Outside scope of SPD. Coronation Square is under relatively new ownership with some improvement works progressing. Import point for SPD is that clear connection is made to this as an important part of community capital	P14	yes
132	Natural England	Objectives welcomed	Natural England acknowledges and welcomes the SPD’s clear focus on five key objectives including the ‘highest standards of sustainability’ (Objective A) and ‘working with the landscape’ (Objective C). We acknowledge the stated sustainability benefits for themes such as managing flood risk and securing ecological net gain and new open spaces. Similarly in relation to landscape related benefits we welcome the document’s reference to the creation of new landscape spaces and biodiversity enhancements. We comment below on further aspects of relevance which will need to be incorporated into the SPD and/or built into suitable monitoring and review arrangements in order to reflect the significant changes likely to be needed to address climate change and declines in biodiversity.	Generally supportive	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
133	Natural England	SAC	Cotswold Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) We welcome the Councils’ collaboration with Natural England and neighbouring local planning authorities (LPAs) to prepare suitable evidence base information in respect of recreation pressure arising from new homes within the indicative zone of influence around this Habitats Site. The recently published visitor survey shows a zone extending some 15Km from the SAC boundary and therefore including the West Cheltenham site. We will continue to advise the collaborating LPAs as the project moves into a phase whereby mitigation options and a strategy for their delivery are identified	Monitoring of SAC	Noted – no change	N/A	n/a
134	Natural England	SAC-AQ	in respect of air quality, we have recently advised the Gloucestershire LPAs regarding recent case law known as ‘the Dutch Case’1. Further dialogue will be needed to discuss options for both project (planning application) level and strategic mitigation of adverse effects on air quality where the assessment of development proposals demonstrates that additional traffic related emissions are likely to occur in the vicinity of this SAC.	SAC Air quality issues	Add to next steps	P82	yes
135	Natural England	Severn Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation	Severn Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar Site With regard to the recreation theme the adjoining authorities in Stroud and Forest of Dean have established visitor survey evidence and corresponding recreation mitigation strategies. As part of the review of the JCS we will continue to advise the Councils regarding the evidence base requirements in	Severn Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar Site	Add to next steps Local authorities to engage with Natural England through their Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) to enable us to maintain dialogue on this issue in respect of the SPA and the Cotswolds Beechwoods SAC (points 133 and	P82	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
		(SAC) and Ramsar Site	relation to this Habitats Site. We also offer the following update regarding the most up to date available information regarding ongoing survey work to map areas of land 'functionally linked' to the Severn Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA). This survey work will allow better understanding of land beyond the SPA boundary and throughout the Severn Vale which is used by the SPA's designated wild birds during the wintering and passage phases of their annual life cycle. The resulting report is due to be completed in late August/September 2020.		134).		
136	Natural England		With regard to the SPD's sustainability strategy we would welcome clearer reference to the role of multifunctional green infrastructure as a cross cutting and enabling theme.	Strategy-Sustainability clarity	Add reference to the role of multifunctional green infrastructure	A3	yes
137	Natural England		A1 - Resource efficiency Flow chart (p18/86) and coverage regarding increased use of renewable energy sources. Please note our update information above regarding SPA functionally linked land.	A1	Add reference regarding SPA functionally linked land	A1	yes
138	Natural England		A3 - Connection to nature We welcome the SPD's clear reference to the Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership (LNP) and key outcomes from the partnership's collaboration including the 'Green Infrastructure Pledge' and adoption of the 'Building with Nature' benchmark. Further engagement with the LNP offers an important opportunity to understand and respond effectively to the constraints and opportunities associated with SPD themes including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4 – High quality new public space • C5 – Innovative approach to sustainable drainage • C6 – New tree planting strategy • C10 – Management strategy 	A3	Add reference to Local Nature partnership	5.1	yes
139	Natural England		Landscape and the public realm (p59/86) We note the SPD's reference to 'intensive use of the land' and CGI pictures showing buildings in excess of 3 storeys in height. We acknowledge the illustrative nature of the drawings but note the absence of 'green walls' as an element of the depicted green infrastructure. We encourage the Councils to give further consideration to the relevant evidence base information (e.g. please see above regarding SPA functionally linked land) in order to ensure the final design both reflects the most up to date understanding of the natural environment and delivers exemplar status green infrastructure design.	Landscape and the public realm	This is linked to comment 138. This SPD has been assessed for accreditation by Building with Nature. This assessment at future stages of the development management process is built into the SPD.	N/A	n/a
140	Natural England		Figure 51 (Place 3 – Main street neighbourhood) p70/86 We note the appreciable extent of land within the design proposed for car parking. In the context of the Councils' shared 'climate emergency' status the SPD's monitoring and review arrangements and proposed 'C10 - management strategy' may provide a valuable framework for ongoing dialogue over a flexible design approach. This might recognise the scope for this land to be used differently during the scheme's lifetime and plan accordingly.	Main neighbourhood	Add reference to car parking land... the scope for this land to be used differently during the scheme's lifetime and plan accordingly	P70, D7	yes
141	GCC	Suggested amendment to wording	Officers of the MWPA strongly encourage that revisions are made to paragraph 1.3.1. The SPD's policy coverage is wider in the specific development plan policies identified. In light of one of the SPD's aims: - '...an exemplar in...waste management' (see key sustainability principle A1) there should ideally be a reference back to the relevant strategic development plan policy driver – Gloucester-Cheltenham- Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Policy SD3 sustainable design and construction. This policy seeks to ensure that all development across the JCS area will incorporate the principles of waste minimisation and re-use, and for major schemes,	New references to additional JCS policy	Add cross refs to relevant JCS policies	Objective A	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			demonstrate how generated wastes will be minimised and sustainably managed. This strategic-level policy also lays the policy foundations for many of the SPD's other key sustainability principles.				
142	GCC	strategic objectives	Officers of the MWPA strongly encourage that revisions are made to objective A so to accommodate a commitment to 'embedding the principles of the circular economy' and 'achieving clean growth'. The concept of circularity is at the forefront of the UK government's emerging environment policy as set out in the 25 Year Environment Plan and detailed within the Resources and Waste Strategy for England. The SPD presents a near perfect opportunity in which to headline how this national policy priority can be meaningfully delivered at the local-level. The suggested reference to 'clean growth' would also further advance the SPDs alignment and policy coherence with key local strategies such as the emerging draft Gloucestershire Local Industrial Strategy (LIS). The draft LIS specifically seeks to; '...put clean growth at the heart of investment decisions and new developments.'	The masterplan framework and strategic objectives	Add reference to 'embedding the principles of the circular economy' and 'achieving clean growth'	Objective A See 3.2.6	yes
143	GCC	Embracing the highest standards of sustainability 3.2 Key Sustainable Principles	Officers of the MWPA welcome the inclusion of 'resource efficiency' as a key sustainable principle for the strategic development locality (A1). The reference to waste management is also acknowledged. However, noteworthy improvements to the ambition would be achieved through a commitment that beyond simply 'managing' the waste that is generated to a high environmental standard. This is very much the basic requirement for waste management practice at present. To be exemplar of innovative, advanced practice possible alternatives should be considered. These could include: - striving to achieve zero avoidable waste (which could also be aligned with government's target of achieving this by 2050); facilitating the transition to the circular economy; and delivering a step change in waste reduction through strong support for clean growth initiatives.	Should be more ambitious in terms of waste policies	Add striving to achieve zero avoidable waste (which could also be aligned with government's target of achieving this by 2050); facilitating the transition to the circular economy; and delivering a step change in waste reduction through strong support for clean growth initiatives.	A1	yes
144	GCC	Net Zero Carbon Diagram under point 2.2	Whilst it is acknowledged this diagram has been taken from another publication prepared by UK Green Building Council, officer of the MWPA strongly encourage that revisions are made to point 2.2. The current wording misses the opportunity to drive forward multiple ambitions of the emerging SPD. The requirement should be seeking the prioritisation of construction materials that are low-carbon relative to conventional options, particularly when they include recycled content. Any offsetting of embodied carbon should really be a secondary measure – although is supported. This prioritisation approach has been taken with the 'energy' elements set out in diagram (see diagram points 3.1 and 4.1) and there is no good reason why this couldn't be applied with the 'construction' element as well?	Suggestions noted	Although we cannot change the diagram, add reference to low—carbon construction materials within our own text	A1	yes
145	GCC	Paragraph 3.2.5	Officers of the MWPA welcome the reference to the local policy framework for waste – The Waste Core Strategy, the proposed adoption of the principles of the waste hierarchy and support for waste minimisation and promotion of construction and demolition waste recovery. However, as highlighted in representations made to other parts of the emerging SPD there is an ideal opportunity to seek more than the conventional policy basics. The issue of waste and its future management is evolving rapidly. The UK Government is already commencing the process of moving the policy landscape forward through publications such as the Resources and Waste Strategy for England.	noted	No change	N/A	n/a
146	GCC	Paragraph 3.2.5	To ensure the SPD is future-proofed and fit-for-purpose to drive forward innovative development over the coming decade and beyond it is strongly encouraged that the attention of the supporting text under paragraph 3.2.5 is greatly shifted towards waste 'reduction' and efficiency use of resources rather than good waste 'management'. Suggested commitments could	Waste reduction not just management	Add reference to waste reduction not just management – review text as per suggestions	A1	As above

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			include: - embedding the principles of the circular economy throughout all aspects of the development and prioritising clean growth initiatives. Furthermore, whilst early engagement with local (district) authority waste services will always be supported by officers of the MWPA to ensure that deliverable solutions are put in place, it must be noted this is somewhat limited and potentially a little ‘out of scope’ as an engagement option for a strategic, mixed-use scheme. Local (district) authority waste services are mostly concerned with their statutory responsibilities to collect municipal waste streams. Involvement with commercial and industrial wastes is either minimal or non-existent depending upon whether the local (district) authority waste service chooses (and is able) to engage in the open market. In addition, whilst the waste management sector is a noteworthy contributor to the achievement of waste minimisation – it is by no means the only stakeholder group or responsible party. To truly achieve sustainable waste minimisation solutions a much broader conversation / debate will be necessary. Developer, scheme promoters, producers and users must be involved not just those dealing with ‘end-of-life’ materials. It is advised that the sentence is revised to reflect this circumstance. A possible re-working of the sentence could read as follows: - ‘Developers and scheme promoters are strongly encouraged to engage early and meaningfully with Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils waste service UBICO and / or other waste operators that may provide commercial waste management solutions, to ensure the deliverability of efficient, effective and high quality waste and recycling collection services. This should form part of a holistic approach to development and the future use of land, which demonstrably embeds the principles of the circular economy, will contribute towards delivering clean growth and the eradication of avoidable wastes wherever possible.’				
147	GCC	Smart City principles:	Officers of the MWPA support the intended employment of ‘Smart City’ principles across the strategic development locality covered by the SPD. Committing to digital technology in this way will undoubtedly help drive the implementation of the transition to the circular economy through a combination of increased virtualisation, de-materialisation, expanded knowledge and greater transparency on product and materials flows. The reference to its application to waste management practice is also welcomed. However, the supporting text still presents quite a conventional view as to how smart approaches could be employed. The text would be a greatly improved if it incorporated potentially supportable opportunities for implementing change rather than explaining about measures to achieve good data and / or governance. For example; the introduction of asset tagging with waste will facilitate this material application to new digital sharing platforms that connect producers of ‘end-of-(current) life’ materials with potential new users. It is these types of functions / activities / initiatives that should be actively promoted as part of the ‘ask’ of new occupants who themselves will be benefitting as stakeholders in the wider Garden Community development.	More ambitious in relation to waste and smart city principles	Add more ambitious references such as...the introduction of asset tagging with waste will facilitate this material application to new digital sharing platforms that connect producers of ‘end-of-(current) life’ materials with potential new users where resources allow.	A1	yes
148	GCC	Paragraph 3.2.6	Officers of the MWPA support the reference to promoting the shift towards a circular economy for new development across development covered by the SPD. However, the paragraph would be greatly enhanced and more likely to secure the desired outcome, if it better articulated the ‘ask’ of scheme promoters, developers and future occupants of the Garden Community. A possible re-working of the paragraph reads as follows: - ‘The principles of the circular economy should be embedded in all new development at both the individual site and community-scales. Evidence of how high levels of resource	Greater emphasis required on specifics of the circular economy	review text as per suggestions – needs summarising	Paragraph 3.2.6	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			efficiency, waste avoidance and low-carbon solutions will be secured must be provided, particularly in respect of its consideration at the concept and design stage. The effective implementation of agreed approaches must be evidenced and successfully delivered during construction and / or future refurbishment and re-development. Furthermore, the carrying out of ongoing and sustainable resource efficient practices that include support for the sharing economy; where appropriate, industrial symbiosis; and will aid the delivery of effective high quality waste and recycling services throughout the lifetime of development, are also a universal expectation.'				
149	GCC	Paragraph 3.2.12	Officers of the MWPA support the reference to 'building flexibility' as a means of avoiding the need for significant demolition and re-development of sites within the Garden Community as it evolves overtime. The requirement for developers to demonstrate design flexibility, conversion capability and adaptation is also strongly supported.	Supportive	Noted	N/A	n/a
150	GCC	Paragraph 8.1.2	Officers of the MWPA support the requirements set out in the paragraph concerning the existing treatment works. It is vitally important that critical waste infrastructure such as Hayden Works is secured until such time it is no longer required. However, it is also important that any neighbouring and nearby development, including that envisaged by the SPD is fully reflective of the operational needs of Hayden Works, whilst it is still active. Officers of the MWPA point to the specific requirements in this regard that are clearly set out in national policy – NPPF (2019) paragraph 182 and NPPW (2014) paragraph 8.	Concern about site whilst Hayden works still active	Review text to ensure appropriate emphasis	8.1	yes
151	Northern Trust	Principles of SPD	<p>"Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted local plan. As they do not form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan. They are however a material consideration in decision-making. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD should correspond to JCS policies SA1 (Strategic Allocations Policy) and A7 West Cheltenham. However, these policies are only briefly referred to in Introduction. The SPD introduces new requirements that go beyond the JCS policy requirements such as sustainability. The SPD has not been viability tested and therefore the 'financial burdens' have not been considered. The SPD is 84 pages, plus technical appendices, it is very repetitious and overly prescriptive. The SPD should be more concise and flexible and set an overarching framework for development proposals rather than a rule book approach. No other JCS Strategic Allocation has an SPD in preparation. Therefore, the bar is being set higher for West Cheltenham which isn't equitable. 	Concern about the uplift in numbers and SPD introducing new requirements	<p>Include a 'status' statement that clarifies. See comment 15. The SPD is not introducing new policies but providing further interpretation of development plan policies and national planning framework/policies.</p> <p>Difference in approach to SPD is directly linked to successful bid to garden Communities, to which Severn Trent Water supported. It should be noted that an output of Garden Communities is the transfer of best practice to other sites. Learning from West Cheltenham will be taken into future JCS allocation policies that will raise the bar for development across the JCS area.</p>	<p>Updated vision</p> <p>Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers</p> <p>All Figs updated</p>	Yes
152	Northern Trust	Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is welcome that a vision for the cyber business park has been devised as previously it was unclear what was meant by a cyber business park. However, some of the objectives for cyber central are confusing and potentially conflicting such as introducing residential uses within the cyber park. Some of the objectives should be applied to the Cyber Park only and not the residential part such as carbon neutral objective which is unviable for residential element. 	<p>Supportive of clear vision for cyber park</p> <p>Concern about residential within cyber park</p> <p>Concern that carbon neutral not achievable for residential</p>	Disagree. Garden Communities principles are relevant across the whole site. The SPD has specifically raised the ambition for delivery; this will be tested at the Development Management stage.	N/A	n/a
153	Northern Trust	Sustainability/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning policy approach for sustainability is not justified. 	Concern about additional detail of	The award of Garden Community status wasn't	Introductio	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
		zero carbon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JCS policy SD3: sustainable design and construction seeks high-level objectives such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to the aims of sustainability; Be adaptable to climate changes, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate waste minimisation; Major planning applications to submit an Energy Statement; JCS Authorities need to prepare a separate SPD to explain how policy SD3 will be implemented, which would be applicable to all major developments not just West Cheltenham allocation. 	sustainability guidance	<p>present at the adoption of the JCS; however, this was awarded subsequently and is therefore a material consideration for the SPD. JCS policy SA1 requires comprehensive schemes to deliver sustainable communities, meet local green space, protection and enhancement of natural resources and deliver transport requirements. It is important that the JCS is read as a whole.</p> <p>Since adoption of the JCS both CBC/TBC have declared climate change emergencies and this is in line with direction of government thinking.</p> <p>Look at introduction and conclusions to draw this out further</p>	n and conclusion	
154	Northern Trust	Quantum of development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD refers to 3,000 new homes and 50ha of employment. Allocation A7 seeks 1,100 new homes and 45ha of employment. Our masterplan proposes 1,200 new homes and 45ha. Density expectations up to 80 dwellings per hectare seem unrealistic page 29 states: “Densities in the west of the site are expected to go above ‘conventional’ housing densities that might otherwise be built on a rural edge in light of the potential future reserve land (HSTW)” The density levels assume the development of the safeguarded land (Hayden works) and ignore the existing odour zone limitation. 	Concern about the uplift in numbers and SPD introducing new requirements	<p>See comment 15</p> <p>The density levels do not ignore the existing odour zone limitation.</p>	<p>Updated vision</p> <p>Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers</p> <p>All Figs updated</p>	Yes
155	Northern Trust	Place making Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High level masterplans throughout SPD provide guidance about themes such as landscape and movement and is largely compatible with preparatory work that has been undertaken for our own masterplan. However, the SPD doesn’t need the prescriptive character areas provided in page 48-75 which provides excessive detail and includes irrelevant examples. It should be for the applicants to devise the character areas for the development. Section 1.1.11 states that the SPD ‘presents a broad and flexible masterplan framework’ but given the level of detail and prescriptive detail the document is not broad and flexible. 	Concern about level of design guidance provided	<p>No change – this guidance is provided to encourage high quality development and is not intended to be prescriptive.</p> <p>Plans are illustrative hand sketches to help communicate the intended character, and precedents are used to illustrate the intended design quality</p>	Character areas	n/a
156	Northern Trust	Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure requirements are unclear, not quantified or qualified. Reference is made to two primary schools – Policy A7 does not include reference to a primary schools Reference is made to ‘community infrastructure’ what is meant by this term? Transport infrastructure – buses, cycle and pedestrian links, links to the railway station, E cars and E cycles are all significant contributions. Page 85 makes reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan but onus is put on developer/landowners to prepare this 	Concern that infrastructure delivery plan is not prepared /lacks detail on infrastructure	The SPD has reviewed infrastructure at a strategic level, it is up to the Development Management process and the specific proposals brought forward through planning applications to detail. Any proposals for development will need to thoroughly assess their impact on infrastructure arising and the impact on existing. The SPD provides a steer in the context of the vision and objectives.	P85	n/a
157	Northern Trust	Deliverability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overriding concern that in its current form the SPD is not deliverable. 	Concern about the deliverability of the	Disagree. See all comments to detail raised by	n/a	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPG goes beyond the role of SPD defined by PPG. The sustainability objectives are too onerous and cannot be justified by policy and together with the other planning obligations would make the scheme unviable. Given the viability implications of the design and infrastructure requirements, it is likely to deter housebuilders when they can bid for unfettered sites such as NW Cheltenham. 	SPD introducing new requirements	<p>Northern Trust.</p> <p>Testing of deliverability will be assessed in detail at the development management stage. The SPD.</p> <p>Key factor for this site is the delivery of garden communities principles, which Severn Trent Water supported at the bid submission stage</p>		
158	Northern Trust	Transport Comments	We broadly agree with the movement principles, but the supporting text is too perspective. This text needs to allow greater flexibility;	Supportive but greater flexibility required	What is clear from the comments across the SPD from all respondents is there are different ends of the spectrum, some wanting more detail and other wanting less. As drafted the SPD has sought to navigate a course that provides enough guidance to drive the strategic masterplan. No proposed change to SPD.		n/a
159	Northern Trust	Public Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree that there is a strengthened case for improved public transport; however, the draft SPD is too prescriptive as to how this should be achieved; It is difficult to predict how the bus network will change in the future, and much of the control over specific routes is in the hands of the bus operator. Therefore key destinations and frequencies should be defined, but suggesting routes that could be improved/extended (such as in Principle D1) should be avoided; Whilst cleaner buses should be encouraged, this is a matter for the bus operator and not the development; It is agreed that bus access from the Springbank area should be promoted. A single bus access is considered sufficient. 	Concern about prescriptive bus plans. This is in the hands of the operator not the developer.	See Stagecoach comments – Further engagement has taken place with Stagecoach and SPD updated accordingly.	D1	yes
160	Northern Trust	Pedestrian and cycle connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree that pedestrian and cycle connections should be improved; however, the SPD is too prescriptive as to how this should be achieved The strategy for the development should be to integrate with and complement existing strategies (Connecting Cheltenham, Cheltenham Walking and Cycling Strategies) which already set out measures for some of the improvements mentioned in the draft SPD (route to Cheltenham Spa Station for example); Principle D2 sets out where opportunities exist to provide local improvements. These should not be defined as part of the SPD. Flexibility needs to be retained; The SPD should not explicitly define where segregated cycle paths should be and their dimensions. For example, stating that at a 3m wide footway should be provided alongside the main street is restrictive to a potentially better solution that may come forward as the Masterplan evolves. Flexibility should be retained. 	Concern about the detailed requirements of the SPD	<p>Comment as above. Add wording to clarify the status of the SPD.</p> <p>Current proposed wording reflects current good practice.</p>	D2	Yes
161	Northern Trust	Vehicle Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD should stop short of defining exactly what type of access junction should be proposed (e.g. roundabout or signal junction). It currently does not explicitly define the type of junction, but does imply preference. Flexibility should be retained to ensure an appropriate access design comes forward that considers all of the constraints; It is our view and GCC's position that vehicle access to Hester's Way and Springbank should not be provided. Instead multiple walking and cycling connections should be provided, as well as a bus access to encourage public transport movement. There are a number of contradictory statements in the draft SPD in 	<p>Concern about the detail – specific about types of junctions.</p> <p>Raises concerns about contradictions in SPD</p>	<p>Comment as above. Add wording to clarify the status of the SPD.</p> <p>Review contradictions highlighted in text. No intention for additional vehicular connections with local roads of Springbank or Hester's Way</p>	D5	Yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			relation to vehicle access to Hester’s Way and Springbank. In places, the draft SPD states that the impact of traffic on local roads is a concern, and that rat-running should be prevented, at the same time as stating that vehicle connections could be provided to Hester’s Way and Springbank, which is likely to encourage rat-running. If people are minded to use their private vehicles, access is still possible via the main access junctions. These will be less direct than the walking and cycling connections, so as to not encourage short car journeys.				
162	Northern Trust	Main Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We broadly agree with the current wording to describe the main street; We consider that the text should not define dimensions for vehicles, walking and cycling routes to retain flexibility for the design. However, we agree that walking and cycling should be encouraged through the design. 	Concern about specific dimensions	Comment as above. Add wording to clarify the status of the SPD	D4	Yes
163	Northern Trust	Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst we agree that a flexible approach should be considered, parking needs to be sensitively considered due to strong local opinion in the local area following the effects of GCHQ employees on local parking conditions; Typically, it is up to the local highway authority to set parking standards, which developments need to comply with. From a commercial perspective, all developments should have a level playing field in this regard. If the West Cheltenham development has stricter parking standards compared to other developments in Cheltenham, it may be less attractive to potential occupiers; There is a need to provide a balance between commercial requirements, the need to not underprovide and shift parking issues to the surrounding area, and not overprovide to make car travel the most convenient mode; Controlled parking zones would need to be implemented by the local authority and not the development. 	Flagging sensitivities over parking	Noted – no change	D7	n/a
164	Northern Trust	Transport and Access Technical Note (Appendix)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4 of the technical note sets out a summary of TPA work on West Cheltenham and Hydrock Comments. This has been prepared following a single hour long meeting between TPA and Hydrock. Hydrock has not reviewed any of our technical documents. Some of the text set out in the Hydrock note is not wholly reflective of the work undertaken and in places incorrect. We do not think this should be attached to the SPD as it currently stands. 	Concern about inaccuracies in transport appendix	Hydrock technical note (included as an Appendix) to be updated to state that the chapter is Hydrock’s interpretation of the TPA work that it reflects a moment in time and is therefore subject to change No changes to SPD, but change to appendix	P134 of 152 in appendix	yes
165	Northern Trust	Design Comments- Masterplan Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft West Cheltenham Masterplan has been developed over a number of years following the instruction of Turley Design in 2017. The masterplan has been informed by a comprehensive technical appraisal of the site with inputs from numerous technical consultants, engagement with key stakeholders and the public, and close collaboration with Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) and their internal Urban Design, Highways and wider internal technical teams. The draft masterplan has been informed by a number of inputs, namely the policy allocation as set out within the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) as well as the brief from the client to deliver a viable, deliverable and sustainable development in line with current policy. The key elements of these briefs are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mixed-use development inclusive of up to 1,100 residential units (JCS Policy) 	Context of masterplan	Noted, however the Garden Communities status wasn’t factored into previous assessment and masterplanning by Turley Design. This is a step change that was a fundamental part of the SPD brief We continue to welcome the close collaboration.n/a	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A mixed-use development inclusive of up to a 45 Ha cyber park and the creation of circa 7,000 jobs (JCS Policy) ○ A development with a viable, deliverable and sustainable development mix in relation to residential, employment, retail and ancillary uses (client brief) 				
166	Northern Trust	Design Comments- Masterplan Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the draft masterplan is yet to be finalised, it is felt the masterplan as it currently stands represents a design solution which meets the above brief as well as meeting the long-term aspirations of the local authority, local community and the client team. • Having reviewed the CCGC SPD and appraised this alongside the knowledge which has been gained during the course of our instruction, it is felt that with regard to issues relating to design and masterplanning, the SPD demonstrates a lack of understanding or has been informed on an insufficient evidence base with regard to the following key areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vision and project brief ○ Deliverable and viable development mix and density ○ Technical constraints and considerations. 	Concern about insufficient evidence base	Disagree. See comments above.	N/A	n/a
167	Northern Trust	Vision and project brief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CCGC SPD offers a valuable perspective with regard to providing a clear vision to what the development should be, namely the 45 Ha element of the development being referred to in the SPD as Cyber Central. Whilst the JCS allocation offers some indication of what should be included on the site, a clear vision and brief with regard to what was referred to in the policy as a “Cyber Park” was not forthcoming. 	A lack of clarity about ‘cyber park’ wording in policy	This is why the SPD is of value. The SPD sets out a clear vision and objectives for the context of a strategic masterplan. The level of guidance now available in the SPD wasn’t available at the time of adoption of the JCS nor did the site have Garden Community status.	N/A	n/a
168	Northern Trust	Vision and project brief	Taking into consideration the policy allocation, engagement with CBC officers and liaison with market specialists with background in cyber businesses and science park developments, a masterplan approach was adopted which sought to deliver a 45 Ha mixed-use Cyber Park with a focus on employment uses with ancillary community, leisure and some limited retail uses. These proposals envisaged the delivery of circa 210,000 sqm. of employment space (use class B1a, B1b, B1c and D1) which provided circa 7,000 jobs as required by the JCS.	Context of masterplan	Noted	N/A	n/a
169	Northern Trust	Vision and project brief	<p>The CCGC SPD offers a different vision for the Cyber Park, now referred to as Cyber Central.</p> <p>“Shops, cafes, bars, restaurants, community and other uses will be incorporated into buildings to serve employees and local residents to provide activity to streets and spaces. Other uses such as hotels will be incorporated into this part of Cyber Central, serving the business community and local residents. Residential uses will also be located within the immediate area. These new homes are likely to be a mix of flats and town houses”</p> <p>Page 59, CCGC SPD</p>	Context of masterplan	<p>See comment 167. The SPD provides greater clarity and guidance.</p> <p>Through the work on the testing of the vision of cyber central there is now greater clarity than at the time of drafting the JCS. This is appropriately incorporated into the SPD.</p>	N/A	n/a
170	Northern Trust	Vision and project brief	The above quote and other references within the SPD suggest a much greater mix of uses is envisaged within the 45 Ha Cyber Central than the draft masterplan originally envisaged. The inferred increase in the level of retail and leisure provision within the context of the provision of 7,000 jobs would also suggest the reduced number of jobs being provided within cyber-related uses unless it is envisaged that jobs provided by the additional uses are in addition to the proposed 7,000 included within in the JCS.	Noting the change in land use mix	See comments above.	N/A	n/s
171	Northern Trust	Technical	The West Cheltenham site is heavily constrained. Of the site area of	% of developable land	Noted	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed																																				
		constraints and considerations	approximately 132 Ha, the draft West Cheltenham Masterplan envisages approximately only 62 Ha or 48% of the site to be developable in its current form.		<p>These % stated in the rep are about representative of the developable areas shown in the framework masterplan once all of the constraints are taken into account. This is a framework masterplan and further testing of constraints may well allow a larger % of the site to be developed. Our calculations/areas as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>Developable area (allocated site)</td><td></td><td></td><td>65.73</td></tr><tr><td>Site area (Ha)</td><td></td><td></td><td>135.45</td></tr><tr><td>%</td><td></td><td></td><td>49%</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>Developable area (safeguarded site)</td><td></td><td></td><td>32.75</td></tr><tr><td>Site area (Ha)</td><td></td><td></td><td>65.62</td></tr><tr><td>%</td><td></td><td></td><td>50%</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>Developable area (all sites)</td><td></td><td></td><td>98.48</td></tr><tr><td>Site area (Ha)</td><td></td><td></td><td>201.07</td></tr><tr><td>%</td><td></td><td></td><td>49%</td></tr></table>	Developable area (allocated site)			65.73	Site area (Ha)			135.45	%			49%	Developable area (safeguarded site)			32.75	Site area (Ha)			65.62	%			50%	Developable area (all sites)			98.48	Site area (Ha)			201.07	%			49%		
Developable area (allocated site)			65.73																																								
Site area (Ha)			135.45																																								
%			49%																																								
Developable area (safeguarded site)			32.75																																								
Site area (Ha)			65.62																																								
%			50%																																								
Developable area (all sites)			98.48																																								
Site area (Ha)			201.07																																								
%			49%																																								
172	Northern Trust	Technical constraints and considerations	As well major spatial constraints including odour contours and overhead/underground utilities, there are a range of smaller constraints including TPO’s, Veteran Trees and PRow which need to remain in situ and will have a major impact on how the site is accessed and developed. Whilst the major constraints above have been identified in the CCGC SPD, the smaller constraints, inclusive of the Veteran Trees on the site do not appear to have been considered.	The veteran trees have not been identified on the site	Initial reviews suggest a workable solution which retains veteran trees should remain the aspiration. Detailed assessment will follow as part of the development management stage	Reference about retention at C1	yes																																				
173	Northern Trust	Technical constraints and considerations	Whilst appreciative of the need for the CCGC SPD to provide high level design principles to inform the forthcoming masterplan for the site, the SPD goes into an onerous level of detail in relation policies and guidance relating to points of design, character and appearance. However, these policies and guidance do not appear to be supported or endorsed by any technical testing against the sites key constraints and as such offer little indication in relation to how the policies can be implemented in accordance with the site constraints and local policy.	Concern about a lack of relationship between design detail and site constraints	Noted – no change. The constraints have been considered	N/A	n/a																																				
174	Northern Trust	Deliverable and viable development mix and density	Key to our clients brief is the production of a masterplan which to includes a deliverable and viable development mix inclusive of a suitable range and density of uses. The CCGC offers its own interpretation of the mix of uses and density to be promoted across the site.	Noting the change in land use mix	It is wholly appropriate for the SPD to set the context. Whilst it is acknowledged that earlier work has been done, key factors are now taken into account, including Climate Change emergency and Garden Community status.	N/A	n/a																																				
175	Northern Trust	Deliverable and viable development mix and density	The West Cheltenham site covers and approximate area of 132 Ha. Following the removal of the 45 Ha Cyber Central element of the West Cheltenham masterplan and other non-developable areas, the remaining residential component of the site represents a gross area of approximately 85 Ha and a net developable area of approximately 38 Ha once other site constraints are considered. This represents a development yield of 44.7%. In order to maximise the development yield, to achieve a policy compliant development of 1,100 residential units, a minimum net density of 28 dph is required. The current draft West Cheltenham Masterplan currently envisages a development yield of circa 1,200 units at a yield of 32 dph. This modestly exceeds the limits set by the JCS allocation but delivers a sustainable critical mass, density and coverage across the site.	Context of masterplan	<p>The JCS policy does not set a maximum housing allocation, it is therefore appropriate for the SPD and subsequent processes through Development Management to test the most efficient use of land.. No change to SPD. See previous comments made in response to increase in densities.</p> <p>New appendix added to clearly set out methodology adopted in testing housing number</p>	New appendix	Yes																																				
176	Northern Trust	Deliverable and viable development	The CCGC envisages a range of densities be accommodated across the site. These densities range from 35-55 dph with the Old Gloucester Road Neighbourhood up to 60-80+ dph in the Cyber Central Neighbourhood. At the	Concern about the uplift in numbers and SPD introducing new requirements	<p>See comment 15 and 176</p> <p>Add wording to clarify the status of the SPD</p>	Updated vision	Yes																																				

