

APPLICATION NO: 20/00683/OUT		OFFICER: Mrs Emma Pickernell	
DATE REGISTERED: 29th April 2020		DATE OF EXPIRY : 29th July 2020	
WARD: Battledown		PARISH: CHARLK	
APPLICANT:	W Morrison (Chelt) Ltd & Trustees Carmelite Charitable Trust		
LOCATION:	Land Adjacent To Oakhurst Rise Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Outline application for 43 dwellings including access, layout and scale, with all other matters reserved for future consideration		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	248
Number of objections	140
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	108

Cedar House
20B Ledmore Road
Charlton Kings Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8RA

Comments: 23rd June 2020

There is a shortage of family and affordable properties in Charlton kings. This development would help address that, without spreading the village wider.

Brecon House
Charlton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9NE

Comments: 25th June 2020

I am supporting because Cheltenham lacks affordable houses for young people and I feel these houses will benefit these people.

Comments: 25th June 2020

I am supporting this application as it will provide affordable houses for young people, which Cheltenham lacks. Especially Charlton kings. As a young adult myself I am worried that young people won't be able to live/work in Cheltenham in the future because of the obscene prices. I don't think the "objectors" seem to understand this or think from a young persons perspective of what a huge benefit this would be to Cheltenham.

It will also benefit St Edwards School which is in desperate need of some support.

I really do hope some "objectors" will try to be more open minded, less selfish and think of others futures in Cheltenham not just theirs.

Brereton House
Andoversford
Gloucestershire
GL54 4JN

Comments: 29th June 2020

I am in full support of this development. It is needed in the area and the school will benefit from the money if it goes ahead.

It's good location for the development and will benefit the area greatly.

46 Pinewood Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 0GH

Comments: 30th June 2020

Having found it impossible to find a property in Cheltenham, including the Charlton Kings area recently, (so building our own now) it is obvious we need more housing, especially affordable housing, so if this development can provide these I fully support the application at Oakhurst.

Mount view
Gretton fields
Cheltenham
GL54 5hh

Comments: 4th July 2020

Affordable homes are desperately needed in Cheltenham for younger couples and those that want to move away from rented properties. There are over 2500 people in Cheltenham on the waiting list for affordable homes and this needs to change.

Pages
Chargrove Lane
Cheltenham
GL51 4XB

Comments: 7th July 2020

This development will deliver in short order 25 private homes and crucially a mixture of 18 affordable homes which has got to be a good thing for Cheltenham The school and the land owners will be in favour of this application going ahead. Both my children attended St Edwards school and I know that using this area of the site will not diminish the schools ability to carry out all the usual activities that it does today and on the positive side the school will hopefully gain some funding to help keep it maintained. They will still retain 35 acres - the land that they actually use.

I am also very pleased to hear that the attenuation system is being put in place which will reduce the flash flood risk.

267 Bath Road
Worcester
WR5 3AH

Comments: 14th July 2020

I think this application is a good idea, I have no objections.

Gray House
Harp Hill
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PR

Comments: 5th August 2020

We write to object very strongly against this proposed development for a reduced number of houses.

This reduction does nothing to address the factors against the original two applications. The site is so steep from Oakhurst Rise that there is bound to be flooding whatever the developer tries to do. The climate is changing and when it does rain it's extremely heavy compared to years ago, so more concrete will exacerbate the situation.

Also surely you cannot consider putting more cars out onto the London Road so near the Six Ways junction which is a nightmare at the best of times, let alone rush hour.

The name Six Ways speaks for itself!

Please listen to this and refuse this application completely.

The Flower House
Stanley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PD

Comments: 5th August 2020

My wife and I strongly object to the above planning application.

The vehicular access to and from the proposed development is entirely inadequate.

The roads approaching the site always have many parked vehicles on both sides of the approach roads!

The access to Oakhurst Rise has a one way system and the surrounding roads layout are overused.

Many families with young children would have more pollution spilling from more vehicles and small children, in particular, who are lower to the ground, would have vehicle exhausts puffing pollutants in their faces!

This is a 'landlocked' site with no escape routes in an emergency situation.

Many thanks for your consideration of this matter.

21 Gabell Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9FA

Comments: 17th June 2020

I supported this application in an earlier iteration for the same reason that I am supporting this revised and reduced application - Affordable Housing.

Cheltenham has a dismal record of delivering Affordable Housing and this application provides much needed affordable homes for the over 2000 people who remain on the housing waiting list.

The needs of the many in this town far outweigh the few privileged objectors many of whom already own their own homes.

Southern Lawn
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NU

Comments: 9th August 2020

I strongly object to this scheme. Even with a reduction to 43 up-market very large houses, with the strong likelihood that each property will own two or three vehicles, there will be a major traffic problem. Living on Ashley Road, each property has at least three vehicles, and sometimes 5, so the roads will have upwards of an extra 120 vehicles using the roads most days, and the vehicles tend to be large 4x4s etc. Beaufort Road already is a very well-used rat run, with speed restrictions and lots of vicious speed bumps in place. However the road is not fully one way, but has restricted access to vehicles from one side, so it has a virtually continuous one way traffic flow. However this many vehicles will often mean that lots of vehicles will go against the prevailing traffic, causing major snarl ups, during peak morning and evening times, as with cars parked on this road, it will not be possible for two way traffic to operate normally. I also frequently cycle along this route and it is already quite hazardous for cyclists with many vans and heavier vehicles using this short cut to avoid the traffic lights at the London Rd and Cirencester Road junction.

23 Wordsworth Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 7DY

Comments: 29th May 2020

There is a Badger family, Foxes who have 6 cubs, the beautiful roe deer in the meadow, among other species of wildlife that are now at risk of losing their homes, through a planning proposal to build luxury homes which will destroy the ancient meadow and their homes. They won't survive this. The planning application has been turned down twice, but it appears that the building corporation, have slyly put in another application during lock down. The planning reference is REF: 20/00683/ for Oakhurst Rise.

I believe any further housing developments would be detrimental to the area as well due to the inadequate road system which already cannot cope since the building of the other new housing estates

34 Lechlade Road
Highworth
SN67HQ

Comments: 7th June 2020

Our youngest son spent a short time at St Edwards Prep School and from all our return visits to see friends we know just how special the land in question is. Many hours have been spent playing in the field and many amazing bugs and creatures have been seen up close by very excited boys. Evenings have been spent waiting to see what would emerge and we have never been disappointed. I can not imagine the damage and loss of habitat any construction work would have on this area. It's incredibly disappointing that this is once again even being considered.

Ancient Trees Forum

Comments: 15th June 2020

The Ancient Tree Forum (ATF) is a charity which has pioneered the conservation of ancient and veteran trees and their associated habitats such as ancient wood pasture and parkland. The ATF seeks to secure the long-term future of ancient and veteran trees and associated habitats through advocacy of no further avoidable loss, good management, the development of a succession of future ancient and veteran trees, and seeking to raise awareness and understanding of their value and importance.

The ATF objects to this application because the way veteran trees have been identified means that trees, which should be protected by planning policy and meet the criteria set out by the guidance (National Planning Policy Framework glossary (2018), Standing Advice (2019) and Planning Policy Guidance (2019)), have been wrongly excluded. They are a significant factor in considering this application.

We set out our rationale for identification of ancient and veteran trees in relation to NPPF in Annex 1. In line with the government guidance, it is our view that for a tree to be categorised as a veteran, it should primarily have key decay features (including branch death or hollowing) and such features should be substantial by volume (in proportion to the size of the tree), long-lasting and/or significant (in terms of quality). NPPF glossary states that a veteran tree does not need to be old enough to be ancient but does not define any specific size or age criteria to be met. However, it is our interpretation of the guidance, that for the condition of the tree (decay features of branch death or hollowing) to be judged as irreplaceable habitat, a veteran tree will usually be in either a mature or ancient life-stage owing to the time taken and complexity of the habitat to develop.

The ATF therefore interprets the guidance to mean that trees which have the appropriate key decay features and are also mature or ancient should be considered as irreplaceable habitat and are the trees to which the policy in para 175c of the NPPF applies.

We strongly disagree with the categorisation methodology used in the tree survey. The first step of the applicant's tree consultant's methodology is to eliminate trees which do not have a "very large girth" before consideration of veteran characteristics. In our view this step is not justified by NPPF or other government guidance.