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
		mix and density	lowest density proposed of 35 dph within the Old Gloucester Road Neighbourhood , providing coverage on the entire developable area would result in a development of 1,330 units – 230 in excess of the JCS allocation – or represent coverage of only 31.4 Ha (83% yield) if development is to be limited to the 1,100 JCS allocation. This figures increase significantly with the higher densities proposed in other neighbourhoods with yields increasing between 2,000-3,000 residential units if densities are to be applied across the West Cheltenham Site or reduces site coverage to between 54% -36% of the site if the original 1,100 JCS allocation is to be retained. A full breakdown of the calculations are attached below.	Still sees housing and employment as two completely discrete things		Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers All Figs updated	
177	Northern Trust	Deliverable and viable development mix and density	The above approach demonstrates the lack of co-ordination that has been implemented when considering proposed densities in relation to the upper development limits as stated within the JCS. If the densities included within the CCGC are to be implemented across the site with a suitable coverage, then an increase of the 1,100 limit included within the JCS will be required. If the 1,100 limit included within the JCS will be retained, it is unlikely the proposed densities within the CCGC will be achievable without having a significant impact on site coverage, critical mass and deliverability.	Concern about the uplift in numbers and SPD introducing new requirements	See comment 15 and 176. Add wording to clarify the status of the SPD	Updated vision Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers All Figs updated	Yes
178	Northern Trust	Deliverable and viable development mix and density	In general, whilst the high level design principles and vision included within CCGC SPD are welcome and offer a framework on which to base a future masterplan, many of the detail design and masterplanning principles appear to be unduly onerous and untested against the policy and spatial constraints which influence the development of the site.	SPD introducing new requirements	See comment 15 and 176. Add wording to clarify the status of the SPD	Updated vision Chap 1 updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers All Figs updated	Yes
179	Western Power	General comment	Summary of key constraints in the report would be helpful/ section on constraints	Suggestion for constraints summary	Please see appendix for summary of constraints	appendix	n/a
180	Western Power	General comment	Land beneath power lines can potentially be used for some development such as car parking, employment land (service yards etc) and roads	Land under powerlines can be used	see note about land under powerlines	P71 sketch plan	n/a
181	Western Power	General comment	SPD should state that power lines are to be retained in existing location (if a flexible use is instead considered under these power lines the SPD should	Clarify position regarding power lines	Following further assessment, this statement is not supported. There is an ambition, if viable to	See Appendix.	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			reflect uses that are considered acceptable such as car parks, drainage)		ground the power lines. SPD to be updated to reflect this See Appendix. Add to fig 17 and para 5.1.3	Page 31, para 5.1.3 Fig 17 C3	
182	Western Power	General comment	Clearance distance (15m either side of the centre line) should be noted in the SPD	Add note on clearance distance	Add note on clearance distance	C3	yes
183	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	Concerned about severance through the site caused by the spine road	Severance caused by main street	See similar comments such as comments 54 & 58	D4	Yes
184	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	A40 £22m upgrade starting in March - not referenced in the SPD. Needs to be referenced in the SPD	Add reference to A40 upgrade	Add reference to A40 upgrade	P6	Yes
185	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	GCC may have a desire to see a north-south link. Cyber team doesn't want this.. would like to see a complete 'break' within the site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus gate through the middle is an option Micro hub(s) for sustainable travel 	Severance caused by main street	See comment 183 above	Add ref	Yes
186	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	Transport comments on the consultation arriving <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCHQ parking a known concern 	GCHQ parking issue	noted	N/A	n/a
187	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	Page 70 'likely to be a busy road for traffic' is not the 'vision'	'busy' road	Noted – review wording	P70	n/a
188	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	LTP will be coming forward for consultation... 14th February – 26th March 2020	noted	noted	N/A	n/a
189	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	Park & Ride (existing and proposed) needs to be referenced in the SPD and shown on the masterplan framework diagram	Add park and ride	Add park and ride to figure 35 – bus plan	Fig 35	Yes
190	Cyber Central Team	Main Street	Have access points north and south then get people out of the car	Concern about accessible route through	See comment 183	P6	Yes
191	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Flexibility essential	noted	Noted – no change	N/A	n/a
192	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Phasing program required, with the odour treatment works taken into account	Phasing required	See figure 58 – Hayden Works phasing	N/A	n/a
193	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Captive audience – Cyber Hub is not seen as a rival for the High Street	Local centre	Already removed references to Local Centre in view of this concern No further change	N/A	n/a
194	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Loss of through traffic/passing-trade should be considered commercially. Developers/retailers will be mindful of this	Concern about accessible route through	Lack of through route should help with this concern See comment 183	D4	yes
195	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Roundabout to the north reticently OK for SPD team, but absolutely not for Telstar Way. Consultant SPD team don't think this will provide the integration, all-mode connectively or place making quality required for Cyber Central's long term success	Junctions design	Noted – no change. Detailed junction design will be a key part of development management stage	N/A	n/a
196	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Meeting with strategic officers within GCC/HE with an SPD focus would be helpful. Strategic policy suggest the high-level thinking is consistent, but that DM level may not be applying this	DM application	Engagement happening and will inform Development management stages	N/A	n/a
197	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Page 3 shared space - remove reference	No reference to shared space here	Edit caption	Fig30	yes
198	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Sustainability - aspiration is for carbon positive, and energy generation	Sustainability	Review part A to ensure this aspiration is included	Part A	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
199	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Masterplan Objective F - deprivation/inclusion/regeneration	Is this comment suggesting a new objective?	See comment 45 make reference to economic inclusion	P48	Yes
200	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Protection of PROWs	PROWs	Review reference to PROW in part C	Part C	yes
201	Cyber Central Team	General comment	Education needs emphasis/reinforcement - further education not mentioned	Add education ref	Review and strengthen reference to further education . See #48	Vision (2.1) and part B	Yes
202	Cyber Central Team	General comment	CBC going to MIPIM to promote Cyber Park	noted	No longer relevant MIPIM cancelled	N/A	n/a
203	Public comment	Self Build	Headline support for self-build in Principle B3 is not supported sufficiently in the document, and we are concerned that the document's other priorities (e.g. for relatively high density development) will lead to an opportunity being missed to create a high quality, sustainably self-build neighbourhood in line with the document's support for 'a number of attractive, beautifully landscaped neighbourhoods, each with their own character' (p24).... We therefore request that officers consider adding wording under Principle B3 to support the concept of a small self-build community as one of the envisaged neighbourhoods, and that local self-build groups be invited to support the developing Planning and Delivery Strategy. Note that the document also omits "detached homes" from the neighbourhoods which is incompatible with self build (page 50 section 7.2.4)	Support for stronger wording on self-build	Review wording as suggested and add caveat about detached homes being permissible within a self-build context	B3	yes
204	Public comment	D7 Vehicle and Green Transport.	<p>Page 47 claims "attitudes towards car ownership are changing" and goes on to say that younger people are not buying cars. We can't see any reference for the data to draw this conclusion. In fact DVLA data shows that private car ownership remains largely unchanged as does the number of new people passing driving licenses (the data is available from the DVLA)</p> <p>Based on the DVLA data there needs to be serious reconsideration for provision for car ownership.</p> <p>In addition, most people buying new houses have a family. Without the provision of local primary schooling (it is only a consideration) then it is to be expected that private car ownership will be necessary if there is no delivery of primary schooling</p>	<p>Concern about car ownership and lack of evidence for modal shift</p> <p>Support for a primary school to reduce car journeys</p>	Noted	N/A	n/a
205	Public comment	D7 Vehicle and Green Transport.	Further, as a cyber technology hub, the basic starting salary for most in this field is around the national average wage, raising into six figures. If the borough council wishes to attract and retain those people within the garden village then (a) greater provision for premium housing is needed and (b) and acceptance that high earners will purchase a vehicle.	Support for housing to encourage tech people to live and work	noted	N/A	n/a
206	Public comment	D7 Vehicle and Green Transport.	Finally, encouraging use of green transport is essential but only works when the transport is ubiquitous like London. Re-routing a few buses is not going to meet the needs of a highly paid workforce. The SPD needs to make significantly greater provision for green transport and increase surface parking (but perhaps limit this to electric vehicles).	Support for green transport	Noted – see narrative in part D	Part D	n/a
207	Public comment	Vision for Cyber Central	Disagree - Element missing- wildlife/ dentist/doctor provision	Vision	Review references to wildlife in part C and add references to specific community provision in part B	Part C and B	As above
208	Public comment	Masterplan Strategies	Suggested ranking- (1) Landscape Quality, (2) Design Quality (3) Access and Movement (4) Sustainability (5) Land Use. Further comment- Wildlife is missing from this.	Suggested re-ordering of objectives	Comments noted, but objective is not to rank	N/A	n/a
209	Public comment	Sustainability Objective	Disagree - Note questioning where electric charging for cars will be provided	Electric vehicle charging	See D7 reference to electric charging	Part D	n/a
210	Public comment	Land Use objective	Disagree - Would prefer for building to take place elsewhere on a brownfield site	Brownfield land preferred to this site	Noted – no change	N/A	n/a


Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
211	Public comment	Landscape Principle	Disagree - More green space and more nature reserves should be provided	Support for landscape and nature reserves	Please see section C. Noted no change	N/A	n/a
212	Public comment	Movement objective	Disagree - More parking needed, parking around GCHQ is dangerous	Support for more car parking	Noted	N/A	n/a
2	Public comment	Vision for places in Cyber Central	Disagree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
213	Public comment	Location of Cyber Focus	Agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
214	Public comment	Priority to cyclist/pedestrians on main route	Agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
215	Public comment	Northern Areas for housing	Strongly disagree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
216	Public comment	Integrated with existing communities	Neutral	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
217	Public comment	Hayden Works relocation to meet housing needs	Comment- Houses need to be affordable	Noted	Noted – see Part B3	N/A	n/a
218	Public comment	Placemaking	Homes should be for first time buyers	Noted	Noted – see Part B3	N/A	n/a
219	Public comment	Overall masterplan	Neutral	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
220	Public comment	Other Comments	Housing should be for local 1 st time buyers only/ 3 storey homes need to be built away from existing dwellings/ lights need to be off between 12am and 6am	Noted	Noted – see Part B3	N/A	n/a
221	Public comment	Vision for Cyber Central	Strongly agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
222	Public comment	Masterplan Strategies	1) Sustainability (2) Access and Movement (3) Landscape Quality (4) Design Quality and Placemaking (5) Land Use	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
223	Public comment	Sustainability Objective	Strongly agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
224	Public comment	Land Use objective	Strongly agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
225	Public comment	Landscape Principle	Strongly agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
226	Public comment	Movement objective	Agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
227	Public comment	Vision for places in Cyber Central	Agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
228	Public comment	Location of Cyber Focus	Don't know	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
229	Public comment	Priority to cyclist/pedestrians on main route	Don't know	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
230	Public comment	Northern Areas for housing	Strongly agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
231	Public comment	Integrated with existing communities	Strongly agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
232	Public comment	Hayden Works relocation to meet housing needs	No comments	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
233	Public comment	Placemaking	No comments	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
234	Public comment	Overall masterplan	Agree	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
235	Public comment	Other Comments	No comments	Noted	Noted	N/A	n/a
236	Public comment	The Hayden Hill Community (HHC) on Old Gloucester Road	From the report it appears that relocating the sewage works would be a complex and expensive operation and is certainly not guaranteed. Odour from the existing sewage works is very strong and pungent and the development would be significantly affected by odours. We know how unpleasant this is because we live near to it, but much further away than the proposed new houses which are within the odour zone. The odour pervades the air in our community on a regular basis. As a result, this should prevent the development in this area unless the sewage plant is definitely relocating.	Concern re odour	Strengthen references in Hayden chapter	Chr 8	yes
237	Hayden Hill Community	The current site - Sewage works	From the Appendix, Figure 3 illustrates the Odour area affecting the proposed new development. We have superimposed this odour zone onto the proposed development. Those affected residential and commercial properties should not be built until it is established that the sewage plant will relocate. Also, it would be very negative for the site as people do not want to live next to a sewage works. It is critical that an onsite odour assessment is carried out because the reality of what we currently experience does not correspond to the theoretical odour report. With reference to the proposed relocation of the sewage works - where is the intended site for the new facility? Is it within the local surrounding area? (see figure in full response)	Concern re odour	Strengthen references in Hayden chapter	Ch 8	As above
238	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Landscape	The proposal states that the planning and design of the site takes account of the topography with a 'landscape first' approach. It states that long views to the Cotswolds AONB and Hayden Hill need to be carefully considered during the design of the location, layout of open spaces and built development. Figure 4 shows the contours and location of the top of Hayden Hill. This area is the most prominent and visible so should only contain low level buildings, a road or ideally green areas.	Concern re building heights given topography and views	Noted – review text at E1 to reference topography and views	E1	yes
239	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Landscape	Why is housing and even high-density mixed-use buildings to be built on the top of a hill where it will be very visible from the south and west of the site for many miles, surely there would a less detrimental impact on the landscape if it were positioned on flatter ground?	Concern re building heights given topography and views	Noted – review text at E1 to reference topography and views	E1	yes
240	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Landscape	Furthermore, why are the housing densities expected to be higher in the west of the site where it borders a rural edge against low-density housing? The visual impact of the new housing on the landscape will look greater here, than if it blended in with adjacent high-density housing areas. The development will certainly not integrate positively with the existing landscape and therefore a contravention of the stated objective in your plan (section 5.2).	Concerns about housing density on the rural edge	Noted – but densities remain consistent across the proposed site. Visual impact testing will be required at planning application stage. The approach is considered appropriate – see C2. No change	N/A	n/a
241	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Landscape	The proposal states that the planning and design of the site takes account of the topography with a 'landscape first' approach. It states that long views to	Concern about responding to topography and building heights	The plan flags these issues and things to be considered at more detailed design. The drawn	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			the Cotswolds AONB and Hayden Hill need to be carefully considered during the design of the location, layout of open spaces and built development. Figure 4 shows the contours and location of the top of Hayden Hill. This area is the most prominent and visible so should only contain low level buildings, a road or ideally green areas.		proposals are not detailed design – but represent an illustrative framework. No change.		
242	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Trees and Hedges	The plan recognises that the new development must respond positively along the edges where the masterplan area interfaces with existing homes with a need for particularly high-quality architecture and landscape provision. It also states that the network of hawthorn hedges and hedgerow trees around the site give the impression of a well treed landscape and provide good visual containment and screen views to some areas. However, the hedgerow that borders the Old Gloucester Road does not provide an adequate screen of the new housing. It is patchy and deciduous in nature and ineffective as a screen in the Autumn and Winter months.	Concern about visual screening along Old Gloucester Road	This makes the assumption that we should try and hide and screen all development – this is a position that we do not share. The existing hedgerows are an important ecological asset and should be retained where possible. Detailed landscape proposals will forward with detailed design proposals. But we can strengthen wording to highlight the impact new development will have on existing dwellings along OGR. Add a number to Fig 17 and list text in the grey box of pg 30 about the positive role landscape in new development.	GI Strategy plan	yes
243	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Trees and Hedges	Figure 6 illustrates that the buffer zone along the perimeter of the Old Gloucester Road neighbourhood is far too narrow, especially compared to other buffer zones separating other existing communities. Please ensure that a more effective green border is planted or a suitable wall erected and an enlarged green buffer zone included along this boundary.	Boundary treatment	See comment 242	GI Strategy plan	Yes
244	Hayden Hill Community	Current Site-Trees and Hedges	We (and probably all of HHC) want there to be sympathetic green landscaping that retains some character of a rural landscape – we do not want to overlook or be overlooked by housing development that looms above any green border. Will the Management Company engaged by the new development be responsible for the maintenance of the vegetation borders along the Old Gloucester Road?	Concern about landscape management	An open space management strategy will be required and will dictate the terms of landscape management measures. Re OGR hedges, responsibility will depend on ownership. No change	N/A	n/a
245	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure	Figure 7 indicates the utilities that we hope to benefit from with the improved infrastructure and also shows our current connection points. The report states that services around the access roads will be affected, namely LV cables, a water main, Openreach cables and fibre ducts for Gigaclear. Please can this work be kept to a minimum with as little disruption as possible.	Concerns about disruption during construction	A construction management plan is likely to be a condition of any planning permission No change	N/A	n/a
246	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure-Gas	We assume that natural mains gas will be the main energy source for the development. We contacted the commercial planning department at Wales and West Utilities who will supply Gas to this site. They told us that given the position of their gas substation, a new gas line will most likely be installed along the northern perimeter of the site along the Old Gloucester Road to service the development. When designing these gas services please ensure that connections to the HHC are included in order for our community to benefit from this infrastructure and to reduce the amount of heating oil used that is a greater pollutant of the atmosphere.	Gas infrastructure	Incorrect assumption that natural mains gas will be the main energy source. SPD has clearly set the ambition to consider innovative and sustainable energy strategy.	N/A	n/a
247	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure-Electricity	Our property suffered from low voltage for many years so a new substation was installed into the Grid and named the Coach House Hayden Hill distribution substation ref: 78/0162 as seen on page 6 of the Hydrock report (their figure 3.2). Its location is indicated on figure 7 above. In the report it also states that there are a number of existing pole mounted substations that will require relocating. Is ours one of them and where will it be relocated to? Smart City Principles and creating an on-site smart grid is an objective. The	Green energy and benefits to the wider community	Noted. The SPD sets high level principles in this regard. Details associated with energy and infrastructure issues will only be able to be considered when detailed proposals come forward No change	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			report stated that introducing measures for the on-site electricity generation will help to reduce energy costs for existing residents in adjacent neighbourhoods. Please explain how the HHC can benefit from the application of these new technologies? If wind turbines are installed, they will be visually obtrusive given the far-reaching views across the site but we fully support all other forms of green energy.				
248	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure- Water	We are concerned that the draw of over 3000 houses on the current supply could reduce the water pressure within the area. Our current heating and hot water are mains pressure so any reduction could adversely affect us. Please ensure that this does not happen.	Concern about water pressure	Water supply and capacity will certainly need to be considered as detailed schemes come forward. No change needed	N/A	n/a
249	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure- Phones and Internet	The report states that Cyber Central will have access to the best digital infrastructure available to support the development and it is perfectly located to take advantage of the UK's high capacity fibre network thus providing completely secure, ultra-high speed and unlimited fibre connectivity. Also, the digital infrastructure will be future-proofed. The report also states that it is anticipated that a new Openreach network will be established from the existing buried infrastructure that surrounds the site. However, the existing infrastructure is far from ideal. Our phone lines are based on very old decaying copper lines from the substation at Coombe Hill. We are at the maximum possible distance from the exchange i.e. 5km, so it is not viable to extend these copper lines further across the site because the cables would be too far from the exchange. Some properties near us have even given up their phone line due to unreliability issues. Others use fibre broadband through a very financially uncompetitive and poor system recently installed by GigaClear (for Fastershire), but this excludes phone calls. Consequently, the majority of properties still use the bad quality unreliable BT / Openreach network.	Telecoms connections	Noted	N/A	n/a
250	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure- Phones and Internet	there is no Openreach fibre and the existing infrastructure of buried apparatus and associated chambers running in the nearside verge of Old Gloucester Road is in a terrible state of repair. The cables have been chewed by rats and there is a permanent fault on most of the lines. We estimate that for 4 weeks every year our line is so bad we lose internet and have difficulty making phone calls. The issue was brought to the attention of Openreach in the form of several complaints and despite the backing of the Ombudsman and local MPs, nothing happens. All the local BT Openreach engineers who visit the site state that the cable needs to be replaced as it is too old and damaged. Therefore, the existing infrastructure is not suitable to bring the desired level of services required for a state-of-the-art cyber site. Our internet speed is only about 1MB! We believe that a new Openreach fibre cable would need to be laid from the exchange. Please ensure that the HHC also has access to the improved phone and internet infrastructure that will be provided for the new development. In addition, it will be necessary to divert the existing phone lines underneath new roads as the existing cables are not deep enough so please ensure that there is as little disruption to our service as possible. In the past we have been without any connection for 3 weeks when new lines were installed.	Telecoms issues	Noted We anticipate that new infrastructure will serve the new development. Improving the quality of connections to existing properties is beyond the scope of the SPD – but the Council is confident that the need for new infrastructure will benefit existing residents too. No change	N/A	n/a
251	Hayden Hill Community	Utilities and Infrastructure- Phones and Internet	The mobile phone coverage is very poor in this area (HHC). Are there plans to have mobile phone masts to serve the new site? This may help improve the service to the HHC.	Mobile phone	Noted. This is a mobile network issue	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
252	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	What measures will be taken to ensure that the residents of the HHC will not also be affected by the traffic noise from both increased traffic along the Old Gloucester Road and the proposed new link road passing through our community and very close to existing houses. Any planning permission granted should have the condition that a screening option be incorporated into its design and a formal Environmental Impact Assessment carried out.	Road noise	An EIA will be required which will consider these issues. No change required.	N/A	n/a
253	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access- Link Road	We are aware that Gloucestershire Highways has sought funding from central Government for the upgrade to M5 Jct 10 including a link road. The plans in the Appendices show the proposed route cutting through the HHC and also the new Cyber Central. We feel strongly that the link road should not cut through the centre of the Cyber Central which is a residential community, when it could be located to one side of the development. In the report and associated Appendices, there are several figures showing different locations of the link road joining the northern edge of the site. This is confusing. We are not sure if these are the actual plans submitted for the funding so please provide a detailed map showing the definitive route of this link road that will be used for the formal public planning process. Please also include details of what traffic volumes are expected on the link road and what methods will be used to mitigate any noise or air quality issues.	Alignment of road linking site to improved J10	No formal decision has been made on the alignment, however HIF bid successful as announced 11 th March 2020. The preferred alignment is not yet fixed. The technical appendix provides an overview relevant baseline work. The SPD takes a view on the current understanding of where the new road linking to an improved J10 would be – but the alignment of that new road is not an SPD issue.	N/A	n/a
254	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	This Cyber Central development is exciting because it is in effect a blank canvass on which to design a modern new community with state-of-the-art communications and environmental credentials. The report states that there will be a new Main Street between Telstar Way and Old Gloucester Road designed as a street for people, not a road for vehicles. Yet this Main Street is actually the proposed link road with a forecast of 2500 vehicle movements in the peak hours across the site. The purpose of a motorway link road is to take traffic as quickly and safely as possible between the GCHQ area and the Tewkesbury Road / M5 Jct 10. We feel that the best location would be to take this very busy link road along either the western or eastern boundary of the site and to create a separate Main Street designed solely for residents and visitors.	Concern about traffic impact of provision of a link road through the site	Concerns noted The SPD will be amended to make clear that the road will be designed and managed to provide local access only – not provide a link road through the site	Ch 6	yes
256	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	It is inappropriate for the fast link road to be the same as the Cyber Central Main Street for several reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in effect splitting the site into two halves, with people having to cross a busy main road to get from one side of the site to the other • It will spoil the dynamic of the site and community • It would be used by HGVs and these should not be encouraged to drive through a housing development • The purpose is for the traffic to flow along a link road from A to B as fast and safely as possible. If traffic calming measures are to be introduced to slow the traffic, at peak times this would cause congestion and clog up the flow of the residents getting around the site. New developments should have centres which are as environmentally friendly as possible, ideally pedestrianised or with just cycles. This is the future. It is going against all planning principles to make the centre high street into a dangerous busy link road • It will also be noisier for residents and businesses in the centre • There will be more air pollution for residents and businesses in the centre 		Careful thought has been given to the 'Main Street' and through variety of comments made to help clarify. The emphasis of the SPD is that this area is a place for people, so through the development management stage careful consideration will need to be given to delivering this through the careful design of highways.	Pg 70	yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision and artist impressions of a leafy central hub illustrated in the report won't be the reality. The photos 3 to 5 below show what the busy main road would likely look like. 				
257	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	 <p>Figure 8 illustrates two alternative locations for the link road rather than the Main street running through the centre.</p>	Alignment and purpose of new road through the site	See comment 254	Chp 6	Yes
258	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	The junction at the House-in-the-Tree Public House (B4634, Withybridge Lane and Hayden Lane) is an accident blackspot and also needs to be improved. If the link road ran along the western edge of the site it could exit at an improved road network junction here.	Traffic impact on existing junctions	A transport impact statement and EIA will be required to support any new development proposals – and through this, the impact on existing road network will be considered and mitigations measures where necessary proposed	N/A	n/a
259	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	What traffic modelling has taken place to quantify the impact of the proposed development in terms of increased vehicle journeys and also the impact on air quality and noise in the local area including around HHC. Interestingly, the Hydrock Due Diligence Report (2018) about the site suggests that the new residential plots near the Old Gloucester Road may need to be set back from the road to reduce the impact of road noise. Yet we can't move our houses	Traffic impact	Traffic modelling will be required to support new planning applications – so this work will be done in due course	N/A	n/an
260	Hayden Hill Community	Transport and Access	Noise, atmospheric pollution, congestion and safe access points are our main concerns. This new development will inevitably produce a significant increase in vehicle traffic on an already very busy relief road particularly at times of peak volumes. The residents of the HHC already find it difficult to pull out onto the busy road due to the volume of traffic, lack of street lighting and lack of visibility along the road. There have been several accidents already and a fatality. With the increase in traffic it will require a traffic light or other such junction to enable us to access the road safely from the layby in Hayden Hill.	Traffic impact	A transport impact statement and EIA will be required to support any new development proposals – and through this, the impact on existing road network will be considered and mitigations measures where necessary proposed	N/A	n/a
261	Hayden Hill Community	Improving Existing infrastructure	The layby at Hayden Hill on the Old Gloucester Road is in a terrible condition (see photo 6) and virtually unusable due to the potholes and poor visibility when the grass gets long hence obscuring the road. Street lighting is required here if the development goes ahead.	Traffic impact	See comment 260	N/A	n/a
262	Hayden Hill	Improving	The Old Gloucester Road is a very dangerous road to either walk or cycle on. It	Traffic impact	See comment 260	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
	Community	Existing infrastructure	is a very fast, busy, undulating road without street lighting along the Cyber Central boundary. There are many sharp bends and a blind junction at the top of the hill. It is unsuitable for a footpath along much of its length. Cars regularly swerve off the road into the ditch and there have been fatalities.				
263	Hayden Hill Community	Improving Existing infrastructure	Due to the road condition and lack of footpaths in our neighbourhood, it is difficult for our community to access the local cycling network and footpaths. We note that there is a proposed new footpath shown in the report running outside of the site along the Old Gloucester Road. We think that it should run on the inside of the site along its northern boundary away from the traffic hazard, with another short stretch of footpath outside the site along the layby on Hayden Hill linking the adjacent houses.	H	Comments noted, this will form part of the detailed masterplanning and development management process	N/A	n/a
264	Hayden Hill Community	Improving Existing infrastructure	The site must provide easy access to areas of green space and transport connections within the site for the HHC. Yet, there is very limited consideration of our needs in this proposal and where access points are included, they do not take account of the challenges associated with the topography of the area and are in locations where it would be too dangerous to cross the busy Old Gloucester Road.	Access and safety	Noted. Cross references added in SPD to ayden Hill	Ch 6	Yes
265	Hayden Hill Community		Please ensure that the connections and gateways between the HHC and the new development are convenient and safe to use for all parties concerned – an obligation of the Joint Core Strategy A7. They must be direct, safe, well lit, comfortable and attractive.	Nature of connections	Noted	Ch 6	n/a
266	Hayden Hill Community		The layby should be improved and perhaps reconfigured to facilitate pedestrian and cycle access to the site. The brow of the hill (site of the layby) is the flattest piece of land without bends and, in our opinion, the safest spot at which to cross this busy road (one which is likely to get even busier once the site is developed).We think that an access should be sited opposite the centre of the layby on the Old Gloucester Road which is the focal point of this community. See Figure 10. There should also be streetlights and a bus stop.	Access and safety	Noted. Specific detail that will need to be picked up at development management stage	Ch 6	n/
267	Hayden Hill Community		Key movement principles – the HHC need easy and safe access to a bus service. We don't have any public transport accessible to us at present. We understand that the intention is to change the route of the 'H' bus and also bring the '94' service through the site. Please can these services have bus stops along the Old Gloucester Road for the HHC to use. Also, a bus service linking to the train station should be introduced for the Cyber Central and adjacent communities to encourage the use of public transport. Please ensure that the development site has ample parking for cycles around bus gateways. This should take account that residents from neighbouring communities will also use these transport facilities.	Need for improved public transport	Existing residents will benefit from required improvements in public transport services which will need to be delivered. Precise alignment of new or improved routes will need to be agreed by Stagecoach who are the Bus Operating Company. Stagecoach has made reps which may result in changes to the how bus services are addressed in the SPD.	D1	n/a
268	Hayden Hill Community	Visitor Parking	Dedicated free parking areas should be provided for visitors who come by car or they will need to park on residential streets. It states that large expanses of surface parking will not be permitted. Yet there are several examples of reinforced grass car parking areas in Cheltenham which are multipurpose in use and serve both as a car park or as an open space and would fit well into such a plan. It is important that sufficient car parking areas are provided. Not everyone can walk or cycle and when it is bad weather people are more likely to drive.	Parking	Generally, government policy is not to take a restraint-based approach to the provision of parking. Existing parking issues associated with GCHQ are noted.	N/A	n/a
269	Hayden Hill Community	Housing types and demographic	We feel that the site has been planned simply to cram in as many houses as possible into the allocated area. Yet consideration has not been given to the demographic. Many of the residents will be blue collar workers with high salaries, well above the average wage. It is a centre of excellence for highly skilled labour. Many of these people would be able to afford and probably would aspire to live in a larger detached property. Yet there are none here at all so you would be in effect excluding this demographic from living in this area, thus destroying a balanced population. There should be housing for	Concerned about high density	All these issues were taken into account in the preparation of the JCS. Making the best use of land released for strategic allocations is critical. Careful consideration has been as part of the masterplanning process to the efficient use of land. A new appendix added to help explain the approach. See comment 15	New appendix	Yes

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			every demographic to create a balanced community. Whilst wanting to cram in as many houses as possible does not mean that the houses themselves all need to be cheap in quality. Some high-end luxury accommodation needs to be included.				
270	Hayden Hill Community	Housing density	It is suggested that densities of housing in parts of the site should go above conventional housing densities that might otherwise be built on a rural edge. We strongly oppose this and consider that conventional housing densities or even less should be observed on what was greenfield land in a rural area. This higher density housing does not sit well nor blend in with the adjacent neighbourhoods. Cramming in as many houses onto the site should not be to the detriment and dynamic of nearby communities. In addition, the proposed height of the houses is inappropriate for a rural site where all surrounding properties are only 2 stories high maximum. It is also inappropriate to have 3 or 4 storey properties at the edge of a rural boundary especially on the higher more visible ground illustrated in Figure 5.	Concerned about high density	See comments 15 and 269	New appendix	Yes
271	Hayden Hill Community	Car parking for residents	There is a housing development built on Southerby Drive near GCHQ with similar houses to those proposed here. Poor planning and low-quality houses has resulted in a housing estate that looks awful. Cars are parked everywhere, even on pavements and it makes the whole area feel messy and untidy. Please ensure that lessons are learnt to prevent this occurring here and more private on drive parking and resident parking bays are provided. Even if residents do use cycles more, many will probably still have a car for longer journeys and will need somewhere to park it. We are not in favour of on street parking because it causes many problems for residents, especially if you have children or are infirm, having to find a space nearby can be problematic. When there are insufficient spaces, residents have to resort to parking on pavements and anywhere else they can find to leave their car. Also, cars are more likely to get bumped and scratched than if they were parked on a drive.	Concerned about levels of parking – and dangers of on-street parking	When incorporated into well designed and sized new streets, on-street parking can offer a very efficient and flexible form of parking.	N/A	n/a
272	Hayden Hill Community	School	See Figure 12 for the possible locations of the primary school. The report states that potential locations for new school premises are identified in the masterplan framework. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position A - In the Old Gloucester Road neighbourhood. We feel that this site is unsuitable for the following reasons. It is located very close to the Old Gloucester Road and as the report identifies, is on the boundary of acceptable noise level so may require mechanical ventilation. It would be better located away from the Old Gloucester Road so natural ventilation could be used which is healthier for the children and more economical for the running costs. In addition, the school location would mean that the residential area near the school would be flooded with cars of parents dropping off and collecting their children. This will lead to air quality and parking issues for local residents. We believe that the school should be located nearer to the centre of the site with a parking area adjacent to it to prevent cars blocking residential streets. The height of the school would need to be restricted because it is positioned on the brow of the hill as seen in Figure 5 and would be more visible with views across the site. The height of the school would also need to have a visual balance to its surrounding residential community. - Position B - This is a much better position and does not have any of the constraints listed for position A. - Position C - This is another location we feel should be considered. 	Location of school	Advice will be taken from the Education Authority on location of school. There has been collaboration with GCC on this point throughout the preparation of the SPD. The location is currently indicative. Any location will be subject to much more scrutiny through an EIA as detailed proposals come forward.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
273	Hayden Hill Community	Sports Facilities	It would be good if this could include a swimming pool as illustrated in the report and a circuit where people could run e.g. to do a park run. In addition, a multi-use sports area which could be used for tennis, netball, badminton and basketball etc.	Swimming pool	A swimming pool is not explicitly proposed, viability is a key factor in the delivery of this type of infrastructure	N/A	n/a
274	Hayden Hill Community		Our main concern is that the community of Hayden Hill is ignored and not represented as a stakeholder in the planning document. This needs to be rectified.	Community of Hayden Hill	Noted Make more explicit reference to Hayden Hill area – in the same way as Hesters Way etc...	6.1, D2, D5	yes
275	Hayden Hill Community		The HHC runs along the western edge of the B4634 (Old Gloucester Road) from the junction of the House-in-the-Tree Public House (Withybridge Lane) to Springbank (Pilgrove Way). See Figure 1. Our community comprises of 20 residential properties and several businesses (including farms, a Public House, home offices and a scaffolding firm). The HHC is not currently well served with essential infrastructure – no footpath or cycle path, no easy access to a bus route and a poor / unreliable mobile and landline phone and internet network. We live directly opposite the proposed Old Gloucester Road Neighbourhood within Cyber Central. See Figure 2.	community	See comment 247	6.1, D2, D5	Yes
276	Hayden Hill Community		The HHC also does not have access to mains natural gas instead we have to use heating oil or electricity. Expensive and non-environmentally friendly options.	community	noted	N/A	n/a
277	Hayden Hill Community		Our closest bus service (route H) can only be accessed via an unpaved and very dangerous walk to Pilgrove Way, Springbank. Our community is essentially cut off by a lack of access to any public transport facility.	community	See comment 267 and 274	D1	Yes
278	Hayden Hill Community		We are pleased to find that there is a clear intention (Masterplan Objectives) and a legal obligation (Joint Core Policy A7) for the project to engage with existing communities to help regenerate and transform the neighbouring communities. Also, to integrate and connect to them so that they can also benefit from the improved facilities, utilities, social benefits, open spaces and services. The proposal document has numerous references to this obligation yet despite this there has been no formal reference to the existence of our community at Hayden Hill.	community	noted	6.1, D2, D5	n/a
279	Hayden Hill Community		Our community, whilst outside the boundary of the Cyber Central, should be integrated with the proposed Old Gloucester Road neighbourhood both in terms of how it is designed (see our Section 5.) and also how they co-exist in the future. For instance, to help the HHC engage with the new Cyber Central please consider putting a noticeboard in the layby at Hayden Hill to publicise their events and information about services, in addition to those in the borough. Please ensure that the HHC is listed as one that will be affected by this development and also as one that can benefit and engage with the opportunities arising from it.	Impact on Hayden Hill community	Noted See comment 274	6.1, D2, D5	Yes
280	SF Planning		This submission objects to the indicative land use illustrated in the SPD for the Site as a lake as set out in the draft Masterplan document. The SPD and draft Masterplan should also be updated to reflect the landowner's intention for residential development of the Site. The Site is located in the North West part of the Strategic Allocation A7 West Cheltenham and is within the Supplementary Planning Document area. The Site is outlined in red at figure 1, and is approximately 2.16 hectares. The SPD area is located to the west of Cheltenham between the westerly extent of the town and the M5 Corridor. The Site is on the western boundary of the SPD area, and is within Tewkesbury Borough Council's administrative area. the landowner has been	Area of SPD not shown for housing in the masterplan	The SUDs is indicative and responds to the topography of the site, flooding and drainage issues. Careful consideration has been given to the role of the new rural edge of the strategic allocation, which combined with the opportunity to deliver effective blue and green infrastructure to meet the overall requirements of the wider site	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
			previously engaged in discussion with developers regarding the Site, with the intention of the site coming forward for residential purposes. Indeed, there is no policy barrier to this occurring subject to compliance with the allocation policy in the JCS.		The JCS policies are clear on the role of comprehensive development. This SPD provides the strategic direction for future masterplanning. It would be inappropriate to consider parts of the site for development in an ad hoc manner, our priority is place shaping as set out in JCS policies SA1, SD4, SD10 and A7.		
281	SF Planning		The Site has been identified in the SPD as an indicative lake (see Figure 2 below). No reason is given for this in the SPD. However, the appendices include a 'Flood Risk and Drainage Due Diligence' report which was undertaken by Hydrock. This states that "The surface water flood map (Figure 3) shows the north-western corner of the site, where the ground flattens out, is considered to be at 'high risk' of surface water flooding during the 1 in 30 year storm event or greater. This mapping does not consider any drainage culverts which may be present under Old Gloucester Road and so this map is considered to be a worst-case scenario, i.e. total blockage of culverts." However this is based on preliminary findings and further investigation will be required before moving forward. The Site has been within family ownership for several decades and there has been no flooding of the Site in that time.	Area of SPD not shown for housing in the masterplan	See comment 280 At this stage the SPD is indicative as full detailed assessment will be required at the Development Management stage. Whilst there may not be anecdotal evidence of flooding, the site is currently farmland. Full assessment will be required that takes account of the development proposed to deliver JCS policy A7. The 'lake' shown is an indicative size and location of a surface water attenuation feature. The location and size are subject to change as the site progresses. In line with policy, and in order to ensure no detrimental impact on third party land these features will be required to serve the proposed development.	N/A	n/a
282	SF Planning		Without a topographical survey of the whole of the land the subject of the SPD, and appropriate surface water modelling taking into account land drains, culverts, watercourses etc it is impossible to suggest an appropriate location for attenuation at this early stage. It therefore isn't appropriate to do so until further investigations have been carried out in consultation with the landowners. Furthermore, given the lack of detail regarding the size, depth and exact position of the proposed lake within the land then it stands to reason that this lake could be accommodated on another parcel of land.	Area of SPD not shown for housing in the masterplan	See comments 280 and 281 There will be a need for detailed assessment at the development Management stage. SUDS as outlined in the SPD are indicative.	N/A	n/a
283	SF Planning		In addition to the above, the SPD notes within Appendix A2.2 that "a number of further landowners/ owner occupier interests control areas within the south, North West and south west corners of the site." This representation is made on behalf of one of those landowners, and is made in the absence of any prior engagement with xx client on behalf of those responsible for the SPD. We are therefore submitting this representation to attempt to rectify this and positively engage in SPD process. The SPD states that "1.3.2 Public and stakeholder engagement has been central to the process of SPD preparation. Having been prepared in accordance with the relevant regulations, the SPD is a material planning consideration and will have substantial weight in the determination of relevant planning applications by the two authorities." We therefore welcome the opportunity to comment, but we also urge the Councils as primary landowners to take a better and more constructive role in speaking with other landowners before presenting indicative plans in the manner in which they have been to date.	Request for more engagement	There has been broad consultation and engagement with stakeholders and the community in the preparation of the SPD. Following the publication of the SPD there has been 1-2-1 engagement with landowners. A landowner meeting was arranged following receipt of all comments to feedback key issues directly to landowners. This unfortunately was cancelled due to COVID-19, however a summary a comments was provided via email to all landowners. We welcome continued engagement.	N/A	n/a

Comment Number	Consultee/ Individual	Key Theme	Comments	Summary of Comment	Proposed Change	Page/ Figure Ref	SPD changed
284	SF Planning		Following publication of the SPD and receipt of a letter regarding compulsory purchase orders, the landowner has also met with both Cheltenham and Tewkesbury councils to understand the best approach towards moving this site forward with a positive outcome. The landowners have expressed frustration regarding the lack of pre-consultation with landowners, and lack of apparent consideration given to all aspects of equalisation.	CPO	It is not the role of the Local Planning Authorities in developing the SPD to make decisions on land assembly. The SPD process is entirely separate from the CPO process and the councils have engaged directly with all landowners on both matters separately.		n/a
285	SF Planning	Objection comment	The SPD itself states that engagement is embedded in the process and that ongoing conversation will continue to shape the emerging SPD. We are therefore taking this opportunity through the consultation for the Councils to actively talk to our clients, and amend formally from the SPD to create an indicative masterplan taking into consideration these comments, and the need for more accurate and complete survey work.	Need more survey work	Further survey work will be required to determine which areas of suitable for development. Masterplan is illustrative	N/A	n/a
286	SF Planning	Objection comment	This submission objects to the indicative land use illustrated in the SPD for xx client land as an area of landscaping as set out in the draft Masterplan document. The SPD and draft Masterplan should also be updated to take into a recent planning permission.	Want their land shown for development	The SPD is indicative based upon constraints analysis of the site, it will be for future planning applications through the Development Management process that demonstrate a comprehensive masterplan in context of JCS policy A7.	N/A	n/a
287	SF Planning	General Comment	The Site received planning permission reference number 19/02417/FUL on the 29th January 2020 for the erection of 2 no. self-build dwellings including landscaping, footpath and passing bay as shown at Appendix A. The Site is located in the southern part of the Strategic Allocation A7 West Cheltenham and is within the Supplementary Planning Document area. The Site as outlined in red in figure 2 shows that the sites has been identified for landscaping within the Draft SPD. Given the Cheltenham Borough Council have given permission for this site it would be justified that the SPD within the maps and diagrams of the SPD area show this site as residential development, particularly as it benefits from an extant planning permission for that use.	Should reference existing planning permission	Clarity has been provided to the landowner that the planning consent is not affected by the SPD.	N/A	n/a
288	SF Planning	General Comment	As part of the ongoing engagement the Councils are having with landowners regarding the development of West Cheltenham the Council sent letters to landowners regarding compulsory purchase orders. It is noted that the Councils are undertaking this work to bring the strategic allocation forward and the email received from Cheltenham Borough Council regarding our clients concern regarding CPO has been included as Appendix B. The SPD itself states that engagement is embedded in the process and that ongoing conversation will continue to shape the emerging SPD. We are therefore taking this opportunity through the consultation for the Councils to amend the masterplan taking into consideration these comments	Amendment to SPD	Engagement has been with a wide range of stakeholders, it should be recognised that landowners are just one part of the engagement process alongside stakeholder interests and the wider community, the SPD seeks to balance these interests.	N/A	n/a
289	Civic Society	General comment	We welcome this plan for the delivery of approximately 3,000 new homes, including affordable housing, and for the creation of a mixed-use Cyber Central Cluster bringing together leading cyber businesses and innovators. This is an exciting vision for the future development of our town.	Support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
290	Civic Society	General comment	Having recently raised these matters with CBC, we especially welcome the emphasis on the importance of planning for climate change, sustainability and biodiversity. Specifically, we welcome the emphasis on: green infrastructure for the benefit of people, environment and wildlife (and the adoption of the Building with Nature benchmark); setting high sustainability and design standards that respond to the character of the landscape; and reducing the use of resources including water and energy during construction and over the long term, covering buildings, environments and transport.	Support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a

291	Civic Society	General comment-	We like the idea of breaking down the barriers between work, play and living; and for creating several distinctive communities.	Support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
292	Civic Society	Sustainability and enforcement	Sustainability: Page 18 sets out a great set of principles towards low carbon development but do the councils have the powers to require this of developers? ditto re waste management? We know from our meeting with you last November on this topic that national policy in respect of planning controls and building regulations makes it difficult to achieve desirable environmental outcomes in new development. What can be done to overcome this?	3.2.6/3.2.7 P18- Ability to secure low carbon and waste management aspirations	See 9.2 objective section A1. The SPD cannot change government regulations, but we will be using this robustly to challenge future government policy.	9.2	n/a
293	Civic Society	Design and enforcement	Design: the visuals are exciting but if the quality of the realised scheme is to fulfil expectations there will need to be very close control over development details. Otherwise high standards of design will be in danger of being compromised (see also next point). The Council should do its utmost to resist developers who want to design their housing areas using an “unadopted” design strategy.	Design quality maintained	Comments noted – see 9.2	9.2	n/a
294	Civic Society	Query regarding development on site	Governance: As far as we can see, the assumption is that this ambitious plan will be achieved through a combination of public investment and private sector investment guided by advice and controls. Are the councils confident that such an ambitious scheme can be delivered in this way? Is the existence of two planning authorities a complication? Do they need to set up some kind of development agency or corporation, or some form of public-private partnership, to realise the ambitions, not only as the development stage but subsequently?	Governance – Site Management and issues with cross LPA boundaries.	The councils of Cheltenham and Tewkesbury are working collaboratively on the delivery of JCS strategic allocation A7. The SPD being jointly commissioned illustrates this collaboration. In addition a shared team is in place to manage the Development Management process. See P12 Objective C and P39 and 9.2 - c10 for landscape management. See also Digital Twin management P17	9.2	n/a
295	Civic Society	Clarification of development partner?	Land ownership: Will the councils retain an interest in the land after it is developed? For example, through leasehold? Won’t that be necessary to ensure aftercare of the public realm and other community aspects at least? Following the meeting at Parmoor House on 6 February 2020, the Forum remains concerned that, whereas CBC may form a partnership with an innovative and caring developer for the CBC’s plot of land, this kind of “beneficial partnership” may not be achieved for the entire tract of development land.	Management of development on land outside CBC ownership.	Not relevant for the SPD. However, CBC as landowner has a long term interest in the scheme.	N/A	n/a
296	Civic Society	Management and long term costs	Green Space Management: We welcome Policy C10 – management of the green space is a key issue (role for Woodlands and Wetlands Trusts). But what is the financial model to ensure that the funding is available for long term green space management? Perhaps the councils will need some kind of “green bond” for developers so as to ensure that they are committed over the long term.	Green space management finance	No change - See C10 and planning req in 9.1 stage 2. Chapter 9 updated – validation list	Ch 9	yes
297	Civic Society	Clarification- Phasing	Phasing: Is it a good idea to have two phases (Phase II = Hayden Sewage Works)? Might it not be better to have just the one phase and do the entire scheme as a single exercise?	Hayden works phasing	No change – policy led position set by the JCS. SPD amended to provided improved clarity on status of strategic allocation and safeguarded land	Ch1 and 1.1.7	n/a
298	Civic Society	Clarification point	Partners: several obvious partners are not referred to, or only in passing, e.g. the University, Cheltenham Borough Homes, GFirst LEP and the Cheltenham Science Festival. Even GCHQ (whose key role is at the centre of the cyber ‘push’) is not given an identifiable role.	Mention of partners	Check context	There is ref to funding partners in Appendix A2.1 but further ref added to	yes

						1.1.2	
299	Civic Society	How will this benefit the existing communities?	Neighbouring developed areas: there are references to the benefits this development will bring to the areas of existing development on the west side of Cheltenham, but it is not clear how this will come about. Is there a need for a separate document to set out the benefits for neighbours and how they will be secured?	Neighbouring benefits	No change – exact benefits / targets cannot be defined through the SPD. The planning application stage will consider through application / EIA documents.	N/A	n/a
300	Civic Society	Transport clarification	Relationship to transport plans: a lot is said about the link to the JCS, but how does this relate to the LEP's key idea in its draft industrial strategy – a mass transit system between Gloucester and Cheltenham?	Mass transit system Glos - Chelt	Agree; reference to be added in 6.1. New development would be supportive, not prejudicial	6.1	yes
301	Cyber Central Team	Bolder aspirations are required from a climate change perspective and as a landmark development	We believe the SPD could be bolder about the site and 'Cyber Park' being of global significance and highlight the blend of public, private and academic interaction on site in order to achieve greatness. We also believe the document should refer to the Local Industrial Strategy which does clearly recognise the development as having national and global importance. Although the SPD promotes Garden Community Principles we still believe it could be a lot bolder in it's aspirations for the site with regards to sustainability and energy generation, albeit remaining commercially viable and deliverable.	Bolder vision, ref to Local Industrial Strategy and bolder sustainability	The vision has been developed in partnership with the Cyber Central team. LIS is referenced in context section. Sustainability is pushed as far as possible noting existing policy context.	N/A	n/a
302	Cyber Central Team	Amendment to para 1.1.6	The Vision Statement 2.1 sets out clear aspirations for the site with further emphasis on Cyber Central. It refers to it having 'great connectivity', promoting the use of public transport and modal shift, which is clearly backed up by its proximity to the motorway network and public transport links. However this is then contradicted in para 1.1.6, which mentions 'poor accessibility', we believe this requires amendment.	Contradiction 2.1 and 1.1.6 re accessibility	Not sure this is a contradiction as one is existing and one the vision post J10 works but suggest 1.1.6 is amended to remove 'poor' accessibility as not strictly true given proximity to J11.	1.1.6	yes
303	Cyber Central Team	Reference should be made to other training opportunities on site	Para 1.1.19 refers to a 'collaborative community that brings together leading cyber businesses and innovators alongside academic facilities dedicated to cyber and digital technologies'. This should also include teaching in order include upskilling and training not just high level academia and research.	Upskilling	Add ref in 1.1.19	1.1.19	yes
304	Cyber Central Team	Clarification on the role of the road-needs to be consistent throughout the SPD	Given the aspirations for this to be a highly sustainable development transport is a key concern. We understand there is a need for the 'street' to run through the development with the key access points utilised, however we have concern that this could be used as a through road to bypass traffic in the town. There are again contradicting statements on this matter – page 46 D4 is rightfully prescriptive describing it as a 'street for people , not a road for vehicles', this is then followed with a statement on page 70 para 7.6.1 which states that this is 'likely to be a busy road for traffic' - this is not at all our aspirations. We believe there needs to be mechanisms identified to reduce cars on site including car parks located close to the perimeter, and possibly physical barriers in place to reduce through traffic. I believe that Arle Court Park & Ride could play a part in reducing motor vehicles on site, however this currently has limited mention in this document.	Spine road traffic and potential conflict Connectivity to Arle Court P&R	Remove ref to busy traffic in 7.6.1 Amend to state 'has potential to be busy if not managed correctly'. Commentary to be included/bolstered re spine road alignment being for access only, and not conducive/attractive to serve as a bypass. Agree that greater emphasis could be placed on Arle Court P&R connectivity – it's proximity is of benefit.	7.6.1	Yes
305	Cyber Central Team	Ambition for reducing carbon	As you're aware the Council has an ambitious target to reduce carbon emissions within the borough, and therefore we wish for the document to be	Greater carbon and energy commitments	See comment 46	N/A	Yes

		emissions	much bolder in this respect. For example page 14 Objective A refers to ‘a potential for ‘lower energy bills’ – this lacks ambition and could refer to the potential of ‘no energy bills’. We believe the document could be more prescriptive on the sustainability strategy with discussion on matters such as; on –site energy generation and waste management.				
306	Cyber Central Team	Additional links should be investigated	We believe it is critical that the development is integrated into the existing surroundings and communities in order to help support the regeneration of existing neighbourhoods at West Cheltenham. Figure 3 identifies key cycle and pedestrian routes to access the development; however we believe the document should further highlight areas in which to open up the development, the existing buffer zones currently make it appear very closed off from the neighbouring areas - is there a way these can be feasibly opened up? More specifically we would like to see strong links to the existing retail area at Coronation Square, as well as links to Gloucestershire College Campus, particularly in respect of cycle and pedestrian routes.	Links to existing areas especially link to College and Coronation Sq.	Annotate Coronation Square and College on figure 3 Add in text re linkages and landscaping not seeking to turn back on existing	Figure 3	yes
307	Cyber Central Team	General comment	As mentioned the Cyber Central Team does welcome the supplementary planning document and believe it does broadly define our vision for the site. To re-iterate, given the Councils environmental objectives we do wish for the document to clearly indicate that the scheme has to be highly sustainable, identifying suggestions to meet this criteria, albeit allowing some flexibility in order to ensure the schemes viability.	General comment	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
308	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	General comment- SPD welcomed	The landowners welcome the production of the SPD as it establishes a vision and key objectives for West Cheltenham. The SPD outlines useful design and concept parameters which will help guide future development proposals and establish an identity for Cyber Central.	General comment	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
309	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	SPD needs to provide further flexibility in terms of wording	Whilst we welcome the production of the SPD, we do have concerns that the document, in places, is overly prescriptive in terms of its design requirements and there is scope for greater flexibility. In most cases our concerns can be overcome through revisions to the text where absolute phrases are not deemed appropriate.	Overly prescriptive and need for flex through text changes	What is clear from the comments across the SPD from all respondents is there are different ends of the spectrum, some wanting more detail and other wanting less. As drafted the SPD has sought to navigate a course that provides enough guidance to drive the strategic masterplan. Additional wording added to SPD to reinforce flexibility.	context	Yes
310	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	Flexibility encouraged and welcomed (Though note comment above)	We welcome the concept that the SPD will be a ‘living document’ and that the SPD presents a ‘broad and flexible masterplan’ (paragraph 1.1.11) and we hope that these principles will be followed in the determination of future planning applications. It is essential that the SPD remains flexible and adjusts to future changes over the duration of the West Cheltenham development which will be constructed in multiple phases over a 15-20 year time horizon. We hope that the Councils will commit to reviewing the document on a regular basis, ideally within three years from adoption.	1.1.11 Review within 3 years	The SPD is a strategic masterplan. The next trigger will be the JCS review in terms of future of the safeguarded land. The position to refresh the SPD will be taken in the context of the JCS review.	1.1.11	n/a
311	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd	SPD needs to be promote a scheme that is deliverable	As landowners preparing a planning application for the site, our main concern relates to deliverability of the SPD and any potential design or infrastructure requirements that could have financial and viability implications that would hinder the delivery of a development scheme. The PPG advises that	Infrastructure / viability for 3,000 units not tested	See proposed new context text / section 9.2 re status and flex. The SPD does not present a detailed capacity	Context / 9.2	Yes

	and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)		supplementary planning documents are a material consideration in decision-making, and they should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. The 3,000 units are an aspiration of the SPD; although the aspiration is supported it should be noted that delivery of these numbers depends on significant infrastructure requirements which have not yet quantified in the SPD. As such the implications of the infrastructure requirements on the viability and deliverability of the 3,000 homes scheme have not yet been tested.		assessment. This will follow in subsequent application(s). See comment 156 and 309		
312	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	Details on implementation and delivery required	In addition, we are mindful that the SPD needs to be cognisant of the existing site's constraints. The SPD focuses primarily on vision for West Cheltenham, overarching aspirations and development principles. Chapter 9 Next Steps is very brief, and little is said about the implementation and delivery of the SPD. Whilst we appreciate, we, as landowners, will have a key role in the delivery of the scheme, it is vital that the SPD is more than just a aspirational vision and presents a deliverable development based on a robust evidence base which has been thoroughly market tested. The West Cheltenham site is unique in terms of the proposed range and mix of land uses which has implications for its phasing and delivery. It is essential that the scheme attracts investment from housebuilders and commercial investors and that the SPD does not pose any onerous requirements that would discourage their interest.	Delivery and implementation	New text to be added to section 9 Sections 1 and 9 updated to include clearer reference to flexibility for design approach but clear requirement to consider tests of assessment matrix	Section 9	yes
313	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	Details on implementation and delivery required	Currently what is absent from Chapter 9 is an implementation strategy. The phasing of the development is critical to its success, such as allowing development to take place in a phased approach therefore enabling cross subsidisation of later parcels that may require installation of further infrastructure before they can be released. Phasing is a very important consideration for delivering such a diversely mixed-use scheme as proposed at West Cheltenham. Hence the importance of considering infrastructure requirements and phasing together as they are mutually inclusive and have significant implications for developer finance and viability of the development.	Implementation strategy and phasing of infrastructure	New text to be added to section 9 Section 9 includes the requirement for a Delivery Infrastructure Plan which will be based on costed and known infrastructure requirements which are unknown at this stage. The development options appraisal work has been undertaken in parallel to the SPD but this is high level. Section 9 further updated	Section 9	yes
314	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	Details on implementation and delivery required	In Chapter 9, Figure 60 (page 83) presents a table outlining the four stages of delivery. We note that Stage 1 'Mechanism and Delivery' refers to a Delivery Options Report having been prepared. As this document has not been made publicly available it is unclear what influence it has had on the SPD's production and the proposed strategy. We would welcome the opportunity to review and comment on this document as it will have implications for the viability of the development. Reference is also made to the SPD being informed by a delivery testing model.	Want sight of delivery and options report and testing model	Update text, whilst delivery options model was part of original brief, this element of the brief was amended in recognition that it could only supply a high level analysis and snapshot in time and therefore questionable on how helpful this was as part of the SPD. Through the Development Management process each application will be assessing its viability and contribution within the context of a comprehensive masterplan See comment 312	Fig57	Yes
315	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	Details on implementation and delivery required	Figure 60 also states that the SPD is not based on fully costed infrastructure provisions or confirmed planning obligations costs. The requirement for an infrastructure delivery plan is referred to in Stage 2 but it is important that the infrastructure requirements are considered upfront as they have significant implications for the viability and phasing of the development.	Infrastructure costs needed up front	Part of Development Management Process	N/A	n/a
316	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd	Welcomed opportunity to provide further	A significant change from JCS policy A7 and the SPD is the quantum of development expected to be delivered by the site, from 1,100 to 3,000 dwellings for the wider site (including the safeguarded land). The increase in dwellings is to be achieved by mixing uses and maximising densities	Welcome change to density	Support welcomed. See comment 15	Updated vision Chap 1	Yes

	and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	dwellings on site	throughout the development by providing a range of dwelling types and forms. We welcome the opportunity to maximise densities and encourage the efficient use of land.			updated to add ref to SD5 context. New appendix added detailing housing numbers All Figs updated	
317	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	Welcome living document	The ambition for the development to be carbon neutral is laudable and sustainability should be a key consideration in the planning of the new garden community. At such a scale and in the current context a carbon neutral development is unlikely to be viable, however as technology advances it is plausible such developments could become viable as the development scheme progresses. To this end it is important the SPD is a 'living document' that can respond to technological advances to deliver the highest levels of sustainability in a viable manner over the lifetime of the development.	Note living document	The SPD sets the ambition for carbon neutrality, but is not prescriptive in how this should be achieved as this can be addressed in a variety of ways. The Development Management process will test the details in connection with specific proposals. No change to the SPD	N/A	n/a
318	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	General comment regarding model shift encouragement	We note the desire to encourage an assertive modal shift and promote initiatives such as car clubs and E bikes. This notion of modal shift requires significant buy in from the future businesses occupying the cyber park and from the Highway Authority.	Modal shift	Agree work is required with both the Highways Authority and future tenants. Work with the former is already in hand. This SPD will further support this together with helping to frame the options for transport in future planning applications.	N/A	n/a
319	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	General comment- flexibility	The SPD is very detailed and in places the design advice is over prescriptive, particularly in the character areas section. This seems to run counter to the statement in the Introduction that SPD presents broad and flexible masterplan.	Over prescriptive design advice	Wording reviewed in character areas, context, section 9. We believe this is the right level of detail to communicate the sense of the intended character and quality. See comment 312	Character areas, context, section 9	Yes
320	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	General comment	Section 9 includes an assessment matrix which will be used to assess future planning application which draws together the five core objectives. In the preparation of the masterplan for the site we have been mindful of initiatives such as Building for Life 12 and Building with Nature to ensure a sensitively designed scheme is delivered which prioritises placemaking and connectivity. Therefore, we would endeavour to present a planning application which scores positively against all the objectives and indicators.	General comment section 9	None	N/A	n/a
321	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	General comment	We have previously provided the Councils with technical documents that have been prepared to support the forthcoming planning application, some of which is referred to in the technical appendices. We would be willing to share further technical background documents with the Councils to ensure that all the environmental and technical constraints, such as the odour zones, have been fully considered in the preparation of the SPD.	Technical information – additional work they can share	None at this stage but welcome additional documents.	Technical appendices	n/a
322	Northern Trust Company Ltd, Midlands Land	General comment- overall	To conclude, we support the preparation of the SPD and would welcome the opportunity be more greatly involved in its production. We welcome the concept that the SPD will be a 'living document' and will be regularly	Involvement going forward	Comments noted. Welcome continued engagement	N/A	n/a

	Portfolio Ltd and Cheltenham Borough Council (via Tetlow King Planning)	support for SPD and flexibility	reviewed. Our overarching concerns relate to deliverability and infrastructure implications of the wider development. Furthermore, it is important that the SPDs remains fluid and is adaptable to change and is applied flexibly in decision making				
323	GCC	Public Health Comments – Rewording suggestion	We strongly support the aims of this SPD to create “a development which creates new and helps to transform existing communities, ensuring they are healthy, biodiverse environments, which encourage physical and social wellbeing” (Para 1.1) – this could include reference to mental wellbeing as well (this is a Gloucestershire Health & Wellbeing Strategy priority) to read “physical, mental and social wellbeing”. Note – this is included elsewhere, e.g. Para 1.1.9	Health and well being	1.1 add text	1.1	yes
324	GCC	Public Health Comments – General comment of support	We also strongly support the ambition to “help neighbouring communities to regenerate and actively engage in the opportunities new development will create” (Para 1.1.5) drawn out further in Para 2.3.1 as a strategy to reduce, rather than widen health inequalities in the town	Neighbouring community - support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
325	GCC	Public Health Comments- General comment of support	We strongly support the references to and prioritisation of “sustainable and active travel options” throughout. For example, we fully support the design and delivery of streets and junctions which prioritise the needs of people and sustainable modes of transport and efforts to ensure that development promotes modal shift (2.2.1 Objective D)	Sustainable modes – support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
326	GCC	Public Health Comments - General comment of support	We support the principles outlined to embrace the highest standards of sustainability, which should have a positive impact on the physical, mental and social wellbeing of new and existing communities	Sustainability - support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
327	GCC	Public Health Comments -- General comment of support	The reference to smart healthcare in the Smart City principles (page 19) is welcomed and we would encourage the local authorities and developer(s) to engage proactively with local NHS commissioners and providers to understand opportunities to deliver this in alignment with the local strategy. There may also be an opportunity to consider how the Smart City principles could apply to the production and supply of nutritious food that has a lower impact on the planet	Smart healthcare and food – support (note refs in SPD to food supply)	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
328	GCC	Public Health Comments -- General comment of support	We are encouraged by the reference to addressing air quality in Para 3.2.13 as a key priority for the Gloucestershire Health & Wellbeing community (see the Gloucestershire Air Quality & Health Strategy)	Air quality - support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
329	GCC	Public Health Comments - General comment of support	We support the use of the Building with Nature benchmark, which includes assessment against wellbeing indicators	Building Nature – support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
330	GCC	Public Health Comment- Note page 28 update required	The last bullet point on page 28 is an incomplete sentence – we would support the provision of social infrastructure to promote social and mental wellbeing but would want to see this point expanded/completed to give examples, e.g. drawn from the Barnwood Trust’s Social Sustainability Toolkit	Social infras – missing text	Add text to end of bullet	P28 last bullet	yes

331	GCC	Public Health Comments – Recommend that SPD references national space standards	Could the SPD make reference to internal space standards, alongside push for higher density development in section 7.2? – the space within a home can impact on physical and mental wellbeing in a range of ways, including overcrowding, inability to store and prepare fresh food, space to study, etc.	Space standards	Add ref to NDSS in 7.2	7.2	yes
332	GCC	Public Health Comments - General comment of support	Alongside the push for high density housing to be built we would support the requirement for any such housing to be of the highest quality standard that mitigates noise and odour pollution and ensures warmth and energy efficiency. We would strongly support the inclusion of bicycle storage for high density housing	Housing quality, cycle storage in high density	Comments noted	N/A	n/a
333	GCC	Public Health Comments -General comment of support	We strongly support the requirement for a food strategy on pages 30 and 38 and would recommend alignment with the developing Gloucestershire Food Strategy and its ambitions for the county. We think the SPD could include some further wording to increase its aspirations, encompassing the production of food, residential and commercial supply chain and nutrition. The Sustainable Food City principles could be a helpful reference point - http://sustainablefoodcities.org/keyissues.html	Food strategy – support and add comment	Add ref 30/38 to Sustainable Food City Principles	P30/38	yes
334	GCC	Public Health Comments - General comment of support	We strongly support the requirement for public spaces to include features that promote inclusivity, e.g. seating and accessible paths	Public space - support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
335	GCC	Public Health Comments – Health Impact Assessment add to validation checklist	JCS Policy SD14 requires a health impact assessment for strategic allocations – should this be included in the validation checklist on page 82? The Public Health team has already engaged with the JCS team to provide support and guidance around this.	Health impact assessment	Add requirement for HIA	P82 checklist	yes
336	GCC	Ecology (biodiversity) Comments- Amendment to typo	Para 5.2.15 correct ‘Gloucestershire Nature Pledge’ to ‘Gloucestershire Green Infrastructure Pledge’	Correction	Correct 5.2.15	5.2.15	yes
337	GCC	Ecology (biodiversity) Comments- Amendment to typo	Policy A7 (box) correction needed – Fiddler’s Green is a <u>Local</u> Wildlife Site	Correction	Correction A7 box	Cannot find	yes
338	GCC	Ecology (biodiversity) Comments – Suggested additional wording	Para 2.7 insertion needed – This paragraph should explicitly say that detailed information to support a HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment) to be carried out by Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) will be required. The main potential impacts on European Sites are increased recreational disturbance, plus reduced water and air quality.	Text insertion HRA	Add HRA req para 2.7 (note CBC and TBC)	2.7	yes
339	GCC	Flood Risk Comments-- General comment of	Overall we support the SPD’s approach to planning sustainable water management for the future of the development using innovative SuDS solutions. The SPD recognises how SuDS features can be incorporated into the green space network and how they can enhance amenity and increase	Support SUDS	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a

		support	biodiversity as opposed to solely discussing the water management aspects of SuDS in isolation. In general the document embraces the multi-functional benefits of SuDS in relation to the development, but is light on detail of design standards and SuDS hierarchy. However, at this stage we accept the balance struck between detail and brevity.				
340	GCC	Flood Risk-general comment	Section 1.2 –There is close proximity to Flood Zone 2 to the North of the site and a southern section of the site lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3 from the Hatherley Brook. Development should be steered away from areas of modelled flood risk as required within the NPPF. There is also a tributary within the site of the Hatherley Brook. Existing watercourses within the site should be identified and their drainage function considered as there may be local springs within the site. Easements around the watercourses should be provided for maintenance and habitat and the development should seek to maximise the ecological and amenity benefit of watercourses within the site as part of the public open space.	Flood Zones	Add brief new para 1.2.5	New 1.2.5	yes
341	GCC	Flood Risk-Add suggested comment	Section 2.3 –add Thought should be given to using innovative solutions to reducing flood risk to downstream areas and what opportunities the development may be able to offer the local area from all flooding sources such as sewer or ordinary watercourse floodingtext “Thought should be given to using innovative solutions to reducing flood risk to downstream areas and what opportunities the development may be able to offer the local area from all flooding sources such as sewer or ordinary watercourse flooding”	Downstream text	Add 2.3 text	2.3	yes
342	GCC	Flood Risk-Add suggested comment	2.3.1 - Objective A: Include a mention of SuDS and the multiple benefits within the second bullet point	SUDS text	Add 2.3.1 text	2.3.1 Obj A	yes
343	GCC	Flood Risk-Add suggested comment	Section 3.2.8 – We welcome the wording and extent of this paragraph. But at the end of this paragraph “whilst also considering effects of climate change” should be included	Climate change text	Add 3.2.8 text	3.2.8	yes
344	GCC	Flood Risk-Add suggested comment	Section 3.2.11 – Although the landscape strategy has identified locations for attenuation based on the topographic nature of the site I believe the referred to “generous network of open spaces” highlight that it is preferable to use above ground SuDS techniques for attenuation and conveyance as it compliments the amenity of the open space network as well as allowing easier maintenance of the site.	Landscape / SUDS text	Review 3.2.11 – noted, reviewed, no change required	3.2.11	n/a
345	GCC	Flood Risk-Add suggested comment	Section 5.1 Strategy point 2 – We welcome the reference to site-wide SuDS strategy, and the potential for amenity and habitat benefits, but reference to SuDS design standards should be included	SUDS design text	Add text 5.1 point 2	5.1	yes
346	GCC	Flood Risk-Add suggested comment	Page 37 section C5 paragraph one add in at the end of the sentence “to maximise the amenity and ecological potential of the site.”	Ecological text	Add text p37 C5	P37 C5	yes
347	GCC	Flood Risk-Building regs?	Page 37 section C5 paragraph three makes reference to the development being part of a permeable system. This can be achieved through SuDS solutions and infiltration is preferable. Buildings Regulations require that discharge to a soakaway should be ruled out first before discharge to a watercourse or an existing storm drain will be considered but the soil description maps indicate the soils as rich loamy clay soils with impeded drainage. If the overall intention is to use infiltration it may not be possible.	Permeable solution clarification	The report produced to date is based on readily available information. This data, as detailed, gives the indication that the underlying geology would not support the use of infiltration features, though this is subject to on site investigations.	P37 C5	n/a

348	GCC	Archaeology Comments	Note- No further comments.	Note	None	N/A	n/a
349	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	<p>The SPD should clearly demonstrate what multimodal framework it is advocating and this should be reinforced as its 1st principle. As such the SPD could substantially facilitate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locking in the right masterplan movement framework and transport infrastructure for West of Cheltenham at its inception. • Connecting new development to existing sustainable transport networks to increase people's propensity to travel by non-car modes; and, • Taking full account of other strategic new development (Phase 2 and NW Cheltenham). This is an opportunity to create bold new movement frameworks and well functioning spaces where they currently do not exist. The SPD should seek to facilitate a dynamic layout that genuinely enables multi-modal transport opportunities through its design. 	<p>Comment – multi-modal framework aspirations</p> <p>Movement/mode share choices</p> <p>Strategic planning/alignment with other strategic developments</p>	<p>Review principles</p> <p>6.2 Key movement principles – identify a hierarchy of mode share priorities? E.g. walking, cycling, public transport, car travel (in that order)</p> <p>Is this a case of providing over-arching comments that demonstrate the wider strategic aspirations of Cheltenham are being/have been considered, and that these should (a) not be prejudiced but more positively (b) opportunities should be sought to contribute to an enhanced connectivity in the region?</p> <p>SPD is considered to reflect the spirit of this guidance</p>	6.2	n/a
350	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport) general comment of support	The objectives are well presented and the aims of each objective are clearly stated. From a transport perspective, Objective A and particularly Objective D are the most relevant and it is positive to see that they set out to prioritise, enable and improve sustainable transport opportunities not just within but outwards from the development as well.	Support	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
351	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- Note the emerging local transport strategy	<p>Objective A – Sustainability.</p> <p>This objective states that the Cyber Central Garden Community will embrace the highest standards of sustainability through ensuring the development is resource efficient and carbon neutral. It needs to be explained how this will be achieved. The Emerging Local Transport Plan Overarching strategy sets policies on how to reduce carbon emissions (PD 0.1) and promote sustainable transport (PD.03 & PD.04). It is recommended the Cyber SPD should align itself with these policies to ensure the delivery of the objective.</p>	Objective A - Sustainability	Make reference to Emerging Local Transport Plan	2.3	yes
352	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- Note the emerging local transport strategy	<p>Objective D – Movement.</p> <p>Objective D sets out the movement objectives for the SPD and how the new development is to integrate with the adjacent built environment/communities as well as onward connections to the Railway Station and Town Centre by foot or cycle or public transport. This objective should also align with the principles and policies set out in the Emerging Local Transport Plan. PD.04 – 'Integration with land use planning and new development'. The expected policy outcomes (4.3(b)) of the Emerging Local Transport Plan's Overarching strategy can also help the development achieve this. Policy PD.05 also sets out in the importance of integration, improved access and safety from a health and wellbeing perspective and should also be considered in order to ensure all opportunities to promote sustainable and/or active travel are taken up.</p>	Objective D – Movement	Make reference to Emerging Local Transport Plan	2.3	yes
353	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	The Government has recently announced that the ban on the sale of new Petrol/Diesel, and now Hybrid, cars has been brought forward to 2035. This gives even greater need to ensure that the development is adequately designed and constructed to accommodate for that change. Consideration must be given to innovations in smart technology/connectivity services/MaaS as this will be vital in ensuring that the development is future thinking and future-proofed.	Sustainability - future proofing for emerging technologies	Please see Objective A and D7	2.3 and page 47	n/a

354	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment, impact of trips should be noted	Robust trip rates, assignment, distribution and impact assessments are required although it is appreciated that these are most likely to be presented in a Transport Assessment and associated modelling outputs. However, it would be useful for the SPD to outline the likely trip impacts and likely mitigation and how that would influence movement within the development and between adjacent neighbourhoods in sustainable means.	Trip generation and impacts	Not part of the SPD brief – a matter for future applications No change	N/A	n/a
355	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment, further direct routes to be considered	6.1 states that the development “acknowledges that priority must be given to supporting more active, shared and sustainable modes of transport alongside the overriding need for streets to be attractive, pleasant and accessible for all.” This remains a welcome statement in the SPD, and expands on statements made in previous iterations. The statement can only be realised if pedestrian/cycle accessibility is convenient and direct to ensure efficient and quick journey times to local centres/services. The same journeys for cars should be made more difficult so as to encourage the uptake of sustainable travel for short journeys. This can be achieved by not affording private motor vehicles direct routes or direct access to frontages except for those with an essential need, and by providing more direct penetration to walk and cycle modes.	Prioritisation of sustainable travel options	Two relevant points, both discussed above: 1 Link road alignment (not attractive to rat-running) 2 Identification of mode share prioritisation	Section 6	Yes
356	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- Suggested wording amendment	Section 6.2 – D1: D1 highlights the opportunities that existing bus services could provide the development. Encouraging additional use of public transport is encouraged and supported, although it must be demonstrated that these new or extended services can be provided upon first occupations to ensure mode choice is available from the offset in order to influence user behaviour. Details of how these services are to be funded would also need to be provided to ensure it is viable. Consideration is also needed of onward journey time impacts of extending existing services into the site, particularly for very high frequency services such as the 94. The increased journey time from the route extension may discourage existing users who may regard it as no longer convenient. Instead other more local intra-urban services may be easier to extend. It is recommended that the wording regarding cleaner buses is changed to ultra-low emission rather than electric/hydrogen to allow technological flexibility.	Bus service provision – seeks confirmation: 1 Phasing (delivery at day 1) 2 Funding 3 Onward journey time impacts arising from diverting existing services All points echoed by Stagecoach Technology	Detailed engagement is needed with relevant bus operators in preparation of applications. The detail requested is not currently available to inform the SPD. Agree to wording re cleaner buses – amend at 6.2 D1	6.2 D1	yes
357	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment regarding walking distances to bus stops/ bus stop infrastructure	Ideally the majority of residents should be located within 200m of a bus stop served by a 15 minute frequency service with the remaining residents within 400m (not as the crow flies). There is a risk that a number of the land plots may fall beyond those walking distances. Careful consideration should be given to the design of the bus stops and the infrastructure surrounding them with bus borders being a preferred method. These are shallow pull in’s that allow enough room for cars/cyclists to pass safely whilst ensuring that buses have ease pulling out (which traditional lay-bys do not offer) or, where no laybys are provided, buses stop in the street delaying flows and creating a risk of conflict for cyclists who move into traffic to overtake or else may have to dismount. Wherever a network includes spaces where cyclists must dismount, take-up of cycling in the wider route area is invariably poor. Sufficient space around the bus stop for waiting passengers should be provided with a buffer between any cycle/footways to ensure unimpeded movement and to reduce conflict.	Proximity to bus stops Detailed infrastructure points	we have added ref that the guidance should be between 200-400m as best practice guidance but we cannot be explicit about the exact location of bus stops until the detailed design of bus routes has been agreed which will occur during the application stage This is similar to that at 71 and 81. It is right to target a high-level, but we can’t be too prescriptive – the proximity to bus routes will be an element of design that is considered in the balance amongst numerous other non-transport related points. In addition, the bus stop infrastructure could be defined as set out.	D1/p42/4th main bullet	D1
358	GCC	Strategic	The scale of this development means the masterplan and its SPD should be	Strategic infrastructure – broad	The SPD has sought to do this at a strategic	N/A	n/a

		Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	identifying existing and necessary new pieces of network at the outset where it meets existing formal and informal networks. This can be in terms of corridors and routes, and current barriers which could be removed to establish new or better routes. It is positive that the pedestrian/cycle links to Spring Bank and Hester's Way have been given more prominence on the plan, and in the latest iteration additional links have been identified and/or emphasised in greater detail to Primary, Secondary and College educational facilities in the wider area which is supported.	acceptance	level. As noted elsewhere in the comments there is a challenge from those respondents requesting more specific detail and those wanting less detail and greater flexibility. The SPD as drafted has sought to balance this challenge,		
359	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment further comment required in regards to linkages from Hayden Works	<p>Section 6.2, D2:</p> <p>D2 highlights the opportunity to provide new pedestrian and cycle connections to the railway station and town centre. This is supported but a commitment to providing this link should be shown on the masterplan/movement plan. Furthermore, the site sits at the apex of a corridor exhibiting the highest propensity for cycle use in the county, in terms of commuter trips and economic benefits and that is before the proposed development sites being built out. That opportunity must be capitalised upon especially as the B4063 is a key cycling corridor to Gloucester. The SPD still lacks detail of how the south western portion of the site will link into this corridor.</p> <p>The SPD also states that Fiddlers Green lane provides scope for enhanced cycle connections towards Arle Court P&R. This should instead be a firm commitment to provide dedicated links to Arle Court P&R which would allow in-bound development traffic to be captured on the periphery of the Town.</p>	<p>Ped/cycle connectivity</p> <p>Connections to Arle Court P&R (discussed above)</p>	<p>Update to masterplan/movement plan</p> <p>Interesting comment: "the site sits at the apex of a corridor exhibiting the highest propensity for cycle use in the county". Include in the SPD</p>	D2, bullet 1	yes
360	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment of support	<p>Section 6.2 – D3:</p> <p>The movement strategy has given more prominence to pedestrian and cycle movements within the development site by highlighting them over and above the vehicular based network. This priority is welcomed. The dedicated cycle links and the quiet streets cycle links are more legible and this iteration shows how the park links help to connect the built land parcels to ensure permeable, non-car based, movement. D3 states that "the shortest, quickest additional routes away from traffic will be encouraged", this is supported. The routes should be set and fixed at the masterplan stage and used to inform the building plot locations to ensure direct, desirable, useable routes.</p>	Mode prioritisation - discussed above	Support welcomed	N/A	n/a
361	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment,, potential for development to provide more than the minimum in terms of pedestrian/cycle space	<p>It is felt however, that if walking and cycling is to be truly encouraged than the facilities should reflect that objective. The SPD states minimum dimensions for segregated and/or shared facilities of 3m. This is a new development on greenfield land, so this is the perfect opportunity to provide infrastructure that isn't just providing the minimum standard. Dedicating space to sustainable travel routes that are highly visible will create infrastructure that is attractive and safe that adequately accommodates users of all experience levels. This also demonstrates to users that sustainable travel (walking/cycling) is at the forefront of personal mobility within the development. This will truly prioritise walking and cycling above other modes and ensures the hierarchy of users is maintained, in turn encouraging additional uptake.</p> <p>Sustainable transport must wholly underpin the planning of this new development.</p>	Ped/cycle infrastructure – requests an increase above minimum standards	<p>Detailed street design will come forward as detailed proposals are made – but priority for cycling provision is clear and should be retained... if anything with a reduction in the level of detail of how this should be delivered</p> <p>remove reference to 3.0 metres, and instead state that "<i>a high quality of pedestrian / cycle infrastructure will be targeted. Where possible, this should meet or exceed optimum design guidance.</i>"</p> <p>See comment 71</p>	6.2 D2, D4, 7.2 E2	Yes
362	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)-	<p><u>Section 6.2 – D4:</u></p> <p>The possible Junction 10 Improvement Scheme is stated as having a</p>	M5 Junction 10	Government announcement for M5 junction10 received 11 th March 2020	6.2 D4	Yes

		General comment, J10 development	determining role in the character of West Cheltenham. What would this character be? Should, for whatever reason, the J10 Improvements Scheme be forthcoming, what impact would that have on the character of West Cheltenham? How would this impact the way the developments layout functions? Caution should be used with the wording as the SPD suggests that the J10 improvement is a committed scheme, whereas at the time of writing GCC is awaiting the funding decision. There also does not appear to be reference to the WCTIS improvements proposed for the A40 and how the development would integrate with them or what the benefits to the development these improvements would bring.		Remove reference to the character of the site being linked to J10 Add reference to A40 improvement works		
363	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	There is also additional benefit to non-motorised users with the West Cheltenham Cycle and Walking improvement scheme. The SPD should make reference to this as well and explain how the connections between the site and externally to key destinations, such as the Railway station with new southern link connection to the A40, will actively encourage additional sustainable travel.	Ped/cycle strategy	Include reference the West Cheltenham Cycle and Walking improvement scheme, and the benefits that this will bring to the site	6.2	yes
364	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	D4 Main Street/Local Centre: The interaction between the purpose of the spine road and the local centre needs to be understood; although this iteration of the SPD has provided further details compared to the previous iteration. The spine road could be subject to high flow volumes and the local centre encourages multiple activities from a range of people; there may be high crossing demands over the spine road, which may create an unnecessary severance issue (which should not be 'designed in' at the outset). High flows will also create an intimidating environment and increases the risks of conflict. Furthermore what are the air quality implications of placing a high flow spine road in close proximity to the local centre? Therefore, there has to be understanding of the likely traffic flows along the spine road 'main street' which may be a determinant of its success. Further details have been given to as how the main street will encourage lower speeds, such as utilising short sections, frontage activity and side road junctions. The design of such facilities is still a key consideration and would help determine its success.	Spine road function	Further explanation as to how this will function, and the treatment within the centre	D4	Yes
365	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	Traditional side road junctions have the design appearance that suggests motorised vehicles have priority which often leads to conflict with pedestrians (and cyclists on shared use facilities), especially those who have already started crossing. Raised platform junctions at grade have been used to attempt to give priority to pedestrians but they often still look too 'road' dominated and issues of priority remain. This development should aim to provide continuous footways that give clear visual priority to pedestrians. Such designs have worked well in locations in Holland and studies have proven that drivers are more likely to give way to pedestrians/cyclists with this type of design arrangement. This removes the typical 'crossing place' for pedestrians and creates instead an area for which drivers have the privilege to cross. This invisible infrastructure ensures that retrofitting is not required in future. The above can be an option in areas where there is likely to be high interaction between motorised and non-motorised users. However, the start point principle should not be to provide shared use footways adjacent to arterial routes. Instead the SPD should promote well designed spaces that invite walking and cycling and a high infiltration to key centres/employment areas with enhanced penetration for Public Transport.	Highway infrastructure that prioritises non-motorised traffic	Descriptive in 7.4 Streets and Movement	7.4	Yes
366	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	The SPD for a large site like this has the advantage of being in a position to apply the DfT's 'Hierarchy of Provision' in a sophisticated way without the challenges of retrofitting soft mode provision into car centred land design. If the desire is for the main street to also play a role in influencing the character of West Cheltenham, this is the time to provide the infrastructure that clearly defines the priority. If frontage activity is to be encouraged sufficient	Spine road and mode priority	All discussed above	D4	Yes

			pedestrian space would be needed.				
367	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment,, potential for development to provide more than the minimum in terms of pedestrian/cycle space	Likewise cycle facilities should be more than just the minimum dimensions and should either be bespoke or well separated from both pedestrian and motorised transport infrastructure. No new development should be providing for shared use walk and cycle infrastructure at a level of preliminary design as dedicated links for either mode should have been identified already These types of networks are almost always retrofits. Providing the space for non-car based movements will help to create a range of activity, that sense of a street fit for multi-activities which in turn will make drivers more aware, cautious and ultimately drive slower.	Cycle infrastructure	Discussed above	D2	Yes
368	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	Section 6.2 -D5: D5 states that “if feasible, vehicle connections could be provided (into Hester’s Way/Springbank) although these would need to consider the impact of vehicle movements on existing local streets and pedestrian/cycle movements.” This would need further investigation and evidencing before it could be supported. It is felt that this may go against the principal of prioritising non-car based sustainable travel and may in fact encourage general traffic usage over short journeys and/or rat running. Should vehicle links come forward, favourable consideration would be given if these motorised vehicle links were limited to Public Transport only.	Highway infrastructure	Subject to detailed assessment at application stage No change to SPD	N/A	n/a
369	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	<u>Section 6.2 – D6:</u> Provision of ‘Safe routes to School’ is supported. However it should not need to be addressed if the principles are simply those of the proposed development. The SPD makes repeat reference to space syntax, this particularly relevant in this context. The development has the opportunity to make these provisions as part of its inherent design; not a heavily engineered measure or secondary consideration. If these requirements were also applied to all walking and cycling routes then this would be the ideal. In the absence of being able to achieve this there should be a need to ensure that any more leisure based walking routes, or green walking routes, offer the same level of convenience in terms of permeability and walking times to offer a real choice for walking / cycling adjacent to a trafficked carriageway.	General quality of ped/cycle infrastructure	No change/discussed above	N/A	n/a
370	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment on change in habit	<u>Section 6.2 – D7:</u> D7 discusses attitudes to car use and declining car ownership, particularly in young people. In addition the SPD suggests that this development allows a clear opportunity for behaviour change and that the development will positively take account of such opportunities. However, the SPD does not go into detail as to how this will be delivered and sustained in perpetuity. What remediation could be taken if the trend were to change again?	Car ownership levels	Agree, this could be drawn out further, linked to the wider climate change agenda, and the need for permanent change being brought about by central and local governments.	6.2 D7	yes
371	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment-committed mitigation to avoid on street parking should be	How will the SPD ensure there is adequate parking provision and limit the impact of additional on-street parking? Will it be reliant on travel planning measures that encourage sustainable travel? What is the contingency should demand be higher? Would there be parking management plans for the employment uses for staff and contractors? The Cyber Park is likely to draw employees from a wide range of places and their travel methods need careful consideration to avoid the issues that are occurring from similar employment in the area today. How would the flexible parking arrangements as proposed in D7 be managed? Parking demands need to be addressed in the SPD with a definite commitment. If it is not addressed sufficiently there is a high risk that	Parking demand – how do we ensure the correct level of provision?	Further justification as to what a ‘flexible approach’ really means –why it will be appropriate and how this will be demonstrated / calculated / assessed	6.2 D7	yes

		stated in the SPD	the proposed development will only repeat and worsen the local issues and pass these issues onto the new development.				
372	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	The theory and the practicality of parking management needs careful consideration of the local and wider impacts. Parking restrictions/controls often have the side effect of displacing parking elsewhere. This has been seen with parking restrictions around GCHQ resulting in additional on-street demand in the adjoining estates. Parking standards will need to consider opportunities to re-use and re-purpose any land that may not be required in the future for parking. If car ownership levels are to reduce, as a result of large scale modal shift or a change in working behaviours in the future, then the outcome will be sterile environments with predominance of unused hard standing. Therefore safeguarded parking areas or areas of land allocated for parking within the masterplans and subsequent development proposals should have a degree of land use flexibility to allow other uses should parking demand reduce. Avoidance, by future proofing, even if ultimately not needed would still constitute good design principles.	Parking demand – how do we ensure the correct level of provision?	Further justification as to what a ‘flexible approach’ really means –why it will be appropriate and how this will be demonstrated / calculated / assessed	6.2 D7	yes
373	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	Consideration should also be given to the developments proximity to the SRN at J10 and J11. This should be taken advantage of, with development land committed to providing multi-mode interchange hub’s serving the West Cheltenham development from their accesses with the A40/B4063 and A4019/B4634 Old Gloucester Road . This would capture inbound traffic on the edge of the development with dedicated sustainable infrastructure connecting directly to key destinations. This removes the need for external private vehicular based traffic to penetrate the development. In turn this will provide health and well-being benefits to in-bound users who engage in an element of active travel during the last section of their journey as well as residents of the development who benefit from improved air quality. Secure cycle hubs can then be provided at key destinations throughout the development or designed within the buildings themselves to give users reassurance that their property is safe. There are a wide range of secure cycle storage solutions such as ‘Bike Hangers’ that take can fit within the footprint of a typical parallel parking space to larger purpose built ‘hub’ structures that will complement the modern design principles that this development aims to deliver.	Proximity to SRN and suggestion of land being dedicated to a multi-modal interchange hub	Inclusion of a multi-modal interchange hub which effectively would be the car parks provided on the fringes, capturing arrivals at the point of entry, and therefore limiting the need to travel (by car) extensively through the site. We envisage that these would in effect be satellite multi-modal transport hubs – amend SPD. At multi-modal interchange hub there should be bus services stopping nearby, electric vehicle charging points, and cycle/scooter hire opportunities	D7	yes
374	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment, avoidance of parking courts where possible.	The design principles set out in Section 7 state the use of parking courts. These should avoid the issues that surround current iterations of parking courts that often have poor passive surveillance, which may encourage crime or are not conveniently located which in turn leads to on-street parking. Charging facilities will be required across the site in residential, employment and public areas for all sustainable methods of transport i.e. electric cars, e-bikes, e-scooters (should the legislation change). 3.2.22 begins to make that commitment but the use of ‘embrace’ suggests that the development would be reactive to technology. Instead a development such as this which is focused on high-quality technology and future thinking should take a more innovative or pioneering stance towards these provisions and set a high standard. The ambition set earlier by 3.2.22 has fallen away somewhat in D7 with little coverage of new vehicle technologies and initiatives and instead talks largely above private motor car parking standards with a token expression given to cycle hire hubs. Will the cycle hire scheme be limited to the cyber central area only? It should be extended site wide to provide local hubs in the individual land parcel areas as identified on the masterplan and perhaps extended to locations outside of the development area. This will encourage sustainable travel that is easy,	Technology – reactive rather than proactive	Difficult to achieve given the emerging technologies. The SPD sets the pioneering ambition. No change to SPD, however in role as Highways authority GCC are well positioned to drive this further through the Development Management process	N/A	n/a

			convenient and always on demand.				
375	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment- language change to provide a more committed approach to expectations on site	Previous comments made mention of the terms ‘should’ and ‘could’ relating to pedestrian and cycling links. This can also be extended to Public Transport. This is a new development and the SPD needs to commit within its language and, if there is a genuine desire to encourage sustainable travel, all means necessary should be provided to ensure this. In green field developments such as this it should not be an issue to commit to walking, cycling or public transport infrastructure/prioritisation/routing from the outset and these should be key considerations in any feasibility assessments rather than only provided where it is deemed feasible by developers. The SPD needs to be directive with active language that tells developers that the sustainable modes are to take a forefront in their design philosophies and feasibility testing rather than, as it is currently, sounding indecisive and not giving developers a true steer as to what this development is meant to be.	Ped/cycle infrastructure require firm commitments	Agreed – replace ‘could/should’ with ‘will’ where appropriate	Throughout SPD	yes
376	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	<p><u>Section 7 - Promoting the highest standards of design quality.</u></p> <p>“There will be a range of neighbourhoods within the area which should each have a distinctive local identity...”</p> <p>Principle E2 discusses the existing built environment and how West Cheltenham shall learn from it to create “friendly relatives of the regency character of the town centre” It needs to be made clearer if this is an just an architectural influence from the buildings itself or whether it is the whole environment including street design/function. If it is the latter this may not support the movement needs of this future development and may prejudice accessibility for all.</p>	Architecture/urban design comment	This section is about architectural quality and influence – not the street scene. Clarification added	E2	yes
377	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment	<p>It is still felt that this development should be innovative in its own right and set its own design principles that look to provide an environment that meets the expectations and needs of first occupiers whilst being advanced enough to accommodate the needs of the future as the site develops and grows. The development should highlight the cyber and/or high quality high end development potential to create a technologically advanced site that sets its own defining character as well as being environmentally conscious so as to ensure it has a sense of openness and lightness to convey the sense of free and easy movements. It should combine the best of technology and environment to create a truly sustainable, well connected, integrated and permeable place to live and work.</p> <p>Little has been said as to how the design concepts for the 4 identified areas (Fig 36) will influence and accommodate delivery of goods and services. The variety of uses proposed and the change in user demands and expectations with the advancement in home deliveries/online shopping will result in increased demands to service the retail/leisure, employment and residential areas. Servicing itself will also have different requirements but is likely to generate additional movements through the development and its management must be a key consideration for the SPD. The SPD should look for innovative approaches to the delivery of goods and services and maximise the opportunity that green technologies provide such as e-cargo bikes or other ultra low emission alternatives. The emerging Local Transport Plan PD3 – Freight document and in particular Policy PD3.5 sets the guidance the SPD can take influence from.</p>	“The SPD should look for innovative approaches to the delivery of goods and services and maximise the opportunity that green technologies provide such as e-cargo bikes or other ultra low emission alternatives”	<p>Bolster statements throughout accordingly</p> <p>Government change in approach to e bikes also explained here</p>	D7, final bullet	yes
378	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)-	The principle of capturing inbound car trips on the periphery of the development has been discussed previously in this response; however this principle can also be extended to goods/service consolidation. 80% of	Home deliveries	No change, This is a national issue which SPD cannot address specifically. See comment 378	N/A	n/a

		General comment- see emerging Local Transport Plan's Freight	deliveries in the UK fall under the term 'Home deliveries' and it is a growing culture which is likely to expand further. This brings challenges as the increase in home delivery demand increases the need for and number of LGV/HGV vehicle trips. This type of delivery also has a high failure rate which often means additional redelivery trips or recipient trips to sorting centres. The negative result is that Home deliveries are a large contributor to carbon emissions.				
379	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment- see emerging Local Transport Plan's Freight	This development, given its proximity to the SRN, has scope to pioneer last mile delivery best practice. Large HGV/LGV goods deliveries can be made to a consolidation centre on the periphery of the development with onward last mile deliveries then distributed outwards via the green technologies stated previously or delivered to collection points located conveniently by foot/cycle around the development for users to collect themselves. This removes unnecessary traffic demand and redelivery trips, reducing carbon emissions which will provide health benefits for residents of the development. Further information on last mile delivery and potential best practice is within Section 7 of the emerging Local Transport Plan's Freight document.	Last mile delivery best practice	Introduce concept of last mile delivery	6.2	yes
380	GCC	Strategic Infrastructure (Transport)- General comment- relevance of Hayden works	Section 8 – Long term phases of growth: Section 8 of the SPD briefly discusses the land further west which is currently safeguarded for further residential development. Section 8 then sets some high level objectives that echo those stated previously in the document. This land does not form part of the adopted allocation within the JCS and would need further consideration during the JCS review. Further detail is required to understand how the safeguarded land can fully integrate and connect to the development that falls within the adopted allocation and what potential ramifications may occur should the safe guarded land not come forward. This leads to the question as to whether the safeguarded land should be referred to at all in this SPD as it technically falls outside of the development plan.	Future phases of development	Greater detail in terms of how the sites are connected/what will need to change to accommodate the future phase. This section moved into appendices and updated	Sec 8	yes
381	GCC	General Comment	The site promotes itself as a cyber led development to attract creators and innovators in new and emerging cyber and tech industries. This cohort of the employment sector has a strong environmental conscience and awareness coupled with a desire to adopt and use new and emerging technologies. Therefore, the Cyber Central Garden Community should deliver exceptional sustainability and ground breaking innovation in the field of environmentalism, especially in transport where the speed of technological change is fast and exciting. Mobility as a Service (MaaS) should be embedded into the first principles of this SPD.	Technology and transport	Greater emphasis on emerging technologies, and reference of MaaS in 6.2	6.2	Yes
382	GCC	SPD 'too traditional' and car centric	The SPD, as it stands, is far too traditional and has been developed using traditional patterns and neighbourhood layouts, focusing on car-centric plots and road layouts that will prioritise the car as a mode over all others, rather than more sustainable options. In addition, there is no eye to the future in the short or long term, making the site, when built, locked in the past and with expensive retro-fitting as the only option.	Sustainable transport choices	Disagree. The SPD welcomes flexibility-particular with parking. No change proposed.	N/A	n/a
383	GCC	SPD does not allow for future proofing and newest technologies	The Government has announced the earlier date of 2035 to stop sales of petrol and diesel cars, as well as including hybrids cars. This development will be only a few years into occupation when this comes into force. Electric vehicles are going to be the dominant vehicle type and will require massive infrastructure that is easier and cheaper to install during construction. There are many new and exciting technological services being introduced, where access to a range of sustainable modes becomes available through smart phones and devices. Traditional fixed location stops, bays and hubs for shared and hired vehicles (car clubs, cycle and scooter hire) are no longer necessary	Electric vehicle infrastructure	Greater emphasis warranted – how is this being designed in, rather than having to be reactive to market? Challenging for the SPD to set this, but valid through development management negotiations. In role as Highways authority GCC are well positioned to drive this further through future planning applications.	N/A	n/a

			and access is universal across an area. The SPD does not allow for any of these already proven and planned for technologies and is far from ‘future-proofing’ itself post 2035.				
384	GCC	General comment- need to increase attractiveness of bus transport that is not faced with congestion	There needs to be a radical, innovative and exciting redesign of the site based on MaaS principles, moving single occupancy and fossil fuelled vehicles (personal and freight vehicles) to the periphery of the site; concentrating parking and deliveries on the edges that have high accessibility to road networks that are suitable to the volumes; and, focussing and prioritising internal trips by sustainable and clean modes. The reduction of motorised transport internally will mean bus trips are not faced with congestion and journey time delays, meaning they become more attractive for residents in and outside of the development. This in turn will increase patronage and hopefully drive up frequencies. If residents and those coming to the site from outside of the development are encouraged to park on the periphery and access all facilities internally by active and/or sustainable modes, it will increase the attractiveness of doing the whole journey by bus or sustainably, particularly for those areas immediately adjacent to the site.	Edge of site strategy, with internal movements minimised/highly focused on sustainable measures	Masterplan implications of movement highlighted throughout the SPD with challenge and clear ambition around modal shift Edits to add reference to interceptor car parks and technology changes	D7	yes
385	GCC	General comment	The introductory chapters clearly state the sites aspiration of ‘environmental innovation in pursuit of carbon neutrality;’ with Objectives A and D specifically identifying sustainable transport. Objective D focuses on prioritising sustainable modes and promoting modal shift. This focus is welcomed in the initial opening pages of the SPD but the document requires a stronger approach to sustainable transport (as outlined above). The SPD includes some weak or contradictory statements and missed opportunities, which GCC feel should be improved and included.	Wording to ensure that sustainability principles are addressed	Wording of SPD to be considered (avoid ‘should and ‘could’)	general	Yes
386	GCC	Lack of understanding on trip generation	There is not enough understanding of how trips generated by the site will impact on the network that will serve it and how this will be mitigated. A thorough and robust set of data, trip generations and modelling will be required; along with impact assessments for junctions and routes. There is some consideration of how the site will work with existing adjacent neighbourhoods but there is no strong guidance on how these areas will benefit and be encouraged to utilise the new development through sustainable means.	Assessment of impacts	Future applications to address No change to SPD	N/A	n/a
387	GCC	General comment	Observations have been made on the content of the SPD below, these are taken on a point by point basis; however, the points raised above should be considered Highways Development Management’s first position with regards to the whole SPD and should be used rather than tinkering with subsections and paragraphs in this iteration of the SPD.	General comment	None	N/A	n/a
388	GCC	General comment- SPD lacks an innovative vision	Overall the SPD lacks an innovative vision that sets out a new approach to developing a site fit for the future. This is a perfect site and opportunity to be visionary and approach the design more holistically to enshrine sustainability from the outset and build seamless permeability and put people and community at the heart of the neighbourhood, rather than motorised traffic.	Lack of vision and aspiration	Disagree; engagement work has informed the vision and objectives. This comment needs to be balanced against respondents who are challenging that SPD is too visionary and challenging deliverability. Clear lead in SPD preparation has been sustainability principles, modal shift and wider challenges responding to climate change emergency. SPD establishes the framework for a strategic masterplan, it will be for the Development Management process to steer the detail to which GCC as statutory consultee and Highways Authority will have	N/A	n/a

					significant influence in respect of outcomes.		
389	GCC	General comment	<p>Objective A – Embracing the highest standards of sustainability</p> <p>A3 recognises the significant contribution traffic makes to poor air quality, yet there is an absence of any firm commitment to address this and only a ‘need to consider off-site effects’. From such a strong opening statement the content of Objective A does not deliver any proposals to mitigate this. Gloucestershire’s Local Transport Plan (LTP) contains many examples of commitments that can be given; for example, Policy LTP PD0.1 – Reducing Transport Carbon Emissions and Adapting to Climate Change identifies digital connectivity, electric vehicles and behaviour change amongst others as ways to embrace sustainability.</p> <p>A5 takes the SPD further in terms of mobility and connectivity to adjacent communities. More objectives and concrete policies based on our opening position should be included to increase and prioritise sustainable modes and a neighbourhood based on innovation and MaaS from these areas.</p>	Gloucestershire’s Local Transport Plan (LTP)	Reference and consider Gloucestershire’s Local Transport Plan (LTP)	6.1	yes
390	GCC	General comment	<p>Objective B – A vibrant and diverse range of uses and activities, serving existing and new communities.</p> <p>4.1.5 States the site will be ‘an exemplar of social and environmental sustainability which provides for the educational needs of the new community, enables health and active lifestyles and where mental and physical well-being is a priority.’ This is not expanded upon throughout the rest of this objective and the contribution transport can make to active lifestyles and improved health and well-being should be included. Gloucestershire’s LTP Policy PD0.5 – Community Health and Wellbeing should provide assistance.</p>	Gloucestershire’s LTP Policy PD0.5 – Community Health and Wellbeing should provide assistance.	Gloucestershire’s LTP Policy PD0.5 – Community Health and Wellbeing should provide assistance. To be considered and referenced	6.1	Yes
391	GCC	General comment	B2 the Cyber Central Hub will be open ‘all times of the day and throughout the week’ and ‘host significant events and cultural facilities.’ These will turn the Hub into a major trip generator and therefore a commitment needs to be made in this SPD to manage travel demand and deliver mode shift to sustainable modes. Further paragraphs link the M5 junction 10 improvements to opportunities for the main axis of the site. The M5 J10 improvement is predominantly focused on motor vehicles and is therefore incongruous and contradictory to a sustainable objective. The positioning of parking hubs on the periphery of the development with the final stage to any leisure/employment hub being by sustainable modes is more appropriate.	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>M5 J10</p> <p>Parking on periphery</p>	<p>Future applications to address</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A	n/a
392	GCC	General comment	B4 identifies the need to increase residential densities, this will increase transport demand. It will also increase demand for private car ownership. A strong commitment is required that addresses this and seeks to keep private car ownership low and prioritise sustainable modes. More direction is required to prioritise reducing the need to travel rather than parking provision; working from home, neighbourhood facilities within walking distance and promoting connectivity across the site by sustainable modes only are the actions that should be mandated.	Car ownership / prioritisation of sustainable modes	<p>Discussed above See comment 387.</p> <p>SPD should not be viewed in isolation. Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan is also a key document that will be taken into account through the Development Management process.</p> <p>In addition GCC in its role as Highways Authority and statutory consultee has the opportunity to steer planning applications in the context of the strategic masterplan established by the SPD.</p>	N/A	n/a
393	GCC	General comment	<p>Objective D – An integrated and connected extension of West Cheltenham.</p> <p>The introduction includes some strong support for sustainable transport, connectivity, public transport, public transport and behaviour change. There is</p>	Concerns for those who are mobility impaired	Add context	6.1.5 and C3	yes

			no commitment to reduce private car use or vehicles using petrol or diesel (outside of buses). There is an absence throughout this chapter to ensuring mobility impaired residents and site users will be catered for in the provision and design of transport infrastructure and services. Overall , this chapter lacks a clear purpose and how design from the outset will make the neighbourhood truly sustainable and people focussed; it is worth noting the principles of architect and urban realm specialist Jan Gehl (www.gehlpeople.com) would be a good starting point.				
394	GCC	General comment	D2 the commitment to walking and cycling is welcomed; there should be a clear objective that pedestrians and cyclists will take priority in the design of highways, streets and overall block layout. To facilitate this, a Hierarchy of Streets Strategy should be required at outline planning as part of the validation documents. This should clearly identify the different types of streets in hierarchy from primary to tertiary based on the neighbourhood and clearly identifying how each will be used and how sustainable modes, including the mobility impaired, will be prioritised. From this, sensible and clear decisions can then be made on additional unsustainable facilities that should be last in the hierarchy of need, such as parking.	Encouraging reduced car ownership/use	Wider national/local government objectives to achieve this No change to SPD	N/A	n/a
395	GCC	Suggested 20mph zone	D4 headlines that the new main street will be a ‘street for people and not a road for traffic.’ This statement lacks any substance on how this will be achieved in the supporting text. The final paragraph negates the headline’s intention by subjecting the layout by “design and capacity constraints and committing to a 30mph speed limit.” For such an innovative development promoting safe and sustainable travel choices, a site-wide 20mph zone should be the default speed for the entire site and the design constraints should be based on sustainable mode being the priority.	Spine road function and speed limits	Largely discussed above, but street character will also be accompanied with speed limit adjustments where appropriate No changes to SPD	N/A	n/a
396	GCC	General comment-suggested removal of para	D5 the principal of junction design, creating a safe and direct crossing points for pedestrians and cycles, is supported; however, this should not be excluded form the designs aspirations of J10 M5 roundabout, where the third bullet point downgrades pedestrians and cyclists for this junction. The final paragraph should be removed as it provides and opt out for all developers and allows for unlimited vehicle connections.	Junction design and mode share prioritisation	Bullet removed. Other references about the need for bus access/bus gate along this boundary in other sections.	D5	yes
397	GCC	General comment-more focus on pedestrian and cycle movement	D6 needs to specifically commit to ensuring routes to schools are direct and follow pedestrian desire lines. Space Syntax is referenced in the document; it is particularly relevant in this context. Pedestrian and cycle desire lines should take priority when designing blocks and plot layouts. At present the design priority is car dominated and purely street based. Cycling and walking permeability must not a secondary overlay; rather the designs should be led by this. This would then ensure the whole site is safe for school access, rather than focussing on routes.	Safe access to schools and pedestrian and cycle priority	These are noted in the SPD, specific access arrangements will be part of a planning application. No changes to SPD	N/A	n/a
398	GCC	General comment	D7 includes some encouraging objectives towards parking standards but these are eroded as the objective develops and throughout the latter chapters in the SPD. The inclusion of unallocated on-street parking goes against the sustainable and innovative objectives. All parking requires robust management, procedures and control mechanisms to avoid operational conflict and placing the car as the dominant mode making other modes subservient.	Parking management measures	Discussed above. Important to maintain a mix of measures	N/A	n/a
399	GCC	General comment	The support for good electric bike and car charging facilities is not ambitious for such an innovative site. There needs to be more focus on this in the objectives and a strong statement on comprehensive electric charging facilities for all users of the site, making them integral to the design of homes, parking facilities and highways. Building in a comprehensive infrastructure at	Technology ambition	To be enhanced throughout the SPD Also ref govt proposed change to legislation of e scooters	D7	yes

			this point, with all necessary facilities being laid down during the construction phase will make electric vehicles more attractive for new residents.				
400	GCC	General comment	A cycle hire scheme and parking will be provided, this is welcomed but a more wide reaching strategy that covers the whole site is required. Cycling and walking should be at the heart of transport in the Cyber Central Garden Village; to this end a commitment should be made in the SPD for a site wide cycling and walking strategy to be included at outline planning stage. This should cover every aspect of cycling and walking infrastructure, marketing, design and provision.	Site wide strategy for walking and cycling	To be added in ref To be added as linked doc to assessment matrix?	9.1.6 and 9.2	yes
401	GCC	General comment-robust parking strategy required	D7 also states 'measures such a Controlled Parking Zones and contractor parking strategies may be required to protect the residents from impacts of new development.' Rather than 'may' this should be a definite commitment. There should be a robust and comprehensive parking strategy for the site included in the outline planning documents. This should include all phases of the development from construction to occupation; it should also cover the different uses across the site and visitors, how the parking will be allocated, designed and managed.	Parking measures – request for parking strategy	This is too much detail for a strategic level masterplan, however note that reference could be tightened up.	D7 and 9.1.6	yes
402	GCC	General comment	Objective E – Promoting the highest standards of design E3 includes a statement on urban design guidance (7.3.2) that includes a number of elements such as streets, movement and public realm; it would be advisable to include routing and desire lines as part of the urban design principals. Too often design at outline and reserved matters stages neglects routing and desire lines for pedestrians and cyclists as a first principal and adds it after block patterns are set. This results in blocks and parcels of land being developed in isolation and routes being created that are not the shortest, well connected or most attractive. This creates issues when occupied and reduces mode shift. At the heart of the site, pedestrian and cycle routes need to be embedded and protected so that as land is designed around these routes from the very beginning when block and building layouts are created.	Desire lines and routes for pedestrians	Site layout would be considered in detail at application stage, No change to SPD.	N/A	n/a
403	GCC	General comment	Place 1: Cyber Central Hub Streets and movement point 3. The multi-storey car park that is proposed needs to be carefully considered at design stage and must include effective management and controls. It would be preferable to site any parking on the periphery, closest to points of best access. The final journey stage would then be by sustainable modes. This will ensure the site is putting people and sustainability ahead of cars. All parking must be covered by a site-wide parking strategy at outline stage, any car park would require an individual set of policies on it design, accessibility and how it will promote reduced car use (e.g. priority spaces for car sharing) and sustainability (e.g. electric charging points). Point 4 identifies bus stops and services, this states 'a pull-in area will allow people to be dropped at the most convenient location...' This will need to be considered carefully and in conjunction with the County Council and operators. If the site is designed to remove as much car and motorised vehicle traffic as possible, pull-ins would not be necessary and bus journey times and reliability would be improved. All bus stops should have designs that ensure conflicts with cyclists are managed. This point needs to include details of how the design of stops and facilities will cater for mobility impairments, for example high level kerbs for wheelchair access at grade on to buses.	Parking strategy Bus stop infrastructure	Noted above- Assessment would be considered at application stage. No change to SPD.	N/A	n/a
404	GCC	Parking for all uses needs to be considered in the SPD	Land uses and activities – point 13. This includes provision for hotels, these have high parking demand for private cars and coaches. This needs to be considered and included in the parking strategy mentioned earlier.	Parking Management	The detail of this would be assessed at the application stage. Agree inclusion of a requirement for a parking strategy would be helpful. Add and link to assessment matrix	D7 and 9.1.6	yes
405	GCC	General	The residential areas are to be higher density; this will mean a higher demand	Parking Management	See comment 403 and 404	D7 and	yes

		comment-submission of parking strategy at outline stage preferable	for parking in a more restricted space. Adequate controls and measures to reduce car ownership need to be considered, as detailed earlier, plus how adjoining neighbourhoods within the site and adjacent to it will be protected from potential overflow parking. This again should be included in a parking strategy submitted at outline planning stage.			9.1.6	
406	GCC	General comment	It is also worth noting at this stage, delivery and servicing is not mentioned to any relevant level throughout the SPD. This is a serious omission and needs to be addressed. Deliveries and servicing will account for many trips generated by all uses in the development area. Employment, retail, leisure and residential premises all generate trips that will need to be managed. The employment, retail and leisure sites will each have different demands and utilise different vehicles. Their requirements need careful consideration at outline stage to ensure routing, timing and service yards are appropriately designed.	Deliveries and servicing	Would be considered in detail at application stage No change to SPD	N/A	n/a
407	GCC	General comment	Delivery and servicing vehicles can be the highest polluting vehicles on the road and also HGVs and LGVs are disproportionately involved in road safety collisions with cyclists. An innovative approach to deliveries needs to be designed at the outline stage; for example, a consolidation centre on the periphery and the use of electric smaller shuttle vans to the final destination. These have been successful in a number of locations and are best for areas with defined boundaries, such as these. Business should be required through Travel Plans to use the consolidation facility.	Deliveries and servicing	Would be considered in detail at application stage No change to SPD	N/A	n/a
408	GCC	General comment	The fast growth in online shopping and home deliveries is creating a huge increase in trips in residential neighbourhoods increasing congestion, parking stress and reducing air quality. This is exacerbated by missed deliveries, some online shopping deliveries are generating up to 3 deliveries for one item. This needs to be accounted for in the design of residential properties and in the provision of neighbourhood facilities. Homes should be designed to accommodate deliveries when out and/or a network of collection points and lockers provided. If the site is to be truly innovative, and sustainability will be at its centre, then delivery and servicing must be included as a guiding strategy at outline stage.	Deliveries and servicing	Would be considered in detail at application stage No change to SPD	N/A	n/a
409	GCC	General comment	Place 2 – Old Gloucester Road neighbourhood. Throughout this section, there is consideration given to the neighbourhood having an intimate scale, a home-zone feel, providing play space, connectivity for cycling and walking, on-street parking, on-plot parking and shared space. This is a lot of conflicting uses to design into a neighbourhood and without a strong strategy in place at outline planning stage there could confusion and a weakening of the design. If a hierarchy of streets strategy and a parking strategy are required and delivered at the outline planning stage, combined with a parking strategy, this will ensure clarity and good practice will be implemented at the reserved matters design stage.	Street hierarchy	Comments noted, but detail goes beyond strategic masterplanning and needs to be addressed through development management process.	N/A	n/a
410	GCC	General comment	Place 3 – Main Street neighbourhood The same concerns that exist for Place 2 exist here. The conflict between sustainability, cycling and walking and parking are more pronounced here due to the inclusion of employment premises. This strengthens the need for effective parking and street hierarchy strategies.	Street character and parking strategies	Agree that careful design of streets is required, this is addressed in the SPD	N/A	n/a

411	GCC	General comment	<p>9.1.4 Validation Checklist</p> <p>There is no mention of a transport assessment in the validation checklist. In addition to the transport assessment the following documents should be included with the outline application separate to the transport assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive transport assessment with due regard to trip generation and impacts on the existing networks and junctions • Hierarchy of streets strategy • Parking strategy • Delivery and servicing strategy • Cycle and walking strategy • Travel planning strategy <p>These strategies should cover the site for all uses and all stages of development. They should inform the design and layout of the outline application and take a primary role in design of all subsequent plots, with reference made to these strategies in the reserved matters applications.</p>	Validation list transport	Add ref if not already	9.1.6	yes
412	GCC	General comment	<p>The SPD requires strengthening throughout for transport related topics. There are many areas throughout that identify or show conflict between use class, road safety, parking provision, sustainability and accessibility with no resolution. The SPD needs to inform development but it also needs to secure a set of transport requirements that must be included at the outline stage. At the very least the documents identified in this document and summarised in the commentary on the Validation Checklist section should be included; these should be additional to the transport assessment site wide and cover all phases from construction to occupation.</p>	<p>General – more detail needed for transport strategy</p> <p>Identify transport documentation</p>	<p>As demonstrated through the comments received from respondents there is a challenge from those wishing greater control and those which are looking for greater flexibility. The SPD has been drafted as a strategic masterplan framework, so we have tried to balance these demands. Review of validation checklist will be undertaken to include relevant references, however it should be borne in mind that the SPD is not replacing wider Government advice/local strategies e.g. NPPF and Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p>	N/A	n/a
413	Conservation Specialist Tewkesbury Borough Council	Heritage	<p>There are a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets within Tewkesbury District whose setting may be affected by the proposal. These particularly include Grade II Listed Hayden Farm House and Barn on Hayden Lane and Orchard House (non-designated heritage asset) on the junction of Hayden Lane and the B4634. Although this area is indicatively allocated for green space there remains pressure for piecemeal development that would affect the character of this area and the setting of the heritage assets. Unfortunately the draft SPD does not appear to make any mention of safeguarding the character of heritage assets through layout and design where appropriate.</p> <p>I am also unclear whether there is a potential for the development to affect the setting of more distant heritage assets in the borough such as The Moat House (a scheduled monument) and associated building and structures and listed buildings along Withybridge Lane. The SPD should acknowledge that due consideration will be taken of this factor as a material consideration.</p> <p>SUMMARY: The SPD should at least mention that Heritage Assets will be acknowledged and respected by this development. This would be required under Section 16 of the NPPF.</p>	Improved acknowledgement of existing heritage assets	<p>Heritage assets are included within the appendix of the report.</p> <p>Add text to E2: Heritage Assets will be acknowledged and respected by this development.</p>	E2	yes

Table 2

VISION AND OBJECTIVES: If there's anything else you feel is missing from the vision, please state:				
Comment No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed change	Page/Figure Ref
414.	education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education provision 	<p>Primary School provision is proposed on site, planning applications will be subject to legal obligations to provide contributions when required to secondary school spaces/ other educational needs where identified.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	NA
415.	No change to SPD good but I think there should be emphasis on green space and on creating an environment that is pleasant to. No change to SPD at and a pleasure to be in through tree; wide roads; attractive housing etc. All excellent for wellbeing and enhance employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verges and green spaces along roads would be supported 	<p>We note your comments, the SPD puts a strong emphasis on green space</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
416.	Saving the rare ridge and furrow wild flower meadow with rare plants and insects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildflower meadow 	<p>Ecological and landscape enhancement (including wild flower provision) is an objective set out in the existing SPD. Habitats/ biodiversity provision on site as existing will have to be significantly improved before a planning application could be approved on the site.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
417.	Young people inspiration and development program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities for young people 	<p>We note your comments however this is outside the scope of the SPD. This could form part of the development strategy or could potentially be a condition as part of a planning application. Point to be picked up at application stage,</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
418.	Low traffic neighbourhood - chance to try something different	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low traffic neighbourhood supported 	<p>This is an aspiration of the SPD as existing- We note your comments.</p> <p>No change proposed</p>	N/A
419.	significant parking places for the jobs that will be located there	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking on site 	<p>Parking provision is noted in the SPD this can be seen on page 47and will be subject to consideration at planning application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
420.	The biggest problem as a resident of the area is the increased traffic/parking on Fiddlers Green and the surrounding area. Surely this is bad enough thanks to GCHQ. Our small estate regularly loNo change to SPDs like a public car park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic concerns for existing network 	<p>Noted, will need to be considered at application stage</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
421.	This will draw more traffic from across the town and more people living there will want to drive into town there must be a ring road to take traffic around the town a bypass from junction 11 to junction 9 which allows through traffic to bypass kingsditch Swindon Road Gloucester Road Evesham Road this road was cancelled in the 90s also parking for workers in GCHQ and cyber park with improved cycle paths and bus roots also all houses and buildings have solar panels carbon neutral design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic concerns for existing network 	<p>We note your comments however this level of detail is outside the scope of the SPD and will be considered at application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
422.	MORE EMPHASIS ON PARKING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking 	<p>Parking provision is noted in the SPD this can be seen on page 47and will be subject to consideration at planning application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
423.	Common sense		Noted	N/A
424.	Little thought given to the existing residents living in and around fiddlers Green who are suffering with GCHQ parking. Councillor, police, and Cheltenham Council area all turning a blind eye to this problem and allowing this the happen. Maybe a call to central news might help!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing traffic issues 	<p>Parking and highways considerations would be considered at application stage. In preparing the SPD the amenity of existing residents has been fully considered</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
425.	some additional ideas on this pdf link: https://www.thehaguesecuritydelta.com/images/pdfs/140114_HSD_Campus.pdf		Noted	N/A
426.	Indication on where the local services will sit in the new development (i.e. doctors' surgeries, schools...)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local facilities and services 	<p>We note your comments, services and facilities will be located in the most accessible areas of the development to ensure easy access for as many people as possible. However this detail will not be set until planning application stage.</p>	N/A

			<p>There is full engagement with the appropriate services providers and this has informed this SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	
427.	We need a south bound junction on to the M5 at Piffs Elm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M5 junction upgrades 	<p>Update SPD following government announcement via the 2020 budget (11th March 2020) of the upgrade to M5 Junction 10 through the homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund, with the works anticipated for completion by 2024, these works support the JCS strategic allocations at North West and West Cheltenham.</p>	1.1.6 -
428.	Affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing 	<p>A minimum of 35% affordable housing (in line with policy A7) will be provided on site- the exact number of Affordable Homes will be considered at application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
429.	The promised remodelling of M5 junction 10 to allow full access in both directions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M5 junction upgrades 	<p>Update SPD following funding agreement on M5 junction 10. Update SPD following government announcement via the 2020 budget (11th March 2020) of the upgrade to M5 Junction 10 through the homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund, with the works anticipated for completion by 2024, these works support the JCS strategic allocations at North West and West Cheltenham.</p>	1.1.6 -
430.	How are the surrounding roads going to cope with all the extra traffic when they are already at standstill?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion on existing roads 	<p>Highways considerations would be considered at application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
431.	There seem to one an incredible lack of thought and consideration for local residents, particularly those that are close to the cyber high density part of the plan. This should change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design/layout of proposals 	<p>The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, and designs development that is deliverable around existing constraints on site. We understand your concerns, and want to reassure you that the amenity of existing residents is an important consideration when designing the masterplan. The masterplan is not fixed however, it is important to locate housing in those areas which are most accessible to services and facilities.</p> <p>Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.</p> <p>Avoid use of jargon and ‘efficient use of land’.</p>	P56/57
432.	Traffic around GCHQ is already awful, this will make it far, far worse. I appreciate people need houses and wonder if there are affordable home allocations as well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing congestion Affordable housing 	<p>A minimum of 35% affordable housing (in line with policy A7) will be provided on site- the exact number of Affordable Homes will be considered at application stage.</p> <p>Highways will be considered at application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
433.	Safety of existing residents on the B4634	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety on the Old Gloucester Road 	<p>Off- site highways improvements (such as the Old Gloucester Road) would need to be considered at application stage, contributions will be sought from developers to improve highway safety.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
434.	Impact on local residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction impact? 	<p>A construction management plan would also form part of any planning application/condition requirement (which would control access and delivery routes, timing for works on site and deliveries, dust and noise management)- which would need to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before construction can begin on site.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
435.	Safety of existing residents on the B4634 and consideration to existing rural/traditional business that provides a service to others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety on the Old Gloucester Road 	<p>Off- site highways improvements (such as the Old Gloucester Road) would need to be considered at application stage, contributions will be sought from developers to improve highway safety.</p> <p>Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify</p>	N/A

			where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.	
			No change to SPD	
436.	Why are cycle links and bus improvements only proposed when roads are set? If this is to be sustainable, active travel modes need to take precedent as per the transport mode hierarchy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable transport encouragement 	<p>Roads will need to be designed in a manner that allows for all modes of sustainable transport, cycle and pedestrian links, as well as bus lands for example will need to be easily accessible/ easy to use to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>There are opportunities for ped/cycle links outlined on the masterplan..page 42...Ped cycle and bus movement is put first in line with planning policy and best practice. Please see also Connecting Cheltenham https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/download/1747/connecting_cheltenham that will be used to influence future applications and establishes a clear transport mode hierarchy.</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
437.	Though I approve of the architecture, I cannot see ,Cyber Central, working. It would only serve to increase congestion across Cheltenham, at a great expense to the taxpayer. Furthermore, if a company has the option to set up in Bristol, Birmingham, Manchester, or indeed, London, where the new National Cyber Security Centre is located, why would they choose Cheltenham? The money ringfenced for this project should be used to expand existing infrastructure within Cheltenham, and gentrify areas such as Hesters Way.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why Cheltenham for Cyber Central? Congestion concerns Support for design-comment welcomed 	<p>Cheltenham is a well-connected, central location within what is described as the 'Cyber Valley'- Cyber Central provides an opportunity for Cheltenham to be placed on the map and seen as an option alongside large cities such as London and Birmingham- High quality facilities and a flag ship development in Cyber Central will bring people to Cheltenham for something more than just another office space. The location of West Cheltenham as a strategic employment location with a focus on cyber was tested through the JCS.</p> <p>The funding drawn from Government for the West Cheltenham garden community is specific to this location and is not transferable to other projects across Cheltenham.</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
438.	Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable homes 	<p>A minimum of 35% affordable housing (in line with policy A7) will be provided on site- the exact number of Affordable Homes will be considered at application stage.</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
439.	This is a major land use change which will have regional implications for trip generation and attraction (for example between the Park and Bishops Cleeve). There is no consideration given to the impact of this land use change for example via Land Use Transportation planning, on the surrounding area so the proposal is naive in the extreme and should not proceed without such analysis and measures to mitigate the impact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion on existing roads 	<p>Land use is already set by JCS. JCS included transport considerations in its site selection. Any planning application submitted for the site would be subject to a Transport Assessment and transport modelling.</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
440.	More emphasis on creating healthy, sustainable communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and sustainability 	<p>Noted in existing SPD</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
441.	CPRE Gloucestershire strongly supports all the objectives set out in the draft SPD, which collectively aim at providing a sustainable, well-integrated, environmentally-friendly, carbon neutral, well-connected and well-designed community. The main challenge, as we see it will be in realising these objectives in a real-world situation. It is vital for the success of West Cheltenham that the objectives are fully met and are not subject to compromise. This will require the setting of clearly articulated and enforceable standards, sustained and adequate funding and rigorous monitoring and enforcement at every stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green standards should be monitored and enforced- Positive comment welcomes 	<p>A planning application would be assessed against the principles of the SPD, and would need to meet a number of these aspirations in order for planning permission to be granted. The SPD, once approved will be considered as a material consideration in any future decision making on planning applications.</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
442.	I like the proposals overall but would like to see more wild spaces & use of water.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principles supported-comment welcomed 	<p>Aspirations for a variety of types of green spaces are noted in the SPD and sustainable drainage.</p>	N/A
			No change to SPD	
443.	High density use is too close to existing homes. High density use would be best placed in the North closer to the motorway and the promised junction 120 upgrade.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tall buildings/density concerns 	<p>The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, and designs development that is deliverable around existing constraints on site. We note your concerns, however high density is best placed close to existing and proposed facilities and links into the town centre. Amenity of existing residents is an important consideration when designing the masterplan</p>	P56/57

			Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.	
444.	This development should not be allowed to proceed until the improvements to M5 junction 10 have had the green light AND a definitive plan drawn up as to when/how the improvements will be delivered. The employees for the proposed Cyber Park will significantly increase traffic from junction 10 but there is no plan as to how that traffic will be routed to the cyber park. How will it cross the Old Gloucester Road without causing huge morning/evening queues? How will the traffic get through the development to the Cyber Park on the opposite side? Your plan clearly states that the "main street" connection between Telstar Way and Old Gloucester Road should not be viewed as a direct route, so how exactly is the traffic from Junction 10 going to get to the cyber park? Seemingly by using the already over-stretched local roads or "rat runs" such as Hayden Lane. Just once it would be nice to see some evidence of "joined up thinking", rather than lets just go ahead, build it and hope the traffic problems it creates aren't too bad.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up front infrastructure delivery is key- general comment 	<p>The delivery of J10 is beyond the control of this SPD. The SPD seeks to minimise car through trips.</p> <p>Update SPD following government announcement via the 2020 budget (11th March 2020) of the upgrade to M5 Junction 10 through the homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund, with the works anticipated for completion by 2024, these works support the JCS strategic allocations at North West and West Cheltenham</p>	1.1.6 -
445.	The consultation is full of ,motherhood and apple pie,, excellent ideas that cannot be faulted but which contain little detail on actual implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good ideas, concerns regarding delivery 	<p>Future applications will be required to identify a clear delivery plan.- A planning application would be assessed against the principles of the SPD, and would need to meet a number of these aspirations in order for planning permission to be granted.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
446.	More emphasis on improved access that does not require existing , overstretched roads such as Telstar way and FGL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing highways concerns 	<p>Any planning application submitted for the site would be subject to a Transport Assessment and transport modelling.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
447.	Integration of existing with new	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration 	<p>These principles are set out in the SPD, physical connectively is also a key part of this- as noted in the SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
VISION AND OBJECTIVES: Do you feel that anything is missing from these strategies?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
448.	what is the plan for schools and education?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education 	Primary School(s) will be provided on site, as seen on the illustrative masterplan in the SPD.	N/A
449.	Make sure there are public facilities available e.g. GP surgery, school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities such as GP surgeries 	<p>Primary School provision is proposed on site, planning applications will be subject to legal obligations to provide contributions when required to secondary school spaces/ other educational needs/public facilities where identified.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
450.	How can Fiddlers Green Lane be deemed suitable for all this extra traffic and what about pollution? How can the fact be ignored that all the fields the other side of the road (when they built GCHQ) have been completed destroyed and now the same is going to be done the other side of the road. What about the Wildlife? There will be no green space left. Conveniently being ignored is the fact that there's a rare ridge and furrow meadow with rare plants and insects (as confirmed by Gloucestershire Wildlife), & this is going to be forgotten & just built over, after it was saved from being so. What about all the hell (again) to the residents. I had 6 years of hell from the building of GCHQ and houses and now we have to put up with more, which caused permanent illness along with deafness. So...who is going to buy my house so I don't have to go through another lot of hell at my age (when I just want to live the rest of my life in peace.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction disruption Traffic congestion Ecological loss 	<p>Any planning application submitted for the site would be subject to a Transport Assessment and transport modelling- the SPD also highlights the potential for alternative modes of transport other than the private car including priority for cyclists, pedestrian and public transport. A construction management plan would also form part of any planning application/condition requirement (which would control access and delivery routes, timing for works on site and deliveries, dust and noise management)- which would need to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before construction can begin on site.</p> <p>Sustainability and the provision of green infrastructure are at the heart of the key principles set out in the SPD, ecological and landscape enhancement (including wild flower provision) is an objective set out in the existing SPD. Habitats/ biodiversity provision on site as existing will have to be significantly improved before a planning application could be approved on the site. Green spaces will also become publically assessable for enjoyment.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
451.	Protect the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental protection 	Sustainability and the provision of green infrastructure are at the heart of the key principles set out in the SPD, ecological and landscape enhancement (including wild	N/A

			flower provision) is an objective set out in the existing SPD. Habitats/ biodiversity provision on site as existing will have to be significantly improved before a planning application could be approved on the site. Green spaces will also become publically assessable for enjoyment.	
			No change to SPD	
452.	Although there is some ethos around sustainability, this is a chance to create something really special in Cheltenham, and an exemplar for Gloucestershire. I would hope that the vision would blend together the low-car need planning that is being demonstrated for the Perry Barr Commonwealth Games village, the best of a ,mini-holland, neighbourhood in London that puts pedestrians and play above vehicle traffic, and the kind of sustainable design as recognised Goldsmith street Stirling prize winning housing in Norfolk. This is a chance to set a new standard in affordable and accessible urban living. Theres also the chance to recognise that such a neighbourhood would have tremendous economic benefit, creating the conditions to attract a workforce with world leading skills, and giving the fuel that is needed to create a global impacting cyber community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic benefit Affordable Housing Provision General comments of support 	<p>Comments welcomed- Some of these case studies have been considered and these comments reflect the aspirations of the SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
453.	significant parking places for the jobs that will be located there	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking for commercial 	<p>Parking will be provided on site, for example multi-storey car parking is encouraged for the commercial element of the south of the site. Specific parking requirements will form part of a planning application for development on site, of which would also be subject to a transport assessment, and possibly a car park management strategy.</p> <p>Add reference to a requirement for a Car Park Management Plan to be provided for any commercial/ mixed used application.</p>	At page 56 and 82
454.	Traffic management is not up to standard changes to A40 and junction 10 not good enough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion on existing road links 	<p>Any planning application submitted for the site would be subject to a Transport Assessment and transport modelling- the SPD also highlights the potential for alternative modes of transport other than the private car including priority for cyclists, pedestrian and public transport. Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
455.	Replace the pedestrian/cycle connection, from the central hub to the B4063 with vehicular access .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular access to B4063 	<p>The boundary for the site runs along Pheasant Lane to the south, as existing this is a very narrow country land with limited access. The SPD highlights the potential for alternative modes of transport other than the private car including priority for cyclists, pedestrian and public transport; this forms a key objective for any future development on the site.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
456.	This, good people of Cheltenham is brought you courtesy of the hapless crew who spent –£1.8 million on the 'Boots Corner' experiment, which for eighteen months increased pollution levels for local residents, caused traffic chaos resulting in thousands of fines for traffic violations, flogged off the cast-iron pigeons and replaced the grass with plastic sheet and went kicking and screaming defending the debacle until common sense prevailed and the 'experiment' was abandoned. Further, they forgot and announced its cancellation before removing the prohibition signage, causing more confusion and chaos. This, from local authority who cannot afford to keep the Promenade clean or maintained or fill the countless potholes in our roads. If ever there was an example of modern-day 'The Emperor,s New Clothes' this is it. Let's first try to guess what this vision of a ,Cyber Central Cluster, has cost us thus far. CBC have borrowed –£37.5 million pounds and bought a section of precious green belt land on which to build an Industrial and Housing Estate, which the public are now being asked for its blessing! The loans are from other Councils around the country and begs the question as to why other councils can afford to loan cash and CBC need to borrow. Could it be anything to do with the fact that they don,t spend ratepayers hard earned money on barmy schemes like this? The reports, research, plans, meetings, consultant,s fees etc. must have cost a small fortune, for which again we have been asked to give our retrospective blessing. And what do we learn by wading through	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landownership Principles of the allocated land Integration with the existing community 	<p>The purpose of this SPD is to provide development that goes above and beyond any 'average' development proposals. This SPD is being led by Cheltenham Borough Council and Tewksbury Borough Council to set a series of standards and objectives of which any developer will need to address in order for planning permission to be granted on site.</p> <p>By owning some of the developable land, Cheltenham Borough Council have an advantage; they can ensure that any developer meets the highest of standards in accordance with this SPD to delivery facilities for both the existing communities at West Cheltenham, as well as any new residents on the site.</p> <p>The principle of development for homes and employment use is accepted (and forms part of an allocation in the adopted JCS)- this SPD therefore goes one step further to identify how these homes and employment facilities can be delivered sustainably, and how they can be delivered to the highest of qualities, with ecological, and environmental benefit, along with health and wellbeing of existing and future residents of West Cheltenham being at the forefront of these objectives.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A

	<p>the endless gobbledigoNo change to SPD, local government speak and politically correct claptrap, that a 'Risk Assessment' has been carried out and the result is a score of 4,4,16. Presumably we can all sleep well now! We should all be aware that the whole concept of a 'Cyber Central Cluster' (this has morphed into this title from plain ,Cyber Centre, as I guess it contains more words) came in a 'vision'. I,m not sure who's vision but don't loNo change to SPD for a burning bush outside the Municipal Offices as it is more likely to have been experienced by the property men in a local wine bar. This vision promises the chosen few who will ,work, live and play, in this Utopia, that they will all be 'vibrant', 'pioneers', and ,digitally, physically and culturally integrated. What this means is, like much of the report, anyone,s guess. One has to assume that tests will be introduced to assess the vibrancy, digital ability or level of pioneering bent of would-be residents or employees in order that they may inhabit this Wonderland and those failing automatically excluded in order to meet the criteria for inclusion. Further, apparently the Cyber-people will be physically and mentally fitter and will in this ,diverse and vibrant neighbourhood, be able to participate in ,activities throughout the day and into the evening, organised on the ,landscaped hard-standings, to ,animate the public realm,. And by-the-way, a ,transformational development will ensure a strong community,. Social Engineering claptrap at its best. Much is focussed on the proximity to GCHQ and the apparent need for ,high tech, and ,Cyber, business to be close by. Why, goodness only knows. If close proximity was an absolute requirement it follows that unless a business could pop round to its principle customers for a quick chat, it was doomed to failure. Modern information processing, communications technology and software development is the very antithesis of that. One can effectively communicate with even basic a ,smart phone, almost anywhere in the world, process data and powerful computers do so even more effectively. Indeed the trend, especially in ,IT, circles is to work from home, which provides obvious benefits both in terms of costs and significant reduction in the paraphernalia required to get a person to a workplace 40 odd weeks a year notwithstanding the need to provide yet more land to be concreted over. Add to this video conferencing and the case for clustering around GCHQ collapses. Nowhere in the report is mention made of who or what companies will be filling the commercial buildings. It is as far as I can see, a fond hope or ambition rather than a reality. And what happens, if as I suspect, only a handful of companies take up occupation. Will they throw the Cyber Centre, open to anyone who will pay the rent and rates. A reclamation yard, abattoir or chemical works, perhaps? Or would the ,exemplar, accommodation lay empty? Would less profitable businesses who couldn,t afford the undoubtedly high occupancy costs be subsidised by the ratepayer in order to cover the cost of keeping this fun-palace going? I am not a dinosaur, change for the good is essential and inevitable if we are to continue to prosper and keep pace in this world. It is highly significant that no business plan has been produced but the go ahead for a –£750 million programme has been put in train. Among the thousands of words, charts, tables, and pictures offered to sell this to us, there is not a single indication of what financial benefits will accrue and importantly where the money (other than loans) is coming from. If this report, that stands before us was to be offered as a justification to a private company for even a far more modest investment, it would never see the light of day. Being positive, there is nothing to be lost and everything to be gained by encouraging new and profitable businesses to Cheltenham, as well as more housing accommodation but the report fails to examine if there are other, far more cost-effective ways of doing so. There is an abundance of empty commercial properties scattered about Gloucestershire that could be refurbished or upgraded to make them more attractive to ,high tech, firms. There is also, so called brown field land also just waiting for development. Try as I might I cannot establish how many, if any at all, companies have signed up to move to or start up a business at the Cyber Centre. My guess is none. The report says ,West Cheltenham’s close proximity to the M5 is currently undermined by its relatively poor accessibility to the national road network. J10 and 11 are minutes away and even J9 and J11A relatively close. Once on the M5 its all points North & South with the M40, M50 and M6 all well within an hour,s drive. So more misinformation. I won,t mention the proximity of the Hayden Sewage Works or the cordon sanitaire that lays beneath the site, both that will needed to be re-located at, if records of similar moves</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>have reported, a cost well above –£100,000,000.00 but thats just money, so best left a grey area!</p> <p>If you, re thinking about popping along the , drop in, centres, for the , consultation of something thats going to happen regardless of what the Ratepayers think, please do, but although the representatives are charming and very attentive, don't expect to get any sensible answers as they are being asked to defend the indefensible.</p>			
457.	<p>Clarity on the impact of this development for existing residents of houses surrounding this. How far away will the new houses be from the existing ones? How are you going to create the new footpaths into the existing neighbourhoods? How many new houses are you expecting to build on this site?</p> <p>Where are the doctors surgeries and schools going to go or are the existing services expected to absorb this?</p> <p>There also needs to be a massive consideration for parking. Make sure there is enough parking for future needs as companies expand there as local residents don't want to be impacted by their roads turning into car parks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity to existing homes Proximity of buildings to existing homes Facilities such as GP surgeries Parking 	<p>A minimum of 3000 homes across the entire site. The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, and designs development that is deliverable around existing constraints on site.</p> <p>Connectively for sustainable transport, pedestrian and cyclists will enable sustainable modes of transport connection to and from existing communities at West Cheltenham also forms an objective of the SPD.</p> <p>Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
458.	<p>Planning only seems to focus on the immediate environment instead of offering a more holistic approach. Only by seeing the bigger picture can you appreciate the issues that development across the region brings to the landscape. The loss of our natural flood meadows and biodiversity is criminal. The knock on effect will be felt by others for years to come.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wider environmental impact 	<p>The SPD seeks to acknowledge these aspirations as far as possible within the planning context.</p> <p>Update SPD to expand on biodiversity net gain requirement.</p>	P21 and 34
459.	<p>Details of infrastructure. Infrastructure should be part of the design at this stage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure delivery 	<p>Infrastructure on the site itself would be subject to a planning application, at this stage, full details would be required.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
460.	<p>Yes - consideration for existing residents. A landscape /nature buffer should be placed between existing residential areas and the new development. Especially between them and the work spaces.</p> <p>There should also be a non-negotiable limit to the height of the buildings, preferably two storeys but certainly no more than three.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building heights Green buffers 	<p>The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, and designs development that is deliverable around existing constraints on site.</p> <p>The SPD aspirations to retain existing hedgerows along the eastern boundary where possible, existing green space has also been extended.</p> <p>Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
461.	<p>Public transport and traffic issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion Public transport 	<p>A key principle of the SPD is focus on providing accessible public transport to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport- in particular, bus lanes and bus priority for example are encouraged in the SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
462.	<p>Safety on the B4634</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Old Gloucester Road highways safety 	<p>Off- site highways improvements (such as the Old Gloucester Road) would need to be considered at application stage, contributions will be sought from developers to improve highway safety.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
463.	<p>Halfway through the 'consultation' process for the development that's going to happen regardless of what we say, and I note that 0.02% of Cheltenham's population have commented on the 'Vision' and a total of 0.09% of the population has commented in total. I have not met a single person since 13 January who was aware that the plan existed, let alone that there was a consultation period underway. I bet planners are ecstatic!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principles of development and awareness 	<p>The principle of development for homes and employment use is accepted (and forms part of an allocation in the adopted Joint Spatial Strategy)- this SPD therefore goes one step further to identify how these homes and employment facilities can be delivered sustainably, and how they can be delivered to the highest of qualities, with ecological, and environmental benefit, along with health and wellbeing of existing and future</p>	N/A

			<p>residents of West Cheltenham being at the forefront of these objectives.</p> <p>The consultation process was widely publicised through the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local press, including Gloucestershire Echo and BBC radio Gloucestershire, • Through Cheltenham and Tewesbury • through key stakeholder groups such as parish councils/local councillors and neighbourhood groups/forums • through leaflet posted to all directly impacted neighbours • extensively through social media – facebook/Instagram/twitter <p>No change to SPD</p>	
464.	<p>Let's today, take an analysis of a section of the 'vision'.</p> <p>"Cyber Central will be the UK home of hi-tech innovation, nurturing an environment of creativity and collaboration. It is a place where this deep rooted pioneering culture thrives; a place where the boundaries of innovative thinking are constantly pushed. A place where bright minds and young talent co-create and want to live."</p> <p>I cannot find any evidence that Cyber Central will be the UK home of hi-tech innovation. Certainly in the so called ,Masterplan, there aren't any specifics cited. (not surprising as there are very few specifics cited in this document). I,m sure that towns currently hosting many of Britain's successful and high-tech innovative companies would hotly contest this. Further, why would a company say, with 90 employees currently in a super facility in Bracknell, with the majority of the workforce living in commuting distance, up-sticks and move to Fiddlers Green in Cheltenham?</p> <p>How can a collection of industrial units, shops, hotel, possibly a school, and an adjacent Sewage Works, nurture an environment of creativity and collaboration? Please someone, tell me how! On the issue of collaboration, I really cannot see, even if is something most companies see as necessary, and that is most doubtful, given that the aim is to attract more 'digital' companies where communication is their stock in trade, they can collaborate just as easily between Birmingham and Belfast as they can from a neighbour, 100 meters away.</p> <p>The next little gem is a place where this deep rooted pioneering culture thrives; a place where the boundaries of innovative thinking are constantly pushed". Let's remember, there will be 1000+ social houses on the site and many 'affordable dwellings'. Typically these homes are provided for the least well-off in our society. People on minimum wage, people with no incomes at all, people low on the ladder of their career. Can one in all honesty, claim that a significant number of the people the report refers to who will in truth, spend their waking time trying to survive, have the wherewithal or time to pioneer culture and push the boundaries of innovative thinking?</p> <p>Finally, (I'm almost in tears now) "A place where bright minds and young talent co-create and want to live". This really is 'Brave New World' thinking. In may have missed the authors notice, but bright minds and young talent are in short supply. It is European problem. It is comforting to know, however, that at last, this is being recognised but it will take a generation before the initiatives now in place take effect. That said, those who are available will most certainly be in highly paid jobs and would hardly be seduced to live and work on an industrial estate located in an environment outlined above.</p> <p>In closing, I'm adding new words/phrases to my ,gobbledegoNo change to SPD, lexicon. Today's word ,co-create,. Off now to co-create lunch with the wife!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cyber Central delivery and success 	<p>Cheltenham is a well-connected, central location within what is described as the 'Cyber Valley'- Cyber Central provides an opportunity for Cheltenham to be placed on the map and seen as an option alongside large cities such as London and Birmingham- High quality facilities and a flag ship development in Cyber Central will bring people to Cheltenham for something more than just another office space.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	NA
465.	<p>Question to mull over this weekend. If the lack of funds prevents CBC providing Cheltenham's 117,000 residents with a clean, well maintained town, pot-hole free roads, adequate public parking facilities, and first-class social care, how will it finance the provision of a 'world-class' 'Garden City', with 'exemplar' buildings, entertainment, superb, safe road system, electric busses, bicycles/scooters, shops, a school, 'green' landscaping and a high-tech Industrial Estate, for the 9000 or so folk who are fortunate enough to live there?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing residents and facilities 	<p>Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.</p> <p>Funding for Garden Communities is specific to the delivery of west Cheltenham, it cannot be used for other council issues or projects.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A

	Answers on a postcard please.....			
466.	<p>Why have comments made by local residents at previous drop-in sessions been ignored?</p> <p>There should be a green buffer zone between the new development and the existing residences backing on to Fiddlers Green Lane. Proposed Mid density mixed use buildings bordering Fiddlers Green Lane should be restricted to two storeys maximum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green buffer concerns 	<p>The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, and designs development that is deliverable around existing constraints on site.</p> <p>The SPD aspirations to retain existing hedgerows along the eastern boundary where possible, existing green space has also been extended.</p> <p>Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.</p>	P56/57
467.	environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment 	<p>Ecological and landscape enhancement (including wild flower provision) is an objective set out in the existing SPD. Habitats/ biodiversity provision on site as existing will have to be significantly improved before a planning application could be approved on the site.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
468.	The vision is all within the new development and does not loNo change to SPD to the immediate surroundings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surrounding area 	<p>Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.</p> <p>The specific design of the proposals will be considered at planning application stage in detail, in which the character of the local area would be a key consideration of the proposed design.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
469.	The vision does not loNo change to SPD at the immediate surroundings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surrounding area 	<p>Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.</p> <p>The specific design of the proposals will be considered at planning application stage in detail, in which the character of the local area would be a key consideration of the proposed design.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
470.	<p>Why are you developing land that doesn't need to be especially on the out skirts of town?? This seems foolish. Will these developments include the millions the town centre will need to update the increased infrastructure usage?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location of development 	<p>The principle of development for homes and employment use is accepted (and forms part of an allocation in the JCS)- this SPD therefore goes one step further to identify how these homes and employment facilities can be delivered sustainably, and how they can be delivered to the highest of qualities, with ecological, and environmental benefit, along with health and wellbeing of existing and future residents of West Cheltenham being at the forefront of these objectives.</p> <p>Detail on mitigations will come through application process</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
471.	Cost effectiveness. The cost benefit analysis undertaken prior to this, if there even was one at all, was woefully miscalculated the net benefit to society provided by ,Cyber Central.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost benefit 	<p>Comments noted, however local planning authorities consider SPD essential part of development management process to guide future development and clearly articulate ambition and quality of outcomes.</p>	N/A
472.	More affordable housing is required in Cheltenham and this should be a priority for any new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable homes 	<p>A minimum of 35% affordable housing (in line with policy A7) will be provided on site- the exact number of Affordable Homes will be considered at application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
473.	<p>Cheltenham needs affordable housing. Cheltenham doesn't need more shops, offices, hotels or leisure centres.</p> <p>Cheltenham has the biggest year-on-year increases in average house prices, with homes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable homes 	<p>The principle of development for homes and employment use is accepted (and forms part of an allocation in the adopted Joint Spatial Strategy)- this SPD therefore goes one step further to identify how these homes and employment facilities can be delivered sustainably, and how they can be delivered to the highest of qualities, with ecological,</p>	N/A

	<p>going up 13% to an average of –£313.000 in 2017, according to the Daily Mail on 2 January 2018. This is not an affordable house price for an average household.</p> <p>The home ownership rate in the U.K. was about 63% in 2015. The U.K. has one of the lowest home ownership rates in the world with many nations having over 90% home ownership rates. The U.K. desperately needs affordable housing. Cheltenham also desperately needs affordable housing.</p> <p>There are many empty shops in Cheltenham town centre, and there are already many offices, hotels and leisure places. Cheltenham does not have any shortage of these. Environmentally it is impossible to justify that the new development intends to relocate all these shops, offices, hotels, and leisure places to this new green belt development.</p> <p>The new development can only provide short term employment during the construction period. The new development will not provide long term employment and there is no need for new employment land, as the policy framework claims.</p> <p>In summary, if a new development on green belt were allowed to go ahead, then only affordable housing plus a few corner shops and one or two primary schools should be allowed to go ahead.</p>		<p>and environmental benefit, along with health and wellbeing of existing and future residents of West Cheltenham being at the forefront of these objectives.</p> <p>A minimum of 35% affordable housing (in line with policy A7) will be provided on site- the exact number of Affordable No change to SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	
474.	The proper consideration of the impact on land use changes on the local road network, and specifically through analysis of the traffic impact on StNo change to SPDe Orchard and Tredington.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic 	<p>Any planning application submitted for the site would be subject to a Transport Assessment and transport modelling- the SPD also highlights the potential for alternative modes of transport other than the private car including priority for cyclists, pedestrian and public transport. Planning applications on site with sit alongside legal obligations which will identify where potential funding/ mitigation measures are required to improve existing infrastructure as well as providing new infrastructure.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
475.	The SPD should reference the following Document: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-weight-environments-using-the-planning-system	Suggested reference	No changes to SPD, note reference for health living	N/A
476.	maybe a little more information regarding the new road structure, but aside from that this loNo change to SPDs great!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New road information Positive feedback welcomed 	<p>Infrastructure on the site itself would be subject to a planning application, at this stage, full details would be required.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
477.	Ample parking for all vehicles must be included at the outset - but with a flexible design to enable alternative uses in the future as needs and requirements change .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility Parking 	<p>Parking will be provided on site, for example multi-storey car parking is encouraged for the commercial element of the south of the site. Specific parking requirements will form part of a planning application for development on site, of which would also be subject to a transport assessment, and possibly a car park management strategy.</p> <p>The SPD amended to reference a requirement for a Car Park Management Plan to be provided for any commercial/ mixed used application.</p> <p>On-site flexible parking solutions are encouraged as part of the SPD for residential development, to provide alternative uses for car parking in the longer term which will not be required.</p>	At page 56 and 82
478.	The proposal makes a big thing about public transport but the reality is that the majority of employees at the cyber park won't be using public transport. For most "home" will not be Cheltenham but will be as far afield as Birmingham, Bristol, Oxford. Having travelled that kind of distance what they will want is a car park within walking distance of their office. The most obvious omission from the proposal is any clear statement about the provision of car parking; beyond a couple of vague sentences. Failure to properly address the issue and make sufficient parking provision will inevitable end with employees angering residents by parking in local streets; something which is already a much publicised issue in the Fiddlers Green area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking Commuting 	<p>Parking will be provided on site, for example multi-storey car parking is encouraged for the commercial element of the south of the site. Specific parking requirements will form part of a planning application for development on site, of which would also be subject to a transport assessment, and possibly a car park management strategy.</p> <p>The SPD amended to reference a requirement for a Car Park Management Plan to be provided for any commercial/ mixed used application.</p>	At page 56 and 82

479.	The opportunity to provide excellent cycle links to the minor roads in the countryside, especially e.g. so as to avoid the A4019 Tewkesbury Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle connections 	<p>The SPD is designed in a manner that allows for all modes of public transport, cycle and pedestrian links, as well as bus lands for example will need to be easily accessible/ easy to use to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes, see P42-45</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
480.	A good transport plan is needed- for building it and for access whilst in use. Telstar way and Fiddler Green Lane are already over used and there is gridlock to the A40 most days. This development will only work if new main access roads are built to the North and West and link through from the M5 North (J10) & also A40 via the B4063/ airport side.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport and existing congestion 	<p>Any planning application submitted for the site would be subject to a Transport Assessment and transport modelling- the SPD also highlights the potential for alternative modes of transport other than the private car including priority for cyclists, pedestrian and public transport.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
481.	Too much vision not enough practicalities. This high design standard comes at a cost. The cost will be to the existing local community who will suffer due to multi storey high density buildings next to 2 storey semi and detached houses. The road network needs completely redesign, not sticking plasters on an already too busy system. Community facilities will not come to fruition because of the high cost.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costing? 	<p>We note your comments and concerns, full details will be provided at planning application stage but the amenity of existing residents is an important consideration when designing the masterplan</p>	N/A

SUSTAINABILITY AND LAND USE: Are there other sustainability principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
482.	I believe it is highly important to consider the environmental impact of this project. It should not only ensure that it is environmentally sustainable, but also taken as an opportunity to improve the ecosystems in the new urban environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impact needs to be considered 	<p>This forms a main SPD principle.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
483.	Would be exciting to see a specific carbon neutral or carbon negative commitment to the construction as well as occupation of the site, using innovative materials. Potential to create civic space distinct from the town centre to host events etc. Also need to recognise this is an area underserved by faith communities. Urban growing cooperatives, and natural play spaces would compliment the plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction and achieving carbon neutral objectives Play spaces would be welcome 	<p>Re-use of materials could be considered at application stage and even be a condition requirement.</p> <p>SPD amended to strengthen this point.</p>	See A1/p18
484.	Please explicitly state that "hedgehog" highways will be included, linking residential gardens with the larger scale landscaping. The majority of roofing (regardless of building use) should have solar panels. There should be electric car charging points.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could we include hedgehog highways? 	<p>Ecology mitigation would be considered at application stage- the SPD encourages partnership with stakeholders such as Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
485.	<p>Sustainable Drainage - We are supportive of wording used throughout the document to promote sustainable drainage, manage flood risk and develop a , sponge city approach. It is vital that the management of water is undertaken through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) that can direct water back into the natural water systems and that surface water connections to foul or combined systems are avoided where possible. We are therefore supportive of the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 2.3.1 Objective A , Sustainability - measures to help manage local flood risk Paragraph 3.1.6 - numbered plan box section 1 and 3 Section A2 Paragraph 3.2.8 , minimise the risk of flooding through the incorporation of sustainable drainage measures, provision of street trees and rainwater harvesting and grey water reuse. Section A2 Paragraph 3.2.10 ,provision of blue green infrastructure. Section A2 Sponge City principles, including the retention of landscape features associated with existing drainage network such as hedgerows and trees. Paragraph 5.1.1 ,supportive of retaining existing assets such as trees and hedgerows Section C5 ,supportive of a site wide scale multifunctional surface water drainage strategy Section C6 ,supportive of tree planting and retention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SuDS supported, along with sponge city approach Recurse efficiency greatly encouraged 	<p>Suggested wording notes in comment-</p> <p><i>Amend SPD - Development proposals should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.</i></p>	C5/p37

	<p>Water Resource Efficiency - We are also supportive of the emphasis made on water resources efficiency. The increase in new development will lead to an increase in the amount of water to be supplied across the region. It is therefore vital that we reduce the amount of water used. We are supportive of new developments following sustainable techniques to reduce the demand requirement. We are therefore supportive of the following sections which focus on water resource efficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 3.1.4 Resource efficiency • Paragraph 3.1.6 numbered plan box sections 1 and 2 • Section A2 Paragraph 3.2.8 , rainwater and grey water harvesting <p>We are supportive of the use of water efficient fittings and appliances within new properties, we encourage of the optional higher water efficiency target of 110 Litres per person per day within part G of building regulations. Delivering against the optional higher target or better provides wider benefits to the water cycle and environment as a whole. This approach is not only the most sustainable but the most appropriate direction to deliver water efficiency. We therefore encourage you to include the following wording:</p> <p>Development proposals should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.</p>			
486.	No cut backs do the job properly	-	Comments noted	N/A
487.	I bet the flash electric scooters will all be nicked within 24 hours but no doubt the scheme will be sustained by holding large stocks in a world class exemplar, high-tech echo-friendly cyber storage facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding security 	Comments noted	N/A
488.	<p>This is a great opportunity to create a truly sustainable and environmentally friendly suburb that should be an outstanding example to future projects across the county and country. I really hope it delivers to expectation and that any cuts and budget restraints don't hinder this green ambition.</p> <p>I believe the plan should strongly reflect a 'garden' presence and atmosphere and the following are paramount the achieving this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High number of dense green spaces to promote wildlife and encourage plant diversity. - Green urban corridors and areas, this should aim to enable buildings and infrastructure to blend with the environment naturally. - Schemes and efficient public transport to reduce private car use within the area (congestion/pollution charges within the area etc..) - Sustainable buildings that should all include means to independently generate electricity (solar panels and small wind turbines) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make this a leading example of a green development- comment of support welcomed • Green energy should be encouraged- comments welcomed 	<p>These comments reflect the aspiration of the SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
489.	Those who are not involved with the 'Cyber World' may not know that the doyen of world-class high-tech businesses, Silicone Valley in California, USA is diminishing at a ferocious pace. It has become so expensive to operate in, what is now a highly competitive industry that companies are relocating to 'cheaper' areas. In fact the industry has been, paradoxically responsible for this demise as Silicone Valley was established in times when the internet was still relatively primitive and companies needed to coalesce but now thanks to their supreme collective efforts it, as easy to effectively communicate with the guy next door as it is with the guy 2000 miles away! Given the prime reason that a 'Cyber Park' should be built in close proximity to ,communicate' with GCHQ in Fiddler's Green, flies in the face of what is happening today. In the 19th Century businesses were built adjacent to the source of their raw materials, Steel near Coal Mines, Woollen Mills near lush sheep grazing land as transport and communications were relatively primitive. This is no longer a consideration. A Software Engineer can, and a growing number do, work just as effectively from home, as from an office in London, Madrid or New York. This trend is also heavily influenced by the growing accent on more efficient and 'greener' uses of our resources. Covering a diminishing green landscape with tons of concrete and Tarmac without due justification flies in the face of this universally accepted concern.		<p>This site is already allocated in the JCS to meet an identified housing and employment need. This document will ensure that the new housing and employment is of the highest quality.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A

	The question is folks, why are we here in Cheltenham, ignoring this and spending huge sums that we are obliged to borrow, to go ahead with a project that fails at the starting post? In truth what we will see here is yet another half-empty Industrial Estate with blocks of flats and shoe-box houses with charity shops and empty electric scooter and bicycle racks, the contents of which disappeared up the M5 in the back of white vans 12 hours after their installation.			
490.	Should include the principle of building using recycled materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could we build with recycled materials? 	<p>Re-use of materials could be considered at application stage and even be a condition requirement.</p> <p>Amend SPD to emphasise this point.</p>	See A1/p18
491.	Commitment to sustainable practices e.g. use of renewable power should be a non-negotiable pre-requisite for all firms locating to the site.		<p>This would be considered at planning application stages specifically, any application will be expected to meet the aspirations of the SPD and policy in order for planning permission to be granted.</p> <p>No changes to the SPD.</p>	No change to SPD
492.	Sadly this project has been spoilt by all the parking issues around fiddlers green that borough council, local councillors, GCHQ and police are all guilty of ignoring. The residents around this area are suffering already and the cyber centre hasn't been built yet. There are major problems in this area with parking in fiddlers green lane and all the roads leading off it. There has been no provision made for a multi storey car park or any other car park. Where do they think all the traffic is going to go!!!!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking will be an issue 	<p>Specific parking requirements will form part of a planning application for development on site, of which would also be subject to a transport assessment, and possibly a car park management strategy.</p> <p>Amend SPD to add reference a requirement for a Car Park Management Plan to be provided for any commercial/ mixed used application.</p>	Page 56 and p84
493.	No consideration to existing established rural business has been given. Those that have been working for 31 years in neighbouring properties will lose their livelihood and way of life.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing businesses 	Comments noted. This is a strategic allocation considered and approved by the JCS.	N/A
494.	Renewable energy should be a key part of any development. Solar panels should be included on all properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drive for renewable energy 	<p>Sustainable energy is encouraged as a key principle of the SPD.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
495.	<p>As the UK's leading woodland conservation charity, the Woodland Trusts vision is for a UK rich in native woods and trees, for people and wildlife. We work to protect, restore and create native woods, trees and their wildlife for the future. We manage over 1,000 sites, including over 200 across the South West, and have 500,000 members and supporters. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the West Cheltenham Strategic Masterplan SPD.</p> <p>We would recommend expanding on 3.2.6 which mentions materials, to explicitly require locally-grown, sustainable timber (UKWAS). Given the carbon intensive nature of the construction industry, policy plays an important role in steering the decarbonisation of construction. Low-carbon, sustainable materials include sustainably sourced locally grown timber which locks up carbon while supporting sustainable forestry.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of local materials where possible 	Amend SPD to encourage the use of locally sourced materials	See A1/p18
496.	CPRE Gloucestershire fully supports the Key Principles set out for Sustainability and Land Use. In particular we strongly endorse the focus on achieving the highest environmental standards as set out under Objective A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability objectives welcomed 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
497.	<p>The development must be driven by people - not profit.</p> <p>The spaces must be attractive & should include private spaces or some privacy in gardens etc.</p> <p>Wildlife should be a priority alongside people.</p> <p>I am a little concerned at the phrase "densities which make effective use of land"</p> <p>The onus should be on quality not quantity (i.e. massive developer profit).</p> <p>Of course developers should make a profit - but not at the expense of people, land & wildlife as is so often the case.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality not quantity with housing numbers 	<p>The vision for the site in the SPD includes a large area of land for green infrastructure and a mix of uses such as pay spaces, wildlife areas, allotments and community orchards. The SPD is about ensuring quality and high design standards.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A

	All alternative uses of power - ie solar panels must be explored fully			
498.	<p>If we are truly loNo change to SPDing at developing ecologically sustainable communities, we need to loNo change to SPD at the serious problem of human waste. We are in the sorry position where we combine two valuable resources, pure water and human waste, and create a horrible pollutant, sewage, which is expensive to clean up and dispose of and cannot match the quality of the starting point, and can be further polluted if run-off from highways is included. Sewage sludge is an extremely unpleasant commodity, yet it is too good to waste.</p> <p>Dr Vivian Poore in his boNo change to SPD Rural Hygiene was a pioneer of the idea of using human waste in the garden, on the allotment, or on farmers fields. Indeed, a pioneering Homecroft, site of 10 houses, based on his ideas, is to be found right next to the proposed development in Uckington. Sweden has already made some progress on collecting human waste for composting. Indeed, composting human waste is the answer, as described by Sir Albert Howard in his boNo change to SPD, Farming and Gardening for Health or Disease (1945); he put the science into composting, which is the foundation of the ,organic, method of farming, the return of the wastes of agriculture to the land from which they have come so as to increase humus, something increasingly recognised as essential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will we address waste? 	Suds and sewage will be details that come with a planning application.	N/A
499.	<p>Unless additional roads are built to the North and West of this development, existing road access is going to be yet more overstretched and gridlocked. These need to be built BEFORE construction of the site starts.</p> <p>This development will also increase traffic pollution and decrease air quality, as well as generating additional noise for local residents, and will be far worse if additional access to the North and West are not provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road infrastructure needs to be in place before development begins on site 	<p>The delivery of J10 is beyond the control of this SPD. The SPD seeks to minimise car through trips.</p> <p>Update SPD to note agreement of government funding of M5 Junction 10 - The 2020 budget (11th March 2020) announced funding of the upgrade to M5 Junction 10 through the homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund, with the works anticipated for completion by 2024, these works support the JCS strategic allocations at North West and West Cheltenham</p>	1.1.6
SUSTAINABILITY AND LAND USE: Are there other land use principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
500.	Are you going to support/make land available for local community-led housing schemes? (especially if they are green)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community led housing 	<p>The SPD encourages this as existing in terms of self and custom build- could community led schemes be encouraged (see Bristol lead on this- https://www.bristol.gov.uk/housing/community-led-housing_)</p> <p>See Page 28</p>	N/A
501.	Include elements of urban greening throughout the project. This could be in the way of urban green roofing on the public building spaces. These provide a multitude of environmental benefits for the population and biodiversity. As well as considering the need for green corridors and open green spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional green space where possible 	<p>The vision for the site in the SPD includes a large area of land for green infrastructure and a mix of uses such as pay spaces, wildlife areas, allotments and community orchards.</p> <p>No changes to SPD.</p>	N/A
502.	Need to think how education (all tiers) blends into this, creating the pipeline and providing access to employment routes for those already in Cheltenham as well as just drawing in new talent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education facilities should be a key consideration 	<p>Primary School provision is proposed on site, planning applications will be subject to legal obligations to provide contributions when required to secondary school spaces/ other educational needs where identified.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
503.	It's good to see some ponds. Ponds are important for wildlife. Please add an extra pond.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife encouragement 	Comments noted	N/A
504.	The principle that our unique landscape is only entrusted to us and we should ensure that building on precious green belt should be a last resort after and if, it can be demonstrated that other options such as 'why build it' to examining if existing empty buildings that can be refurbished, have been thoroughly examined. Come on all you would be conservationist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with building on greenfield site 	The principle of development for homes and employment use is accepted (and forms part of an allocation in the adopted Joint Spatial Strategy)- this SPD therefore goes one step further to identify how	N/A

	do something positive rather than whinge about carbon footprints!		these homes and employment facilities can be delivered sustainably, and how they can be delivered to the highest of qualities, with ecological, and environmental benefit, along with health and wellbeing of existing and future residents of West Cheltenham being at the forefront of these objectives. No changes to SPD.	
505.	There should be a commitment to 'green space'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on green spaces 	<p>The SPD aspirations to retain existing hedgerows along the eastern boundary where possible, existing green space has also been extended. Between 35-40% of the site has been shown to contribute to blue and green infrastructure within the masterplan.</p> <p>The vision for the site in the SPD includes a large area of land for green infrastructure and a mix of uses such as play spaces, wildlife areas, allotments and community orchards.</p> <p>No changes to SPD</p>	N/A
506.	Regarding land use Objective B, I am not happy with the proposed buildings adjacent to the housing at the top of Henley Road. I am led to believe that these buildings are intended to be mixed use with residential above employment, which clearly means multi-storey flats. This would be totally not in keeping with the area and why on earth would you even be considering building such a development on the high part of the land, surely the most common sense would be to build such things on the lower section of the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building height concerns 	<p>The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, and designs development that is deliverable around existing constraints on site.</p> <p>Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.</p>	P56/57
507.	Affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing provision 	<p>A minimum of 35% affordable housing (in line with policy A7) will be provided on site- the exact number of Affordable Homes will be considered at application stage.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>	N/A
508.	Land use and safety of neighbouring properties should be taken into account	-	Comments noted	N/A
509.	CPRE Gloucestershire has serious concerns about how to achieve the integrity of the new mixed community and limit commuting both out of and into it. Without the right incentives, there is distinct danger that those who decide to settle in Cyber Central have outside employment, notably in Birmingham or Bristol. Conversely, others may commute into Cyber Central from outside the area. In these circumstances, which are common elsewhere, there will be a growth in commuter travel so that much of the environmental and carbon-neutral benefit will be lost and the community could fail to thrive. This concern is repeated under Landscape and Movement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding commuting outside of the area 	<p>The planning application requirements will require robust transport assessment and travel planning.</p> <p>No change to SPD.</p>	N/A
510.	<p>PEOPLE.</p> <p>All these objectives are about people - living, working etc. It's not just about glossy pictures, it's about people & whilst that may have been thought about it doesn't sing out as a message.</p> <p>If you build little boxes people won't be happy - allow individuality & they will.</p> <p>SELF BUILD</p> <p>Are you considering Self Build spaces?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-build? 	<p>This is encouraged in the SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD.</p>	N/A
511.	<p>Landscape to put the lower buildings along the frontage e.g. FGL & Springbank area and the higher buildings further to the North and WEST.</p> <p>Trees along the o=borders would be more natural than buildings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planting encouraged along borders 	<p>The SPD allows for some flexibility; however it is designed to provide a masterplan that makes efficient use of land, sets the framework for high quality designs development that is deliverable around existing</p>	P56/57

			<p>constraints on site.</p> <p>We note your comments, building height will be fully considered at application stage as will the impact on the amenity of existing residents. It is best practice to locate higher density in the most accessible locations.</p> <p>Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.</p>	
512.	Cyber hub should be in north of site, closer to junction 10 so that all the traffic is not flowing through the site. Dumping it next to GCHQ so that 14,000 workers are all concentrated in the same area is a huge error and will cause misery for existing residents of west Cheltenham. New developments should never be at the expense of existing communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial should be to the north Traffic concerns 	No change to SPD. The removal of a through route for cars is already being promoted through the SPD. The SPD also includes a long list of urban growing ideas to be considered at application stage.	N/A

LANDSCAPE AND MOVEMENT: Are there other landscape principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?				
N o.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
	It's a great opportunity to build a natural environment on a par with the best in Cheltenham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to build on natural environment 	No change to SPD	No change to SPD
	<p>I think all of the Artists impressions loNo change to SPDs great, especially with lots of greenery / natural environments incorporated. Hopefully it will match what is developed. Some suggestions that I would put forward:</p> <p>1. Community Garden - Area where produce can be grown, allowing community cohesion to be developed and established.</p> <p>2. Most of the new buildings should have public rooftop gardens. Allowing people to enjoy an elevated views. There's a real opportunity here to build more than just buildings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage community gardens Rooftop uses/gardens would be encouraged 	No change re. community gardens as already in the SPD (C8). However add ref in 5.2 to potential use of roof gardens.	5.2No
	Design the environment to be hostile to cars, to make their use difficult, whilst also ensuring that public transport, pedestrians and cyclists are given priority at every stage. The idea of crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists is the wrong way round, make the car give way to the other. Yes have car corridors but through the majority of the area relegate cars to second class citizens.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage a pedestrian and cycle focussed development. 	No change to SPD. This aligns with proposed strategy to prioritise non car modes through the scheme.	N/A
	Chance for a test bed of low traffic neighbourhood principles that could subsequently be retro-fitted to other communities across Cheltenham and Gloucestershire. In particular, that pavements/cycle paths have priority over cars at side streets (set back give ways and raised tables etc), and filtered permeability so that non-vehicle movement is key. Master plan doesn't recognise explicitly how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous segregated cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve, creating an active travel ,acknowledge corridors that creates equity of access for employment and scalability for employees from post university through into family life and beyond.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraged by potential to make development pedestrian and cycle led, aspirations that can be retrofitted elsewhere in Cheltenham; Cycle connections through to existing communities should be encouraged more where possible 	Amend SPD to enhance references in D2 P42 to how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous segregated cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve.	N/A
	need to include significant parking spaces for the people working in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking required 	No change to SPD. Parking no.s will be dealt with at application stage, see section D7 P47.	N/A

	<p>Make sure existing hedgerows are shown on constraints plan. Particularly Fiddlers Green Lane - where the red line site boundary may be sitting over the green hedgerow line.</p> <p>Please ensure existing hedgerows are retained.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that hedgerows are retained where possible 	<p>No change to SPD. The SPD has been informed by the remit to retain hedgerows wherever possible – see section 5.</p>	N/A
	<p>C2: It is clear that the main entry to the commercial site will be from Telstar way. This road is currently very green, with grass verges and trees along most of it. The commercial area will back onto Fiddlers Green Lane, which runs along the back of many residences and alongside hedgerow and fields. There will be a desire to make the entry from Telstar Way to be very open, unscreened and obviously commercial. However, there needs to be a balance with the current feel of the landscape for residences. It will be terrible for residents in houses backing onto Fiddlers Green Lane to just see the faces of commercial buildings instead of the natural greenery that they see now. There needs to be a graduation into the site, rather than a sudden feel of a business park. In the current diagrams, the green spaces shown around the edges of Hesters Way and Springbank provide this, but not so for those around the top of Telstar Way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide more greenspaces/ landscaped spaces around the entrance to Telstar Way- at the moment the area has grass verges, could this be continued? 	<p>Comments noted. The approach to the development is to not turn it's back on the existing areas but ensure that the site entrance and edges do provide landscaped settings making the most of existing features. The application process will determine the detail and potential level of impact. See existing ref at C7 P38. 'The Telstar Way entrance is the site's principal gateway and a high profile point of arrival. Architecture of the highest quality and street design with landscaping and tree planting will help to mediate between the character of new and existing places.'</p>	N/A
	<p>Very impressed with suggestions; would be interesting to try and include 'rooftop gardens/allotments' as well</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rooftop gardens and rooftops gardens encouraged 	<p>Amend SPD, ref in 5.2 to potential use of roof gardens.</p>	5.2
	<p>Would love a mini Singapore Gardens By the Bay style plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspire to Singapore example 	<p>No change to SPD.</p>	
	<p>Many people will have no choice but to drive to the site, parking should be made available. People who work have to get there and to park somewhere but local roads are already blighted by inconsiderate and illegal parking,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient parking facilities should be provided 	<p>No change to SPD. See D7 P47</p>	
	<p>The landscape objectives seem good in terms of trying to preserve green spaces and protect the environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	<p>No change to SPD.</p>	
	<p>There are warm words but these need to be backed up with practical measures and strong planning enforcement. Local Planning Authorities have not been strong enough in the face of development (profit) pressures to deliver on these policies, particularly in the matter of flood alleviation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need strong LPA approach to implementation 	<p>No change to SPD. The SPD is on tool that the LPA can use but the application process will fix the detail</p>	

			and provide the conditions and Section 106 obligations for delivery requirements.	
	<p>C3: We strongly welcome that there is a requirement that the masterplan achieves Building with Nature Design accreditation, with a view to achieving ,Excellent, status upon delivery.</p> <p>C5: We welcome the requirements for sustainable drainage to be creatively integrated with wider green infrastructure to maximise co-benefits.</p> <p>C6: We welcome this section, with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ,Amend ,Development should promote a strategy for new tree planting and retention of existing species, to ,Development should promote and deliver a strategy for new tree planting and retention of existing trees, • We would prefer the second point to focus on ecological integrity rather than design, for example: ,The strategy should primarily comprise ecologically appropriate native species, and should mimic natural processes to result in a diversity of species, size and age, where some natural regeneration may be appropriate alongside planting. Street planting should include a diversity of species appropriate to the location, integrate with SUDS, and should be sited and cared for in a way that promotes their good health • We would like to see that the scheme is required to procure trees sourced and grown in the UK, or otherwise from nurseries with sound biosecurity measures such as quarantine, to help avoid the spread of disease. • We welcome the aspiration for a Community Woodland over the whole of the site. We would welcome a more ambitious canopy cover goal towards 30%, rather than 20% of the site. We strongly support that the canopy cover target should be integrated within the green infrastructure strategy. • With regards to existing trees, we recommend specifying ,arboricultural best practice, e.g. a requirement to follow BS:5837. In the case of this standard, we advise that for ancient and veteran trees, where a precautionary approach is warranted, the Root Protection Area should be 15 times the diameter or five metres beyond the crown, whichever is greater. • We would welcome any new hedgerows to also include hedgerow trees, and to comprise a mix of native fruiting species to providing foraging opportunities for wildlife and people. <p>C10: We strongly welcome the requirement for a management strategy to have consideration for long-term sustainability, with reference to climate change and low resource inputs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building for Nature supported • SuDS and greenspaces supported • Tree retention needs further encouragement as well as further tree planting (include focus on ecology with planting of certain species etc) 	Review C6 P37 bullet points to respond to points raised and add in references where possible to issues raised.	C6 P37
	yes i think that that they should have more landscape principles because i personally think that the whole world should know what it is and how to improve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More landscape principles 	Comments noted. The SPD provides a detailed landscape framework which will be implemented at application stage.	N/A
	<p>1. Promote healthy and sustainable food to the public with licensing and use type policy that provides adequate retail space for fresh fruit and vegetables and democratic access to healthy food for all people from all walks of life. Technological advancements (smart city principles,) could play a role here, as well as Health Impact Assessments for planning applications that incorporates food provision</p> <p>2. Make it easy to access affordable healthy food for everyone in West Cheltenham to tackle diet-related ill health and help ease food poverty.</p> <p>3. Build community food skills and resources, including social infrastructure (e.g. shared bbqs,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy and sustainable food production/ buying, encourage healthy food in the area • Community food areas (community BBQs etc) • Community recycling facilities site wide to reduce waste 	Comments noted. C8 P38 picks up the thrust of these ambitions	N/A

	<p>food growing clubs and support to grow your own) that encourage social cohesion via food</p> <p>4. Promote a vibrant and diverse sustainable food economy - with appropriate land for food production (allotments, community gardens, private gardens, balconies to accommodate growing, community orchards), facilities for storage and sale of produce, and the exploration of opportunities with existing food networks and initiatives such as the National Farmer's Union and community supported agriculture projects to help improve the supply and availability of fruit and vegetables locally. Ensure the built environment infrastructure supports access to Gloucestershire grown fruit and vegetables within the development (allotments) and outside the development (local surrounding farms)</p> <p>5. Transforming catering and food procurement - e.g. compostable food packaging recycling infrastructure on site or commitment from commercial site users to procure food from community gardens and CSA's on site as well as producers within Gloucestershire. The set up between Westmorland Ltd and Gloucestershire Gateway Trust with the construction of Gloucester Services could be used as a model that ensures community support/engagement by commercial tenants or owners of the site/units.</p> <p>6. Reducing waste and the ecological footprint of the food supply chain - with residential and commercial waste infrastructure, to encourage circular systems (e.g. a well-managed community compost scheme) and infrastructure to accommodate the redistribution of surplus food produced on site e.g.. community gardens and allotments with adequate electricity provision to refrigerate or process produce on site</p>			
	<p>Not surprisingly, CPRE Gloucestershire fully supports the 'Landscape First' approach proposed. Almost all the key principles C1 to C10 are fully in line with our own objectives for new development. We especially endorse C1, C2, C3, C6 and C7. We applaud the intention, at C8, to promote local food growing. C10, to provide a cross-site management strategy to inform the design process and provide for longer term sustainability is essential to make sure these principles are carried forward.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Landscape First approach • Support community food growing 	Comments noted	N/A
	<p>"provide a strategy for additional tree planting"</p> <p>Don't just have a strategy - make it happen right from the start! Plant as many trees & plants as you can.</p> <p>Considering this is the landscape objective it should prioritise flora & fauna more.</p> <p>Use water; be it ponds, fountains, lakes etc.</p> <p>Create & use vertical gardens - they're awesome!</p> <p>Create & use roof top gardens!</p> <p>So much opportunity - make MUCH more of it please.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage further tree planting • Use water • Use vertical gardens and roof top gardens 	Amend SPD to add ref in 5.2 to potential use of roof gardens.	5.2
	enclosed spaces where dogs can be exercised off lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog parks 	Comments noted	N/A
	Move it all west by one field and landscape / tree plant so buildings are not visible from the residential areas outside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more screening along the eastern boundary of the site 	The site is allocated for development in the JCS. Proposal would be counter-productive to integrating the development with Cheltenham	N/A
	Landscape to hide the commercial buildings from the residential areas- Tree plants, sculpting etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more screening along the eastern boundary of the site 	The SPD includes detail on landscape proposals but the intention is not 'hide' the development.	N/A
	Putting the high density cyber hub next to an existing residential community is not fair on the existing community and does not make for good integration of existing and new communities. The current housing along Fiddlers Green will become an island stranded between GCHQ and the new	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of commercial elements not suitable next to existing residential communities 	The development is intending to provide mixed uses	N/A

	hub. This is not integration and is not how garden communities are meant to work.		within the cyber hub area which will be compatible with existing and new residential uses. It will be well connected and provide valuable facilities for existing and new residents. No change to SPD.	
	Focus on a direct & safe cycling route between Cheltenham & Gloucester, encouraging people to cycle to work, thus removing polluting cars & improving the environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more direct and sustainable cycle routes between Chelt and Glos 	Amend SPD to include references in D2 P44 to how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve.	D2 P44
	As a mother of 2 young children who cycle but find cycling on roads intimidating, I would love the opportunity to cycle between Cheltenham & Gloucester on a safe route.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more direct and sustainable cycle routes between Chelt and Glos 	Amend SPD to include references in D2 P44 to how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve.	D2 P44
LANDSCAPE AND MOVEMENT: Are there other movement principles which you feel should be included? Are there principles which you feel should be excluded?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
	Minimise traffic volumes on existing minor roads especially in residential areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage a move away from the private car 	Comments noted. The development will create traffic but the SPD provides ambitious measures to minimise use of the car.	N/A
	This might be grandiose but how about elevated cycle paths? It's good how there are meant to be dedicated cycle lanes, but enviably they will have to cross roads and pedestrian paths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider elevated cycle paths 	The SPD does not preclude such ideas as elevated cycle paths at planning application stage but the SPD does need to assist in	N/A

			facilitating a commercially viable development.	
	design an environment where access to the bus and train network is easy where car use is not necessary. Where people can live and not have to worry about air born pollution, of which Cheltenham has far too much already.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make train and bus travel from the site easier than using a car 	The SPD encourages bus links and the SPD recognises the wider Connecting Cheltenham work regarding links to the rail station and town centre.	N/A
	<p>If the main road is truly for people not cars, it should not be continuous, but divided in two. A cell based model dividing Telstar way in two (so the area is approached either from the north or the south, but cannot be transited except by non-private vehicle means (pedestrian, bus gate, cycle lanes), would create a distinct community and prevent rat running (and would have flexibility to be reversed at a later date if the experiment did not create the desired levels of outdoor occupancy).</p> <p>It's unclear how biodiversity and urban growing will be enabled - even in multiple dwelling blocks, some creativity to enable micro allotments or similar would be exciting to see.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divide the proposed road in two to discourage car use- this could be provided in a flexible way to allow private car reduction over time. Unclear on biodiversity and urban growing 	The removal of a through route for cars is already being promoted through the SPD. The SPD also includes a long list of urban growing ideas to be considered at application stage.	N/A
	need to include significant parking spaces for the people working in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking is required on site for people working on the site 	Parking is considered within the SPD including at D7. The parking levels will be determined at application stage.	N/A
	<p>It's hard to know exactly what the plan for parking is because it is so heavily veiled in platitudes, but the simple fact is that in a modern connected business environment like this, people live across a wide geographic area. Therefore public transport really isn't an option for the majority (also think childcare arrangements and the impact parking difficulties create with respect to workforce diversity), so creating a parking problem to force public transport use, actually just creates a parking problem which reduces productivity and annoys residents.</p> <p>Luckily there is a blueprint for how not to do this within Tewkesbury Borough - Gloucester Business Park and Coopers Edge. The mix of businesses on the park is fairly tech-focused, so it should be easy to survey those companies to work out what parking ratios would support the development of businesses in that sector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of reliant public transport and congestion a concern Parking standards need to be appropriate learning from examples (Glos Business Park and Coopers Edge) 	Parking is considered within the SPD including at D7. The parking levels will be determined at application stage.	N/A
	<p>This is a great opportunity to introduce dedicated cycle routes. It is already possible to travel most of the way from the top of Telstar Way to the centre of Cheltenham without cycling on roads with cars. Other than crossing roads, a cyclist doesn't need to worry about cars. Paths are generally wide enough to allow pedestrian and cycle traffic side-by-side. This must be retained within the new development. Providing "cycle routes" that are just markings in roads dominated by cars won't be good enough.</p> <p>Telstar Way joining the A40, with traffic from Springbank and GCHQ, is already a congestion hotspot at peak travel times. Fiddlers Green Lane is used to try to avoid this, but the Arle Court roundabout junction isn't fit for this. Different movement principles are going to be needed during construction, once the commercial aspect of the site opens, and once the connection through to Old Gloucester Road is made. If Telstar Way gets further congested, more and more traffic will make it very difficult for residents who have to use Fiddlers Green Lane to access their properties. Perhaps it could be considered to close the road where Fiddlers Green Lane joins Telstar Way from the south. This would ensure that Fiddlers Green Lane is only used for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage dedicated cycle routes as much as possible Congestion concern, could some of the existing roads have amended traffic control/ routes 	Dedicated cycle routes are proposed. The access arrangements for the development during and post construction will be considered at application stage and controls (including construction traffic management plans) will be	N/A

	residential access from the Arle Court Roundabout whilst construction traffic uses Telstar Way. Once additional road access opens to the site from other parts of Fiddlers Green Lane, it could be re-opened.		implemented.	
	While commendable to try and persuade people to use public transport the catchment area for a lot of the companies in the area is anywhere from Malvern to South Wales to Bristol and Swindon. As a result improvements to traffic flow from the motorway junction that as indicated in the initial brochures you are "conveniently" off and sufficient parking available for all companies in the area, present and future, should be considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport focus not sufficient to stop people driving from afar so parking needs to account for this. 	Parking is considered within the SPD including at D7. The parking levels will be determined at application stage.	N/A
	Need to ensure that they streets and routes remain well lit but remain environmentally friendly. Investing in kinetic tiles in parts of the main street or cycle path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well lit streets and cycle paths are important. LoNo change to SPD at kinetic tiles. 	Amend SPD to reference to kinetic tiles in list of measures at A5 3.2.23	A5 para 3.2.23
	,the provision new direct connections to existing communities and facilities, There is much to chuckle about and criticise, but the above little gem just about sums up the level that the CBC have been hoodwinked, and indeed how we are being hoodwinked by the snake oil salesmen who penned this rubbish. I have discussed the 10 words above with several colleagues in order to understand what they mean. The consensus view? Roads!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terminology 	Direct connections can include cycle and pedestrian routes.	N/A
	Hi, thank you for talking with me at the public consultation in Regents Arcade today. I was very impressed with the commitment to complete local community living, with schools, shops and other facilities within walking distance of homes. This will severely reduce the need for residents to use motorised transport, with huge health and climate benefits. To the North of the development, BODDINGTON BRIDLEWAY 25 comes down from the A4019 to the edge of the development. Please can this be continued down through the development to Golden Valley and on to Badgeworth Lane at the Reddings. This would make a great way for riders and horses stabled around Elmstone Hardwick, Uckington and even Tewkesbury, to get up the escarpment to the Cotswolds. It would also make an essential good quality North South route for Horse Riders, Bicycles and walkers between Cheltenham town and Gloucester City, something that is currently incomplete, involves busy roads, and is very difficult. In addition it would bring a live and natural aspect to the proposed community - everyone loves to see a horse.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraged by the SPD's aspiration to reduce reliance on the private car Continue Boddington Bridleway 25 from A4019 through development and beyond. 	Consider references in movement sections (D2 p44) to linking Boddinton bridleway 25 through development – although need clarification on linkages beyond site.	D2 p44
	We are all for the seven objectives bulleted above. However, as residents of Darwin Close , we have major concerns over the traffic flow increase onto the Arle Court roundabout (ACR) from Fiddlers Green Lane (FGL) – especially if that turns out to be the favoured route in and out of the new development at rush hours, and more especially if nothing is done about the major problem arising from GCHQ employees parking on the roadside all around the locale. Something must be done to either introduce limited time (e.g. 2-hour) parking through single yellow lines on the through routes like FGL, or resident permit-only daytime parking in the residential streets. It is also suggested that there is a proposed 'improvement' to junction 10 of the M5. This must involve the conversion of it to a full 2-way junction, to alleviate load on junction 11, which is one reason why the ACR gets so congested. We would therefore like to know what analysis of increased flow in FGL has been conducted, what conclusions have been reached and what solutions are proposed to deal with the problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic on the Arle Court roundabout and Fiddlers Green Lane a concern GCHQ parking J10 must be 2 way junction to alleviate issues from J11 and traffic on Arle Court Roundabout. 	Traffic modelling will continue through the application stages. Any future parking management on existing streets falls outside of the remit of this SPD.	N/A
	A good design practice will be to allow people to take cars and motorcycles etc., and ensure that the all the offices being built also have space for a multi level car park either above or underground. An example that works well is Green Park in Reading. Major head offices are based here but little to no parking problems. This site also has houses, a school, bus routes, cycle paths and running and exercise areas. If Cyber Park can match or improve on that layout it will be seen as a success of transport planning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport and parking need to be considered in detail – loNo change to SPD at Green Park Reading as a good example of parking provision. 	Parking is considered within the SPD including at D7. The parking levels will be determined at application stage.	
	The inhibition of through traffic to prevent this becoming a "rat-run" for people from south cheltenham using the route to access the new Junction 10 and M5 northbound and vice versa Split the site into 2 with traffic bollards to stop it becoming a short cut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop traffic from using the site as a through road, split the road to discourage car use 	The removal of a through route for cars is already being promoted	

			through the SPD.	
	<p>On the proposed plans there is suggested an optional bus route from the development through to Henley Road. This should not be considered as a road here would be a barrier to the safe passage of children from the Solway Road green area to the proposed green area along Henley Road and vice versa. Pedestrian / cycle path would be adequate for access to the bus stops currently sited along Springbank Road. Opening a bus route here would introduce regular traffic flow of which there is currently No change to SPD. This can only increase the danger of child /traffic interaction.</p> <p>It is also noted that there is a proposed circular road that passes the green space opposite Henley Road. Again, this is adjacent to an area where children will play. Consideration will need to be given to the methods of providing safety boundaries in this area.</p> <p>After viewing the affect of parking on grass verges in the areas around Springbank, Hestersway and Coronation Square I can only see that any green edges will soon be turned into ploughed fields if no parking areas are provided at the public areas like shops and schools etc. No point creating a garden village that more resembles a battle field.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child safety concerns raised regarding bus route through to Henley Road. Parking management concerns re verge parking 	<p>Transport team and officer will review position and comment on Henley Road bus connection.</p> <p>Parking management on site is expected to be dealt with via a management company and parking regime.</p> <p>Public spaces and verges will need to be designed in such a manner as to prevent indiscriminate parking (hard landscape features for example).</p>	N/A
	Great opportunity to build a safe (ie no cars) direct cycling route between Cheltenham & Gloucester. This would encourage people who commute from Gloucester and its environs to forsake their cars and possibly get to work more quickly, also help reduce climate change, and maybe become fitter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more cycle routes 	Amend SPD to include references in D2 P44 to how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve.	D2 P44
	The principles do not apply widely enough. Walking and particularly cycling access needs to apply over a much wider area to be effective and include provision outside the area to local service villages and service centres. The area is not well served by routes which segregate cycle and vehicular traffic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking and cycling objectives need to be encouraged further afield than just the site 	Amend SPD to include references in D2 P44 to how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve.	D2 P44
	The best practise that Cyber Park implements with cycle routes may be thwarted by the lack of a network that links east to west Cheltenham. Provisions for the development to support/encourage the development of cycle route east to west across the town will ensure commuters are able to make their whole journey by bicycle (ie. D2 references 'existing' facilities/connections/routes - thee are well known to be woefully inadequate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of cycle routes elsewhere to connect the development 	Amend SPD to include references in D2 P44 to how important the onward connections are - so for a continuous	D2 P44

			cycle path to run from Gloucester, through cyber central and through Cheltenham and up to Bishops Cleeve.	
	Regarding ,Movement, CPRE Gloucestershire regards sustainable travel and transport as absolutely essential and therefore welcomes the approach taken. But the management of the traffic impact at and outside the boundaries is critical but is outside the scope of the proposals. Achievement of a number of objectives will critically depend on sufficient investment being made in the connecting road network, including M5 junction upgrades, which are outside the scope of this SPD. The document also refers to a new high-quality Cheltenham - Gloucester transport system adjacent to the area but without any clarity of whether and when such a system might be introduced. It is essential that a full transport flow analysis is undertaken and transparently presented as part of any future detailed planning and/or development application We applaud the intention to employ designs throughout which limit or discourage the use of private vehicles. It will be especially important to provide rigorous mechanisms to ensure these are carried through.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of traffic impact management at and outside boundaries is key. Clarity on high quality wider transport system required. Require rigorous mechanisms to discourage car use 	The planning application requirements will require robust transport assessment and travel planning. No change to SPD.	N/A
	As already noted under Sustainability and Land Use, we have related concerns over how to achieve the integrity of the new mixed community and limit commuting both out of and into it. Without the right incentives, there is distinct danger that those who decide to settle in Cyber Central have outside employment, notably in Birmingham or Bristol. Conversely, others may commute into Cyber Central from outside the area. In these circumstances, which are common elsewhere, there will be a growth in commuter travel so that much of the environmental and carbon-neutral benefit will be lost and the community could fail to thrive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of the existing and proposed development is vital Incentives required to minimise commuting 	The SPD seeks to acknowledge these aspirations as far as possible within the planning context. No change to SPD.	N/A
	Don't forget that these new spaces & ways of living still have to interact with the rest of the town/county/country. Will there be parking areas for visitors etc? Most people in Cheltenham won't have access to such modern facilities. Please make public parking free - high car parking costs have hugely contributed to the decline of our town centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow free or reduced car parking where possible to make the new community facilities accessible for all and avoid high parking charges which has resulted in the decline the town centre. 	Parking is considered at D7 and future provisions, charging regimes and management will be discussed at application stage. No change to SPD.	N/A
	cycle paths should be flexible to facilitate cyclists taking any possible routes, not just the most busy/popular or most convenient to accommodate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage greater cycle route flexibility. 	Key cycle routes are identified within the SPD but the overall development is expected to be designed in such a manner as to encourage cycling and walking throughout. No change to SPD.	N/A
	well thought out and usefully positioned cycle parking facilities. provision for ev charging for homes and public charging points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide plenty of cycle parking Provide EV charging for private homes 	No change to SPD. Reference is already made to these requirements at A5.	N/A
	The quality of cycle links must be brilliant to ensure people use them and there is not enough detail to be able to comment on whether this will be the case. It is essential to consult cyclists themselves through their representatives to ensure the detail is got right. Too many facilities built with good intentions are wrecked by poor design and lack of understanding by the engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage greater cycle route provision, with high quality design and engage with cyclists to design them 	No change to SPD as the intention is to ensure links are useable. The	N/A

	responsible.		suggestion to engage with cyclists and users is welcomed and will be expected at application stage.	
	<p>Make M5 J10 4 way and provide access road from there.</p> <p>Additional access road to A40 / Old Gloucester road to the WEST of the park.</p> <p>Before commencing construction.</p> <p>Then make the industrial / commercial part of the site largely car free (apart from essential deliveries).</p> <p>Use bus, cycle, pedestrian access- or even an electric rail access.</p> <p>Start free, stay green.</p> <p>(essential car parking by M5 J10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow for greater road connectivity from J10 to west of site with parking then make development car free (except deliveries). 	<p>The delivery of J10 is beyond the control of this SPD. The SPD seeks to minimise car through trips.</p> <p>Amend SPD to update on government funding agreement for M5 Junction 10 - The 2020 budget (11th March 2020) announced funding of the upgrade to M5 Junction 10 through the homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund, with the works anticipated for completion by 2024, these works support the JCS strategic allocations at North West and West Cheltenham</p>	1.1.6
	<p>Make the M5 J10 4 way and provide access road into the site from there, to the North, with additional access to M5 via A40 using a new link to the WEST of the site. Do NOT use FGL & Telstar way and Golden Valley area - these are already at saturation and the congestion, gridlock and pollution will build up yet more.</p> <p>Apart from essential deliveries, access to the industrial part / cyber hub should be on foot, cycle or bus, with external parking (e.g. M5/J10 area).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow for greater road connectivity from north, do not connect from south. 	Comments noted. Access is required from the south but the proposals are to minimise car through trips within the site.	N/A
	Climate change is leading to more extremes of weather, including extremes of heat and cold as well as storms. People are not going to want to ditch their cars. Light rail linking Gloucester, Cheltenham train station and Cheltenham town centre should be a priority. People are not going to walk and cycle with Storm Ciara, Dennis or whoever flinging wheelie bins and trampolines around!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider a light rail link into the town centre, train station and Glos. 	Comments noted. The SPD seeks to facilitate future connections into sustainable modes of transport if they come forward.	N/A
PLACEMAKING AND DESIGN: Subject to its relocation, the longer-term redevelopment of the Hayden Sewage Treatment Works site is seen as opportunity to deliver more housing to meet local needs. Are there important principles for the redevelopment of this area that the masterplan has overlooked?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
	Plenty of parking for additional housing. Continuation of green elements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide parking and green spaces 	We note your comments. Parking and green infrastructure	N/A

			addressed by the SPD.	
	Connectivity again will be key. It's hard to see how this new area will mesh into the likely main active transport spine along Telstar way. Perhaps master plan needs to protect an east-west movement corridor as well, so that it is easy to mirror the design principles in future development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better road connectively is required including east west link 	The rationale for the approach to the north south route and not encouraging through traffic is explained in the SPD and the masterplan allows for east west movements.	N/A
	More gobbledegoNo change to SPD and consultant speak folks! Have you any idea what if would cost to relocate a Sewage Treatment Works? A recent closure of a similar site by Thames Water cost ~£100,000,000. Rebuilding it would cost at least as much AND where would it be practically located? By your house, by mine. Some poor souls are going to have to tolerate it. Clearly it must be in the general area as the feed-pipes run through this location. And what about the ,cordon sanitaire,, a barrier to prevent disease spreading? Will houses, schools etc be constructed over this land? Will regular check be made on dangerous gasses issuing from the soil? If they are discovered, will the site be evacuated? There are so many unanswered questions. But, hey it's only our money isn't it and a highly remunerated firm of snake oil salesmen will have no difficulty in selling the idea. They'll do what they are doing now. Put the project in motion, then consult the public. Easy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding relocation cost and implications of relocation of works. Concern regarding cordon sanitaire and potential ground gas. 	Comments noted. Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils are in direct engagement with Sever Trent Water on future options for relocation of the sewage treatment works. The purpose of the SPD is not to determine this outcome.	N/A
	This isn't needed. Cheltenham needs affordable housing. The business park should not be built and instead this should be used for housing. This would eliminate the need for the destruction of more green belt land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage affordable housing 	We note your comments; the land is already allocated in JCS to meet housing as well as employment needs. The scheme will include significant affordable housing through the residential element.	N/A
	Creating healthy environments: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-weight-environments-using-the-planning-system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to health environments 	Comments noted	N/A
	i think that they should work on the sewage and stuff like that because on most days all you can smell is sewage mixed in with cow much and stuff like that so yh but the housing estates and stuff like that are Oakley designed but the only problem is that is on the flooding stuff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with flooding Concerns regarding sewage works 	Air quality and amenity issues will be considered at development management stage.	N/A
	Severn Trent Water understands the objectives of the Cyber Central project and welcomes the fact that the complexity of relocating Hayden Sewage treatment works is recognised. The relocation of an operational site like this, including the associated underground infrastructure, will require a significant investment by the project and Severn Trent acknowledges the efforts made to date to recognise these issues and we loNo change to SPD forward to discussing this further as plans develop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocation of Hayden works will be a huge infrastructure project – welcome that this is recognised in the SPD 	Comments noted	N/A
	If the town is serious about the environment, free issues and pollution, Do NOT Telstar way or FGL for access to this new development site. They are already overloaded.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with congestion- particularly Telstar Way or Fiddler's Green Lane for access 	The access points will be subject of further work including transport assessment at	N/A

			application stage. Reference is made elsewhere within the document to the use of Fiddler's Green Lane as a key cycle route.	
	<p>"Main Street, will connect Telstar Way with the proposed new link road (to join an improved M5 J10), this should be designed to give priority to pedestrians, cyclist and public transport, rather than private vehicles. Do you agree with this?"</p> <p>Do not agree to the link of mainstreet to Telstar way. However agree that any roads should give priority to pedestrians, cyclist and public transport, rather than private vehicles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding proposed links of the road through the south towards Telstar Way Agree that public transport, cyclists and pedestrians should be given priority 	Comments noted. Priority is proposed for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians through site.	N/A
PLACEMAKING AND DESIGN Do you have any other comments on the placemaking areas of the masterplan?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
	parking on site. Already gchq workers park cars along fiddlers green lane. The increase in demand for the service needs to ensure existing communities are not further blighted with there streets being used as a car park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns re GCHQ parking and sufficient parking will be required to avoid further impacts 	Final parking levels will be provided at application stage but the SPD does recognise the existing problem.	N/A
	<p>I believe making Telstar way a ,through road, invites the local community to be divided by speeding and rat running, and fails to create the right conditions for this community to emerge as a new model of urbanism for Gloucestershire and beyond. There's a chance here to create a bold filtered network by making this through route only for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, changing the modal mix and incentivising community mixing, inclusion and shared purpose. Combined with an ambitious parking SPD that models principles from low car dependency neighbourhoods, and specific travel planning principles and requirements for employers in the area, this would give Cyber Central the chance to become a county wide model of a totally different kind of place. Also needs to be specific SPD consideration of housing style, to maximise opportunities for inclusion; theres good research on this published from work in London, for example, mixing in affordable housing, ensuring it isnt identifiable by different materials and finishes, creating shared gathering spaces that arent just pavements, urban allotment space etc.</p> <p>Finally, there will need to be clear parking restrictions to prevent it becoming another commuter overspill. It cannot create additional car parking capacity as this will induce demand away from active and public transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable homes should be integrated across the whole community to create inclusive spaces Concerns regarding connecting road through the entire site Encouragement of ambitious parking SPD to encourage low car dependency Parking restrictions will be required to avoid becoming commuter overspill 	Add ref on B23 P28 to tenure blind design to ensure integrated affordable housing	B23 P28
	There is mention of 4- or 5-storey buildings in the in Cyber Central, perhaps graduating in height as buildings approach Main Street. I'm concerned about these tall buildings being so close to residences that back onto Fiddlers Green Lane around the top of Telstar Way. Tall buildings here would dominate the area, obstructing light and creating an unnatural environment for those residences. Thought should be given to the skyline as experienced from those existing residences. GCHQ itself has been built to feel quite a squat site, where it does not tower over nearby residences. Advantage should be taken of the natural lay of the land to build taller buildings where the land is lower, which is probably on the western edge of the Cyber Central, rather than along Main Street.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding 4-5 storey high buildings beside existing residential development Taller buildings should be on lower lying land 	Add ref to P56/57 that full consideration to height, scale and massing – and therefore impacts on existing residential development will be considered at development control stages.	P56/57
	<p>The infrastructure in the Old Gloucester Road neighbourhoods- has provision for a primary school. There is no mention of any health facilities.</p> <p>The closest surgery is a branch surgery of West Cheltenham at Springbank Community Resource Centre- this will be insufficient to handle the increased number of patients.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where will health care facilities be? 	The Local Planning Authorities are in direct engagement with the relevant	N/A

			<p>health care service providers as referenced at 3.2.21 Through on going liaison with health care providers and their relevant authorities, contributions towards additional health facilities will be required to ensure the health needs of new communities are adequately catered for.</p> <p>The detail will be determined at the planning application stage.</p>	
	<p>Would like to see safety as a key priority as well as sustainability, considering the community nature of the project. A need to ensure that the housing neighbourhoods are not negatively affected by the popularity of the Cyber Central area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public safety should be a priority 	<p>We note your comments, secure by design is a standard design best practice and is part of the more detailed considerations of layout that will come at planning application stage. Considered as a pre-requisite.</p>	N/A
	<p>Not sure that I understand what placemaking is. (I had a terrible fight with my auto-spell corrector whilst typing this, as it kept insisting that there was no such word) However, as we sport a Managing Director of Place and Economic Development, I guess it must be really, really important!</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is placemaking? 	<p>Add text to para 1.3.3. P9</p> <p>... ‘Guidance on Placemaking <u>(the intention of creating public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being)</u> and more detailed design guidance for new development is contained, along with longer term strategic guidance on the potential redevelopment’</p>	<p>Para 1.3.3 P</p>

	The high density cyber business area is closer to residential properties than to GCHQ. A natural / landscaped buffer zone should be put between the site and existing roads and residential areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More landscape buffering should be provided near the commercial elements to protect residential properties 	None. Landscaping and green space is provided by the intention is to integrate the existing and proposed developments and not to hide development.	N/A
	<p>I visited another drop in session today to see if I could get some further information, particularly financial. Unfortunately, as on the last occasion the CBC representative was not aware of any financial plan that is in the public domain. I asked him if anyone had worked out the cost of servicing the proposed development and if so, how would it be funded. His answer was that it would be self financing. I asked how he knew this as he had not seen any financial data, he replied, ,sometimes these things work out, sometimes they don,t., He went on to cite the Manchester Science Park in support of his view. Manchester boasts 540,000 residents (Cheltenham 117,000) and the Science Park's sandwiched between Manchester University, Manchester Metropolitan University and has been open some 4 years. Some 150 companies reside there mainly just occupying office space, many being offered (bribed with tax payers money one might say) up to ~£55,000 business rates relief each year. Further all main centre are still trying to find tenants for the many vacant lots. The question is, in my mind, ,if thats the benchmark for success, shouldn't CBC perhaps loNo change to SPD a little further for a role model?'</p> <p>So Ladies and Gentlemen, were going to spend (or invest as the representative assured me) around ~£750 million on a scheme that may or may not work out! Bit like ,Boots Corner, experiment really. It didn't work out. But, it only cost ~£1.8+ million. Onward and upwards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will this work in terms of funding? Future management of the development 	Comments noted. The SPD's role is a planning document rather than a commercial delivery strategy. The SPD does however include reference to requirements for future estate management.	N/A
	No though has been given to green infrastructure outside of this development. Cycling and pedestrian must have priority in the new development. However this is useless without improving the infrastructure across the whole town. Bikes and pedestrians should have safe routes and priority through out Cheltenham. We are an over weight oil obsessed society. Active travel can massively help individuals and the environment at the same time but this needs to be support by well thought out infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green infrastructure outside of the SPD area needs to be considered- pedestrian and cycle routes are key 	Comments noted, Full consideration has been given to other projects outside the staregic allocation. The SPD links into the wider GCC/CBC Connecting Cheltenham study and the SPD seeks to maximise sustainable transport opportunities throughout.	
	I would suggest loNo change to SPDing at Sport England's Active Design: https://sportengland-production-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/spe003-active-design-published-october-2015-email-2.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to Sport England guidance on Active Design 	<p>Amend SPD at 5.1 P30 to add reference to guidance under point 7.</p> <p>7 Provide sports and recreational opportunities and a quantumof space typologies in line with CBC/TBC Open Space Policy</p>	5.1 P30 bullet 7

	West Cheltenham is currently of poor design quality, so I have mixed feelings about 'integrating with existing communities' - of course new development should interface in an accessible way with existing areas, but for God's sake don't try to emulate some of the worst architecture in a town that's full of good architecture. The key is high-quality planning, architecture and design. Grass verges, decorative frontage to main streets, and domestic architecture that lives up to the best of Cheltenham's Regency and Victorian heritage - a relatively high-density model that's easy to replicate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High quality design is encouraged Green verges and smaller design details welcomed 	Agree with comments made as demonstrated in high density examples provided in the SPD from Cheltenham.	N/A
	no its all good	Support	Comments noted	N/A
	Swap areas 1 & 4, ie move the industrial / cyber hub area- and any tall buildings- to the WEST. Keep at least one area of greenbelt next to FGL.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep taller buildings away from residential developments. Green buffer next to Fidlers' Green Lane. 	The density reflects the key access point and main street, as well as the intended phase 1 delivery at the southern end of the site. Green infrastructure is provided as a key element of the SPD, however the intention is to integrate existing and new development, not to hide. It is best practice to locate higher density in the most accessible locations and close to existing and proposed facilities not on the edge of a site.	N/A
	Cyber hub should be in north to stop Fiddlers Green community being isolated. Cyber Hub should be located next to Junction 10 to prevent traffic having to travel through an area already chNo change to SPDed with vehicles. Schools, community facilities, public areas, housing would all work much better in the south.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taller buildings and cyber hub should be located in the north 	The rationale is integrate the cyber development with the existing built form of Cheltenham with potential links to GCHQ. Further employment space could however be provided in the north of the site.	N/A
THE OVERALL MASTERPLAN: Do you have any other comments you would like to make?				
No.	Comments	Summary of Comments	Proposed Change	Page/Figure Ref
	Grandiose schemes such as this never seem to come to a full fruition. I have not seen any plans for adequate parking for these new 3000 odd dwellings. Experience should tell these planners/developers that a minimum of 4500 parking places will be needed, no matter how much public transport is being touted. Plus this should never go ahead until a full J10 on the M5 has been approved AND built.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General concern re delivery, parking and need for J10. 	J10 outside of scope of SPD, parking levels will be determined at application stages.	1.1.6

			Amend SPD to update on government agreement to M5 Junction 10 funding	
	Parking needs to be at the for front of the plan. I know in an ideal world everyone would use alternative modes of transportation. However, you only have to loNo change to SPD at the areas around GCHQ which clearly shows this sentiment is not felt by the people that work there. Why not put double yellow lines in areas where this is happening already? Testla way has this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking issues including GCHQ 	No change to SPD. The SPD acknowledges existing issues.	N/A
	Give me a multistory car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi storey car park 	Potential provision identified within the SPD.	N/A
	Good for the town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Comments noted	N/A
	It is really important Junction 10 is opened both ways before this is put in place. It is already a nightmare coming in and out of golden valley without increased vehicle numbers. Attracting more business will hopefully be a benefit, however I wouldn't want to see it have a negative effect in the centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J10 in place 	Comments noted. Amend SPD to update on government agreement to M5 Junction 10 funding	
	Get a move on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Comments noted	N/A
	My objections would be the loss of farmland and hedgerow when there are brown field sites that could be utilised (for example Ashchurch camp) as well as better use being made of current out of town shopping areas which could be developed to include residential properties above. Our councils are not thinking creatively enough and just seeking to use all our green space for housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of farmland and hedgerow ahead of brownfield land. 	The SPD follows the JCS which allocated the land for development. The SPD is however seeking to use the land as efficiently as possible taking full account of high quality design and development, this includes considering opportunities for increasing densities from those suggested in the JCS.	N/A
	A great opportunity for Cheltenham.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Comments noted	N/A
	As somebody who works in Cheltenham, I am concerned that this proposal will ruin the town. Cheltenham is already one of the most polluted towns in England, with bad vehicle congestion and the Government issued a Climate Emergency last year. This development takes away an important green area and buffer with the increasingly busy and polluting M5. This site is too far away from the railway and relies on motor transport. A Cyber Park is not necessary in this area with GCHQ nearby. There is already a significant shortage of cyber and IT specialists in the area and it is likely that any local labour benefits will be extremely limited with most potential employees commuting from further afield, hence increasing traffic congestion. The Gloucestershire labour market is already too tight. I also question whether GCHQ will be allowed to provide any public sector funding contribution or whether they have any actual requirement for such a large development. Have they confirmed their formal interest? I suggest Staverton airport or further North would be more appropriate for this development using brown land nearer rail services. Thank you.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pollution, congestion. Concerns labour force will not be locally sourced and question requirements for space. Suggest use land at Staverton Airport. 	Comments noted. The SPD seeks to embrace and promote sustainable development beyond that of similar schemes seen to date. The economic case for the development has been supported by central government.	N/A

	Need to push for a real green criteria, rainwater harvesting, solar panels, electric vehicle charging points, secure cycle parking, good public transport links, hi spec insulation etc. and yes as many trees as you can fit in!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Push for green criteria. 	The SPD is seeking to drive the green agenda and Smart Cities principles throughout in order to deliver the garden communities vision.	N/A
	need to include significant parking spaces for the people working in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking for employees 	No change to SPD. Parking levels will be determined at application stage.	N/A
	As others have said, the proposed work to Junction 10 must be completed before anything else is done. Likewise, the stretch of Old Gloucester Road between the House in the Tree pub and Springbank will need a significant upgrade to accommodate the increase in traffic, and to make it safe for cars and bicycles to use it at the same time. It's a narrow B-road with a number of blind corners and crests, and is already heavily used at peak times of the day. Adding a subsidised/free Park and Ride near to Junction 10 would help reduce traffic on what are already congested roads, particularly the A4019 that leads into the town centre.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J10 and Old Gloucester Rd upgrades required including cycle provision. Subsidised park and ride at J10. 	No change to SPD. See movement sections.	N/A
	Junction 10 must be derestricted and A4019 improved first.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J10 and A4019 improvements first 	No change to SPD. See movement sections.	N/A
	There doesn't seem to be any mention of doctors' surgeries? More capacity will be needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to GPs. 	P22– add clarification to on / off site provision of GPs as required.	P22
	The original plan we were invited to comment on has changed so dramatically that I no longer feel I have been consulted. The land now earmarked for the cyber park is so close to existing housing on Springbank Road offers MORE misery with existing GCHQ parking issues. 3,000 houses + workers = minimum 5,000 + cars!!! Disaster.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern re changes since original plans. Parking and traffic issues for existing residents. 	The SPD provides the framework for future applications, CBC has planning authority has not endorsed previous masterplans prepared for the JCS process. Parking and traffic analysis will take place at application stage. No change to SPD.	N/A
	LoNo change to SPDs good, well thought through, make the J10 improvements please. Lets get on and bring this opportunity to the town as soon as possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support but need to secure J10 	Comments noted. Amend SPD to update on government agreement to M5 Junction 10 funding	1.6.1
	Generally feeling quite positive but having read the documents, and being a local resident, I would appreciate more clarity on the southern access arrangements for vehicles and any related changes required to Fiddlers Green Lane regarding (a) rerouting the existing road (b) closure of the southern section (c) future access arrangements for the existing private car park on the northern section that backs on to Galileo Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity on southern access arrangements and future access to car park at rear of Galileo Gardens 	Final access arrangements will be determined at application stage.	N/A
	I think proposal is fantastic and will really add value to the contribution that Cheltenham has at the heart of the Cyber industry and government. My only caveat that with the increased number of residents, a wider loNo change to SPD at providing clear cycle routes around the centre of Cheltenham to the West Cheltenham development area is really crucial. A corresponding increase in spaces for securing cycles in the centre will be great.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support but need clearer cycle routes to town centre and more cycle spaces in town centre. 	Cycle linkages are proposed in the SPD but do note comment re spaces in town centre for inclusion in wider	N/A

			town initiatives. No change to SPD.	
	Some interesting ideas but, as others have mentioned, adequate parking has to be prioritised. Failure to do this will be disastrous. Schools and medical centres have to be established. Every residence, however big or small needs to have room for its recycling bins/boxes or whatever. Sort out junction 10 immediately. Don't be distracted by the frilly stuff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking • Schools/medical • Waste storage for housing. • J10 	These elements are covered within the SPD.	N/A
	Very impressive. I love the sustainability, modernity & creativity of it all. Please ensure that the new builds are varied & full of light - not little identical boring boxes built to maximise builders profits like so many developments today! Also might I encourage the use of more water features - be they fountains or ponds (as part of grey water use or water recycling/conservation) akin to the Supertree system in Singapore - being near water is always a therapeutic thing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support but ensure residential includes lots of light. • Use water features. 	The SPD provides aspirations for high quality building design and use of water features where possible.	N/A
	Overall it loNo change to SPDs to be a great vision for the West Cheltenham. A few points I would add based on when I lived out in Australia: - having public BBQs people can use, that can bring people together when the weather is good - definitely a strong element of rain water harvesting, solar panels, etc - Free water taps / fountains - Having outdoor fitness areas (like they do on the honeybourne line) - To get those creative juices flowing free Peroni taps as well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support but suggest potential for communal BBQs, water taps, outdoor leisure, rainwater harvesting etc 	The SPD allows for these elements which can be incorporated at application stage	N/A
	Stress on Green issues good and essential. Any car parks should be on outside with electric public transport and cycling within - should be start of integrated & segregated cycle network for town & improved park and ride scheme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parks at edge of scheme with electric public transport and cycling within plus park and ride. 	This is the vision presented within the SPD.	N/A
	Great , its just the impact on the existing road system and alterations no where near enough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support but concerns with existing roads 	No changes to SPD. Further details at application stage.	N/A
	I'm pleased to see so much focus on the environment, wildlife, sustainability, renewable energy and quality of life, whilst still ensuring there will be a lot of parking for those coming from out-of-town where public transport cannot help (for example, from The Forest of Dean). I loNo change to SPD forward to being able to cycle around the site without fear of contact with cars. I hope that my employer gets an office here that I can work in. I was originally very saddened at the thought of all this greenfield land being lost, all the displacement of wildlife and the feeling of greedy human consumption that often goes with large development. However, I see that a lot of consideration is going into really taking advantage of technology to reduce the impact this development will have on our countryside. I hope that you are working with local organisations like the WWT at Slimbridge and the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust to provide genuine habitats for fauna and flora in this development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support green credentials with comments regarding still requiring sufficient parking and suggest work with WWT and GWT. 	No change to SPD. Parking will be fixed at application stage and Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Council are already in dialogue with WWT and GWT.	N/A
	Having read the comments from others, I strongly support ideas to prevent Telstar Way becoming a rat-run, and especially the idea to provide parking at the edge of the Cyber Central with only cycling and public transport to get you further in (excepting the need for loading/unloading). I can imagine people driving in from Bristol and The Forest of Dean, parking on the outskirts then taking a shuttle bus or borrowing an electrically-assisted bike to get them to their office. A car-free cyber central would be amazing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid Telstar becoming a rat run and seek parking at edge of scheme to allow car fee within. 	Comments noted. These aspirations are reflected within the document.	N/A
	I think the project will be fantastic for Cheltenham and its economy. The buildings loNo change to SPD modern, which is ideal to attract people to the area. My one suggestion is that we are already going into more green land to build this development. I strongly believe we should be building taller buildings to make the most of the land we are using. We need more then 7 or 8 stories for the main buildings in the cyber park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support with comment regarding request to increase density. 	Comments noted. The density aspirations are already higher than the JCS intentions but the application stage will provide the opportunity to test this further.	N/A
	Very concerned on traffic on Fiddlers Green Lane as already stretched with GCHQ traffic at peak times. The effect on egress to the A40 roundabout unless fully signalised could be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic concerns 	Comments noted. Traffic modelling	N/A

	catastrophic.		and assessment will be undertaken at application stage.	
	I use Telstar road every day and it is busy with GCHQ traffic at peak times, my concern will be lack of additional access roads to the new Cyber Park. Also no parking available for GCHQ contractors, so they all park on Fiddlers Green Lane and nearby estates. Merging traffic from the Cyber Park into Telstar road will cause untold grief to local residents and the drivers/employees at the Cyber Park and GCHQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and existing parking concerns (GCHQ). 	Comments noted. Traffic modelling and assessment, and parking will be undertaken at application stage. The SPD cannot address existing GCHQ parking issues but it does acknowledge the issue.	N/A
	<p>Seems there is a lot of poor analysis and assumptions that have significant impact.</p> <p>- assumption most people will use public transport and car use is declining. Fact 1 - Dept for Transport reporting shows no decline in car usage in the south west. Fact 2 - extensive use of public transport works where the infrastructure exists and significant constraints force people e.g. tube and London buses + congestion charging; rerouting a few buses will not solve the problem. Fact 2- local primary school is only assumed and will not be built until later, if at all. Therefore any families moving into the housing will need to commute to school. Fact 4 - the business case for building on the green belt is predicted on high density housing. Fact 5 - the upgrades to M5 are not guaranteed.</p> <p>All in all the document makes assertions that are not backed by fact. Draws conclusions without good data.</p> <p>As a marketing brochure its something they should be proud of.</p> <p>As a proper plan to build a community that will meet their expectations it appears to be woeful.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding: Car usage and ability to force people to use public transport. Primary school phasing. High density housing. No guarantee for J10. 	Comments noted. It is accepted that the proposals are not fully tested at this stage as the SPD can only go so far. The full technical assessment will take place during the application stages.	N/A
	Priority should be affordable housing and Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing and jobs 	These are clear priorities in the SPD	N/A
	It is an exciting development for the area, particularly for someone loNo change to SPDing to get onto the property ladder in the area over the next few years and loNo change to SPDing for a community feel but within the town rather than in the surrounding villages. It loNo change to SPDs like it will encourage development for the area and provide skilled opportunities for work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Comments noted	N/A
	<p>The height of the buildings is very concerning. Up to 6 stories high is too much and will dominate the landscape.</p> <p>Multi storey car parks again a major concern. What if these go 6 stories high? Put them underground? Make it a car free work place?</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the new development with existing homes and streets in the immediate area will be extreme. How will this impact be reduced? It's critical to get this right.</p> <p>Placing more hotels, restaurants, entertainment venues in the area will increase road traffic in the immediate area even further. The pressure on Telstar Way especially when workers leave the GCHQ site will be huge and congestion and queuing traffic will increase at peak periods. How are the planners proposing to limit the impact of even more cars in the area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns include: Six stories too high. Use underground parking. Relationship with existing homes. Traffic 	We note your concerns and the amenity of existing residents and the details of building height. The development seeks to provide an appropriate balance between effective use of land, a world class development and integration with the existing town.	N/A

	Currently there are green fields. I believe brown field sites should be used before green belt is built on.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use brownfield first. 	The principle of development was established through the JCS allocation.	N/A
	<p>his whole scheme is based on a vision. I,m not quite sure who,s but nevertheless someones vison.</p> <p>Clearly, it is everyones right to dream and imagine a world or place that fulfills their idea of Utopia, but it is equally everyones right to see things as they are.</p> <p>The vison that spawned the ,Cyber Central,has been worked up into a plan, referred to as the ,Masterplan,, and is being sold to the public by professional marketeers in order to gain approval from those whom its implementation will affect and those who stand to benefit. I have a vison too and it is markedly different from the one being presented. What I shall try to do here, is to present the two views as honesty as possible for comparison. I cannot guarantee that my interpretation of the ,masterplan,, as much is presented in language that I do not understand or can relate to, but I will do my best to interpret what I think they are trying to convey.</p> <p>The Masterplan Vision.</p> <p>West of Cheltenham there a housing development known as Fiddlers Green. Located near this development is the HQ of an important government department GCHQ, that employs a considerable number of people and among other activities, we're told, houses the latest advances in information capture and processing. It is proposed that land adjacent to GCHQ should be developed to accommodate, what is referred to as high-tech companies who should be close to this facility and to provide 1000 council homes and eventually 2000+ other dwellings. Further, there are plans to provide an ,Innovation Centre, which will serve as a hub or focal point for these high-tech companies to use. It would also act as a community center and host cafes. The development will also have hotels, a school, shops and parking facilities as well as what is referred to as mixed accommodation.</p> <p>This will be ,World Class Accommodation,. All the buildings will be exemplar and be equipped with the latest technology to ensure longevity and heating efficiency, be architecturally appealing and flood protected. There will be a High Street full of shops, office accommodation and workshops, with electric busses and ,Äögreen,Äô routes linking open spaces. Pavements will be provided made of high-quality materials. The homes in this area will have their front doors facing the main route to access street activities.</p> <p>The high-density homes will have 6/7 levels and in keeping with the ecological theme of the development will have roof gardens to encourage growing local produce. The streets will be tree-lined with a wealth of on-street parking. Residential areas will have Home Zones where trees and shrubs and different road surfaces will ensure the safety of people, children and vehicles. Streets will be positive with pedestrian crossings with cycle lanes and parking. There will be electric scooters and bicycles with an abundance of storage spaces.</p> <p>All residents and employees will be vibrant, pioneering and digitally as well as socially and culturally integrated. The edges between work and play will be blurred and the exciting activities will continue well into the evening with cutting edge art and entertainment on the landscaped pavements.</p> <p>In the early days of development, the foul odour from the Hayden Sewage Treatment Works may restrict the scope of the scheme but this facility will eventually be relocated to accommodate more housing. It is not clear where it will be located to or how much this will cost but it is acknowledged it will be expensive.</p> <p>The underlying concept that underpins the scheme the marketing consultants advise, is that ,address, is everything. By creating a ,Cyber Park, closely allied to one of the most prestigious cyber buildings in the country, the very best talent and high-tech companies will flock to the site. This will generate wealth for the Town as well as ensuring the physical and mental</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of an alternative vision. 	No change to SPD. The vision intends to set the aspirations to deliver a development that provides a step change to the 'norm'.	N/A

<p>wellbeing of all those live and work there and produce a highly socially integrated community.</p> <p>My vision</p> <p>Ten to twenty years of roadworks, construction, massive traffic delays and grime. Considerable increase in the volume of traffic both in terms of cars and heavy lorries. Add to that the shuttle buses and vans, living anywhere West of Cheltenham is going to be a nightmare. If and when the Hayden Sewage Works is ,relocated, prepare for thousands of tons of highly contaminated land to be bussed through Cheltenham on its way to designated disposal areas.</p> <p>The development itself. If any ,high-tech, company is persuaded to take up residence, and that is doubtful as given the Mecca of ,digital, companies. Silicone Valley in California, is rapidly being vacated as the need for ,cyber,businesses to coalesce is now redundant, thanks to the technological advances made. It is now a highly competitive industry and the cost of operating in a ,smart, location is not viable. Companies are leaving in droves. If any company is persuaded to relocate to our ,Cyber City,, when entitlement to any inducements to come, like rate/rent free holidays, come to an end they,ll likely up-sticks and relocate to a less costly area as their Californian counterparts are doing.</p> <p>I can then envisage many industrial building laying empty with piles of junk mail laying on the mats of long abandoned reception areas. Graffiti strewn walls and faded Estate Agent posters offering ,To Let , Exemplar Commercial Accommodation, blowing in the wind. Adjacent lots with a parcel distribution a depot and bathroom equipment storage shed. And all around, litter, lodged in the gutters and collected around fly-tipped household appliances.</p> <p>The roof gardens on the high-rise flats, now restricted access by CBCs Health & Safety team as local lads toNo change to SPD to throwing the turnips from the gardens on to high-tech visitors en-route to the Cyber Centre below, and worried by the possibility that they would fall, padlocked the access doors. The years of neglect that followed would see the earth, dissolved by continuous rain and covering blocked drains, run down and stain the grey concrete of the tower blocks frontage.</p> <p>Across to the exemplar private houses, graded in value by the proximity of the Sewage Works, residents would fight over car parking spaces and send in daily complaints about the noise generated by the exiting and vibrant art and entertainment that went on ,well into the evening,.</p> <p>The concrete ponds, now dry, as the same H&S crew who closed the roof gardens learned that a toddler had fallen in and had ordered their drainage, now lay dry, filled with fast food containers, empty ,CNo change to SPD, bottles and the odd syringe.</p> <p>At the Cyber Centre, bereft of any cyber usage, now used for voting days and the Blood Transfusion Service each month, the upper accommodation accessed through doors with notices saying ,Office ,Private, and no one knows who can enter or what they do up there. Where, on Saturday afternoons childrens parties are held and eight year-old girls, dressed as twenty somethings, bop to the latest pop song, whist at the other end of the hall the boys knock the living daylights out of each other and helicopter parents hover, beaming with delight at their ,angel,whilst keeping a weather eye on the piles of black plastic sacks in the doorway holding the presents guests were obliged to bring along.</p> <p>The safety roads, their special surfaces long been worn away, are littered with potholes and like in Cheltenham Town, dozens of craters. The severe strain on public finances, stretched to the limit by thousands of extra residents, wear and tear and provision of more social services, explodes and the area degenerates into an out-of-town ghetto. The vibrancy, social and cultural harmony is in short supply and those of a pioneering mind long since ,pioeneered, off to fresh pastures. Local medical and educational services fail, overwhelmed with demands the limited resources can provide. The High Street now boasts seven Charity Shops, eight Fast-food outlets and a night club. The hotel is sold to a chain and unsuspecting commercial travelers divert from the M5 for the night, and park in a barbed-wire enclosed parking lot.</p>			
---	--	--	--

	<p>QCHQ still operates incredibly efficiently, as the supporting industries such as software developers even though they have now to occasionally travel from the established Staverton Industrial Estate they fled to, adding five minutes on to their travel time, can meet, where, at either office they can link up with any part of the world.</p> <p>The electric busses, as power is rationed because the renewables, cannot possibly provide sufficient power to make up for the power that defunct fossil fuel power stations generated, will stop running or will need to be charged via diesel generators. The electric scooters and public cycles disappeared, anyway, within 24 hours of the estate opening, never to be replaced. After years of wrangling the sewage works is moved, and yet more green belt is grabbed to accommodate it. The cost to remove it at today's values exceeds ~£200,000,000 and already bankrupt CBC have to go cap in hand to government agencies and other wiser local authorities to borrow even more money.</p> <p>Apart from all that,</p>			
	<p>There needs to be consideration and space for self builders please.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/self-build-and-custom-housebuilding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self build 	No change to SPD. This is acknowledged at B3 P28.	N/A
	Ridiculous name, but investment welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question name 	SPD being amended to re-name Golden Valley Development following a branding exercise undertaken by Cheltenham and Tewkesbury councils.	Change to all title references
	<p>There are already significant issues in this area with on street parking from all those commuting to GCHQ (which was deliberately built with "inadequate" parking to try and push people to use "public transport" - which basically still does not exist for many of those travelling from out of town unless you want to spend hours on multiple busses). Even with the parking that is there the off site roads are completely congested at the start and end of day.</p> <p>We now have another plan to build "business" units that seem to have virtually no parking (I can find no clear number in the documents as to how many parking spaces are going to be provided for all the employees on site - nor who the daily visitors to such a site will be able to part). This all again seems to be based on an "aspiration" that better public transport will magically be available and that whatever growth in traffic arises will somehow be dealt with by a plan to add a lane from Jnc 11, an uplift to Jn10 (which may not happen) and a link road from the Old Gloucester Road to the A4019 which also does not exist. Put some parking in, with charging provided in each for lots of electric cars and you stand a better chance of getting people to adopt "carbon neutral" transport than trying to assume they can all use busses etc that don't go where they need or even exist.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCHQ parking issue. Provide adequate parking with EV points. 	Comments noted. The SPD includes commentary on parking strategy but parking numbers will be dealt with at application stage. The SPD cannot address existing GCHQ parking issues but it does acknowledge the issue.	N/a
	The B4634 desperately needs altering before any of the development starts. As someone who lives in a house along this road I witness just how many incidents and accidents that happen on this road currently. There is no way that the road will cope with any more traffic as it is. The sharp bends in the road need straightening out and the speed limit up the hill needs to be reviewed. During rush hours the traffic lights adjoining the B4063 take considerable time as it is, adding extra time to this is ridiculous. It is great that bridle ways have been taken into consideration. Existing businesses in the surrounding areas need to be considered as the development is going to majorly impact my business. Communication with people surrounding the site could be greatly improved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B4634 works required. Impact on existing businesses. Communications with nearby population needs improvement. 	<p>Comments noted. Detailed traffic modelling will be required at application stage.</p> <p>Note comment re communications but this SPD consultation process is intended to involve local population.</p>	N/A

	The surrounding roads need to be made safe and possibly revised/redirected. The B4634 can not cope with the volume of traffic and is not represented in it's true form on the plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearby roads including B44634 won't cope with traffic 	No change to SPD. Detailed traffic modelling will be required at application stage.	
	Make surrounding roads safe first.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearby roads to be made safe first 	No change to SPD. Detailed traffic modelling will be required at application stage. Note the new development cannot necessarily address existing problems but will have to demonstrate they are not made worse.	N/A
	<p>We were told it was to be built by now - these plans loNo change to SPD great but there are no timelines are included.</p> <p>I have a cyber business and I'd love to move there but without timelines its hard to plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need timelines as want to locate business there. 	No formal delivery timeline can be provided at this stage.	N/A
	Support the principle of developing this area of Cheltenham with an employment hub around cyber and residential areas, but the key is that it must be high quality in terms of planning, architecture and design, so that it brings up West Cheltenham to the standard of the more attractive parts of the town. That means for example grass verges (standard in garden cities all over the world, but Cheltenham is rare in the UK in having them), decorative frontages to main streets (the example given of Southwark Street SE1 is worrying - that should be a cautionary tale of how not to do it), and for the domestic architecture, traditional designs that replicate or at least complement the town's Regency and Victorian heritage (and emphatically not the weak, blank-faced pastiches shown on pp 66-68 of the SPD, which would dilute it).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need high quality design including verges, street frontages, and residential elements to complement the town's Regency and Victorian heritage. 	No change to SPD, these aspirations are reflected in the SPD.	N/A
	<p>The proposal includes for up to 3000 dwellings. Therefore there is a need to ensure there is adequate built sports facilities and playing fields. Sport England have a number of tools to assist in ensuring this happens. Cheltenham also have a dated Built Facility Plan (2016) which flagged future shortages & current issues and a dated playing pitch strategy which again flagged up current and future issues. These should be loNo change to SPDed at with reference to the SPD.</p> <p>It make zero sense to create 2 separate sites for playing fields - it is better and more sustainable to create a single sports hub.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sports facilities 	No change to SPD, sports and leisure are included and Sport England will be consulted at application stage as well as considering the Cheltenham/Tewkesbury requirements.	N/A
	<p>This loNo change to SPDs like a lovely plan and development for Cheltenham. However, I fear that many of the ideals in the proposal will be dropped on economic grounds and this utopia vision will not be delivered. What will be delivered is just a new low quality development with poor transport and integration with the community.</p> <p>A great deal of care needs to be had of the design and layout. Selling off parcels of land to house builders to put up their own designs should not be done. To make it truly work a unified theme and design for the entire development should be followed.</p> <p>Having higher density housing can provide more affordable homes. Flats can be very low quality, but well designed flats and communities can work and help to provide more affordable homes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with final quality to be delivered. Design consistency through phases. Cycle routes and effective use of streets to facilitate them. Seek to ban cars within the development. Use of transport contribution from each house 	Comments noted. The SPD sets an ambitious vision and CBC/TBC are committed to ensuring the quality is maintained throughout the planning process. Tools such as design codes and principles can be used to assist this.	N/A

	<p>Some of the largest concerns are around transport and accessibility. Cheltenham has few cycle routes, most are poorly designed and badly maintained. Most emphasis seems to be on car travel. The masterplan shows pictures of other towns and cities with good cycle and scooter networks, this is a must for the community design. The traffic flow priorities should always favor bus, cycle and alternative transport rather than cars. Sadly a significant number of drivers in the UK treat cyclists and second class citizens, often almost causing accidents. Ensuring that the car and bicycle / other transport are segregated on key routes is the most effective solution for providing a safe environment.</p> <p>With new technologies being developed and licensed a great deal of effort needs to be made to encourage other modes of travel other than cars within the community.</p> <p>Most households have two cars. Tree lined streets with parking maybe cheap, but they are not the most efficient use of land. Personally a street with no cars is far nicer to loNo change to SPD at and better for walking cycling / other transport options. To achieve a high density of housing and the green environment, possibly loNo change to SPDing to ban the car almost entirely within the cyber community although this would be a radical solution. If the ban is too much perhaps permit householders one underground / other surface parking space near the house. Then provide multi-storey / underground parking on the edge of the community, for householders with more than one car and all visitors to the community. Something like a self driving electric pod could provide shuttles from car parks on the edge to the areas within the community, some of this technology already exists.</p> <p>There have been many new houses built and proposed within Cheltenham area over the past 10 years, the traffic and pollution levels are not good. Ensuring that all new developments have a good dedicated cycle route added in the design and connected to a main networks is a must.</p> <p>Much should also be done to improve the cycle paths within the area to provide good express cycle lanes that people will feel safe using. The Cheltenham cycle paths often are not joined up and some are not that safe for cars and bikes. To do this controversial road redesigns possibly should be considered. This may include butting bollards in some back street cut throughs to make them access to residents only for cars and create a safe environment for cycles, scooters, pedestrians from the community, to the station and town center. Road re-designs may also need to be more radical, e.g. having trees planted down a central reservation of the road and removing trees at the edges to provide more space for cycles and cars simultaneously (any tree lost would be replaced with 4 trees elsewhere within the area).</p> <p>This could be partly funded by ensuring all new housing developments within the area are designed around other transport, and that the builder has to provide a sum e.g. ~£200 for each house built to a community pot for transport redevelopment plan. A special council tax levy could also be added to fund maintenance and development of the network.</p>		<p>A coordinated cycling and pedestrian strategy will be required through the planning process and the Section 106/CIL/Travel Plan mechanisms will be used to secure necessary contributions.</p>	
	Using greenbelt for an unnecessary development like this is a disgrace	Loss of greenbelt	<p>We note your comments; however there is an identified housing and employment need for which this site is needed. The principles of development on this site has been established though the JCS.</p>	N/A
	<p>The Hesters Way Forum (HWF) is generally in support of the SPD and is particularly keen on the proposals which involve biodiversity, passive house designs as exemplified by the RIBA winners in Norwich and by the cycle, walking and public transport aspirations.</p>	<p>Generally supportive but concerns:</p> <p>Buffer zone needs to be 80m+ for houses backing onto Fiddlers Green Lane, Beverley and</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The concerns regarding buffer,</p>	N/A

	<p>The forum has held several meetings to discuss the SPD. The feedback responses given below have emerged from those discussions and reflect the views of the whole group. (hesterswayforum.co.uk)</p> <p>Buffer zone. All agreed that the buffer zone of at least 80 metres between houses backing onto Fiddlers Green Lane, Beverley and Juniper Courts and the Cyber Hub buildings is key to the success of the project as far as local residents are concerned. This should be a landscaped area with screening trees and shrubs and include good access to the development for walking and cycling. The closest buildings on the cyber site should not be visible from the residences which back onto Fiddlers Green Road and should definitely not loom over them. The references to a buffer zone in the document should include Fiddlers Green Lane as well as Henley Road and Old Gloucester Road. There is a good description of the views of the group in the HW masterplan on p24 available at http://hesterswayforum.co.uk/documents . Any careful planning of the boundary buffer zone should include close collaboration with the HWF.</p> <p>Fiddlers Green Lane (FGL). The traffic on FGL should be reduced to a minimum and if possible be limited to a walking and cycling route. If vehicles do access the road that should be limited by either bollards to restrict width located at the broNo change to SPD near to Meadow Close on FGL (as at Caernarvon Road in Hatherley) or using weight restrictions. If traffic is permitted to use the road then chicane parking as shown in the masterplan on p22 should be used. Further narrowing could be installed at the junction of Niven Courtyard with FGL allowing safer walking and cycle crossing and access to the development through the hedgerow.</p> <p>Building heights. Building heights should be restricted in the vicinity of the housing on FGL and Beverley and Juniper Courts and should definitely not loom over properties on these roads as may be the case with the proposed ,mid density mixed use, buildings. The proposed entry to the site at the FGL / Telstar Way roundabout should abide by the proposals regarding the buffer zone presented above. Buildings on the site should gradually increase in height with distance away from FGL. Some views from FGL to the west to be retained. An explanation of the need for greater densities would be useful as would the number of taller buildings above 3 stories.</p> <p>Community facilities. The role, management and objectives of the Innovation Centre should be clarified. The community facilities described in the plan are minimal; will there be a community centre building? What services will it supply and how and by whom will it be managed? The local school could be relocated to the centre of the residential area so encouraging walking and cycling rather than car use especially at the busy peak commute times.</p> <p>Sports and recreational facilities seem to have been omitted from the plan and yet are included in the HW strategy drawings. What will be provided and where will it be located?</p> <p>Public art The public art section should reference the CBC Public Art strategy; https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s24385/2017_12_05_CAB_Public%20Art%20Strategy_Appendix.pdf</p> <p>Transport access (bus and car) Access to the development should encourage bus and cycle usage. Bus access should be agreed in the document and not simply described as ,potential. Some access to the development should be via the current residential areas. E.g. Henley Road and Springbank Road. M5 Junction 10 developments should be completed prior to the site development. If this isnt possible construction traffic should have no access to FGL. Park and ride facilities should be proposed and implemented prior to the site opening. All possible opportunities should be taken to ensure that the main road through the development is not used as a direct through route between the Tewkesbury Road/M5 junction 10/Old Gloucester Road and Telstar Way/FGL</p>	<p>Juniper Courts and the Cyber Hub buildings.</p> <p>Reduce traffic on Fiddlers Green Lane and potential removal</p> <p>Reduce building heights so restricted in the vicinity of the housing on FGL and Beverley and Juniper Courts.</p> <p>The proposed entry to the site at the FGL / Telstar Way roundabout should abide by the proposals regarding the buffer zone presented above.</p> <p>The role, management and objectives of the Innovation Centre should be clarified. will there be a community centre building? What services will it supply and how and by whom will it be managed?</p> <p>The local school could be relocated to the centre of the residential area so encouraging walking and cycling rather than car use especially at the busy peak commute times.</p> <p>Sports and recreational facilities seem to have been omitted from the plan and yet are included in the HW strategy drawings. What will be provided and where will it be located?</p> <p>Public art The public art section should reference the CBC Public Art strategy; https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s24385/2017_12_05_CAB_Public%20Art%20Strategy_Appendix.pdf</p> <p>Bus access should be agreed in the document and not simply described as ,potential. Some access to the development should be via the current residential areas. E.g. Henley Road and Springbank Road.</p> <p>J10</p> <p>Construction traffic should have no access to FGL.</p> <p>Park and ride facilities should be proposed</p> <p>main road through the development is not used as a direct through route</p> <p>Multi story car park. This car park would better serve the area nearer the centre of the cyber provision.</p> <p>Further underground parking</p> <p>A better explanation to flexible approach to the application of parking standards</p> <p>would a decked car park at the current GCHQ alleviate some of the current pressure and address future concerns.</p> <p>Concerns re. build on the wildflower meadow in the fields next to FGL, what mitigation is proposed?</p> <p>The hedgerow at the top of FGL has been removed; this may be necessary in order to create the new road and the open spaces around the entrances to the site. Where possible hedgerows should be retained, and new habitats created for the species affected.</p> <p>The SPD describes potential development at Coronation Square; what will this depend upon?</p> <p>Further clarification of the proposed allotments is necessary, particularly their location in</p>	<p>height, proximity and relationship with existing housing have been carefully considered by the masterplan team. The final heights, positions and interaction will be considered at application stage at which point a full analysis of amenity considerations will be made.</p> <p>The application stage will also determine the extent and positioning of community facilities, and also require details of their future management to be provided (likely to be through a Section 106 obligation).</p> <p>Again the concerns regarding parking levels, construction traffic and wider highways issues will all be considered in detail at application stage. The SPD has responded to comments regarding the removal of a potential through route for cars along the main route.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>The document describes a modal shift in transport; clear evidence of how this will occur should be included.</p> <p>Multi story car park. Whilst its accepted that decked parking needs to be provided the location of the multi-story car park adjacent to housing and assessed from a bend on FGL is not suitable or safe. This car park would better serve the area nearer the centre of the cyber provision. Parking proposals Further underground parking at offices and apartments will be required to ensure overspill to nearby residential streets is minimised. A better explanation should be given for the ,flexible and innovative approaches to the provision of residential parking, and ,flexible approach to the application of parking standards to ensure development promotes modal shift , what do these phrases mean in practice?</p> <p>Considering the current parking issues would a decked car park at the current GCHQ alleviate some of the current pressure and address future concerns.</p> <p>Other issues. Concerns were raised regarding plans to build on the wildflower meadow in the fields next to FGL ,Ä what mitigation is proposed?</p> <p>The hedgerow at the top of FGL has been removed; this may be necessary in order to create the new road and the open spaces around the entrances to the site. Where possible hedgerows should be retained, and new habitats created for the species affected.</p> <p>The SPD describes potential development at Coronation Square; what will this depend upon?</p> <p>Further clarification of the proposed allotments is necessary, particularly their location in relation to housing.</p>	<p>relation to housing.</p>		
<p>Under certain conditions, the western edge of Cheltenham may be seriously affected by the odour from the Hayden Works. The West Cheltenham residential areas will be much closer to the Works than existing housing so that this odour may act as a severe deterrent to those thinking of settling in West Cheltenham. CPRE Gloucestershire is concerned that the impact of odour has not been adequately taken into account in these proposals which may therefore paint an over-optimistic view.</p> <p>The later phase of development depends on closing and moving the Hayden Works. However, the SPD provides no real indication of how feasible or affordable such a move would be and in what kind of timescale.</p>	<p>Odour from STW works</p> <p>Future relocation of STW works unclear</p>	<p>No change to SPD. Initial work has confirmed the extent of the cordon sanitaire which has been indicated. Further detailed assessment will be required through application stage.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>StNo change to SPD Orchard and Tredington Parish Council object most strongly to the Cyber Central Project in its present state of presentation.</p> <p>As is the standard of all development projects in the past 15 years in the Cheltenham Gloucester and Tewkesbury area, local Consultees are expected to give a detailed and responsible report on a 250 acre mammoth development with associated transport and drainage implications and yet none of these are available. The Standard Planners response is that they come later. NO - the flooding and traffic chaos comes later as is historically evidenced.</p> <p>The Parish is situated in the centre of the Bishops Cleeve, Cheltenham and Junction 9 developments. Traffic counts are now over 10,000 vehicle movements each day and climbing rapidly and yet County Council and local Borough Councils ignore their responsibility to sustainable transport by refusing to provide cycle paths and footpaths as required by the NPPF on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>The headlong dash for housing is in the total absence of any joined up thinking of both fluvial and pluvial flooding with the Parish continually overwhelmed and yet no Drainage Infrastructure plan is available for the JCS North West Cheltenham area, the Ashchurch Garden</p>	<p>Object to principle and concerns regarding flooding, infrastructure and transport with reference to wider developments</p>	<p>No change to SPD. The SPD is written on the policy direction of the JCS.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>Concept and now the Cyber Park. One must also include the Bishops Cleeve area - no schools - we forgot about that!! And the expanded Junction 10 which without any action on Junction 9 will lead to traffic chaos as HGVs use rural cut throughs to avoid deadlocked roads.</p> <p>It is our considered opinion that all of these Developments should be shelved - put on hold, until full plans for traffic, drainage, schools, medical centres are planned and agreed.</p> <p>The present system is untenable and we demand support financially and in kind for the safety of our residents and their children and also the major reduction in the use of our rural infrastructure - Traffic and Drainage - for the benefit of a County Council and Borough Councils who totally ignore their responsibilities and Duty of Care as laid out in the NPPF.</p> <p>This plan and the aforementioned plans are ill-conceived and totally unready for consideration until full Infrastructure plans are prepared and local Councils are consulted properly on the inherent problems which no Authority is willing to approach or even accept are real.</p>			
	<p>I was pleasantly surprised when I went through it. It seems modern, imaginative & quite well considered. I hope the employment opportunities will be there to allow it to flourish. I hope it will be delivered properly, using design & experiences from existing sustainable developments in the UK, Holland etc, making the most of the opportunity to do something PROPERLY with people in mind - not profit! To repurpose so much agricultural land & the impact that will have on the wildlife..... this development must be done properly with the environment at its core. There are a lot of amazing initiatives out there - please access them & not try to cut corners or reinvent the wheel.</p>	General support	Comments noted	N/A
	<p>The Cheltenham Voluntary and Community Sector Forum is generally supportive of the SPD as if it is delivered well then it will be beneficial for Cheltenham especially in terms of employment and housing. The Forum is concerned that the language used in the document is not in plain English, making it difficult to fully understand the document. It may be appropriate to use additional engagement methods to help people understand the proposals and how it might effect them. The Forum also felt that it was important to ensure that the implications of this significant development on the rest of Cheltenham not just the adjoining communities) is included.</p>	<p>Use of plain English required Impacts on wider Chelt requires consideration.</p>	<p>Comments noted. SPD will be reviewed to 'plain english' the document as much as possible.</p>	As required
	<p>Please see Environment Agency's letter ref SV/2018/110097/SD- 01/PO1-L01, dated 17Feb2020 for full details. Thank you, Ruth Clare.</p>	Refer to EA comments	<p>Comments noted and edits made – changes made in response to comments including finding opportunities for even greater reference to climate change through the document, retrofitting of improvements to existing communities in terms of renewables, zero carbon emphasis, biodiversity net gain, SUDS and watercourse</p>	yes

			improvements.	
	Waste of money, what wrong with Cheltenham town which it's lovely historical place. Dont need other town. Difficulties with GCHQ traffic in rush hours. NHS comes first, need potholes repairs everywhere!	Waste of money. Traffic concerns.	Comments noted, need is established through JCS and full details and traffic assessment will be dealt with at application stage	N/A
	Please consider, very carefully, the impact on (road) transport and pollution in this already overcrowded area. Make the cyber park as green as possible, visually pleasing, low impact and well blended in- there is very little green space left now.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road traffic and pollution. Make green as possible 	Comments noted. No change to SPD.	N/A
	Views of existing residents have not been taken into account. It is wrong to drop this on an existing community without considering their needs and views. This plan strands the existing community along Fiddlers Green Lane between GCHQ (7000 workers) and the cyber hub (7500) workers. They will become an island with thousands of vehicle flowing around them, chNo change to SPDing them up with fumes. The cyber hub part of this development should be in the north, next to junction 10, with the housing in the south. This would make for a connected community. The Cyber business part of this development should not ride roughshod over the existing community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with community engagement. Put cyber in north near J10 and residential in south. 	Comments noted. The cyber element is intended to provide a mix of uses including residential rather than a distinct business land use element. The process has sought to engage with residents and community groups and the planning application stages will provide further opportunity.	N/A
	I would like to support the Hester's Way Neighbourhood Forum's submission to this consultation and also draw CBC's attention to the Master Plan for the area previously submitted by the Forum but seemingly overloNo change to SPDed when drawing up this document. I hope to see evidence in the final document that the Forum's, and local residents, views have been properly taken into account and helped to shape the plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Hester's Way Neighbourhood Forum previous masterplan submission and seek assurance community listened to. 	This SPD process has sought to engage significantly with the local community and take on board the balanced mix of views where possible. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan has been considered in the preparation of this SPD.	N/A
	This "vision" is a dream that disrespects the existing community and their opinions, homes and quality of life. Locating the cyber hub part of the site with buildings of 7 or more storeys next to existing 2 storey houses with NO BUFFER ZONE, just a narrow road with thousands and thousands of vehicle movements along it every single day, is cruel. It does nothing to integrate the existing community with the new one. Planners need to go back to the drawing board!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration concerns regarding heights and traffic impacts on existing residents. 	No change to SPD. The SPD seeks to strike the appropriate balance as the intention is for the development not to turn its back on the existing community.	N/A
	Please acknowledge in Appendix A.1.3.7 that feedback has been provided in a previous community drop-in event (Gloucestershire college 19th September) that concern was raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over bearing buildings on Fiddlers Green Lane residential 	No change to SPD. Comments have	N/A

	that the new cyber buildings should not ,loom over, existing residential areas, especially those in Fiddlers Green Lane.		been recorded here.	
--	--	--	---------------------	--