It is our view that at least two trees should be re-categorised as irreplaceable veterans and protected from harm by appropriate buffer zones. They are the mature trees numbered T3010 and T3014

The Tree Survey states that T3010 is mature tree and has "Fistulina hepatica fruiting body on root buttress at ground level east. Laetiporus sulphureus on old branch loss wound at 2 metres south. Numerous habitat holes within branch structure indicating heartwood fungal decay is well progressed." Decay or hollowing evidenced by heart-rot decay fungi is a clear criterion for veteran

categorisation and the applicant's tree consultant accepts this too. Although it is the view expressed in the tree survey that this tree may not survive long term, there is no indication why it is judged not to be able to survive long-term nor what time period that might be. There is no reference to life expectancy/longevity of the tree in the NPPF and therefore this should be disregarded in categorising a tree as a veteran. The extra protection that a buffer zone would provide, and should be allocated to this tree, would mitigate the possibility of deterioration resulting from development pressures - the very purpose for which it is intended. According to Standing Advice the Buffer Zone should be "at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5m from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter." Due to the proximity of this tree to proposed buildings the Buffer Zone may need to be greater than the minimum to avoid future intervention on the grounds of risk.

Tree number 3014 is recorded as OM/over-mature in the survey. It is recorded as having a stem diameter of 930mms and in the Raven assessment as 148 years old and not of an 'age or size to merit veteran descriptor'. We assume the OM label is a error. However, it is recorded as mature and having "bark wounding after historic lightning strike seen as broad tongue of bark loss from ground level south extending into upper crown structure, exposed and desiccated non-functional heartwood within the affected stem section comprises large volume dead wood Scattered dead wood and smaller distal decline." It is quite clear from this description and images on the Ancient Tree Inventory that the trunk of this tree is hollowing and has a large volume of deadwood in the trunk. This tree definitely has substantial and long-lasting veteran characteristics which accord with Standing Advice, it is mature and therefore is a veteran tree and should be given proper protection by an appropriate Buffer Zone.

Other mature trees on site may also be veteran trees but we do not have enough information on which to confirm their status but the LPA must be assured one way or another. The Ancient Tree Inventory is a citizen science project and has not required surveyors to assess trees according to NPPF as it started in 2005 which is well before the planning policy changes in 2018. The tree records on it however are good indicators of whether trees are ancient or veteran. For example, T3015 is listed as a veteran on the Ancient Tree Inventory and the record states that it has hollowing branches - substantial enough features on such a large tree to be good veteran characteristics. In addition, the Tree Survey, provided with the application, confirms that there are "large dead limbs scattered through the crown". Dead branches are given as a key veteran tree criterion in Standing Advice. It is very likely that this mature oak is a veteran for the purposes of NPPF and therefore should be given the protection of an appropriate buffer zone.

We would strongly recommend that the trees on site are resurveyed to identify whether other veteran trees have been overlooked.

Annex 1: The Ancient Tree Forum's interpretation of the application of National Planning Policy Framework's protection measures for ancient and veteran trees.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in England refers to ancient and veteran trees in three places:

1) in Conserving and enhancing the natural environment document, para 175c:

development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists;

2) and in Annex 2: Glossary:

Ancient or veteran tree. A tree which, because of its age, size and condition, is of exceptional biodiversity, cultural or heritage value. All ancient trees are veteran trees. Not all veteran trees

are old enough to be ancient, but are old relative to other trees of the same species. Very few trees of any species reach the ancient life-stage.

Irreplaceable habitat: Habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity. They include ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees,...

In terms of applying the NPPF to a development proposal and to relevant trees, the first step must be to identify if a tree is ancient or veteran. The glossary, to be used in this context, describes three characteristics i.e. age, size and condition, which contribute to the stated values of biodiversity, cultural and heritage value of both ancient and veteran trees. There is no guidance on the parameters of age (except that veterans can be younger than ancient trees), or size or the meaning of condition.

In relation to ancient trees, the ATF considers ancient is a life-stage indicated by the chronological age of the trunk, using trunk girth only as a guide. Trees in this ancient life-stage usually also have well-developed key veteran decay features as a consequence of ageing. It is ATF's view that all ancient trees are exceptional and irreplaceable for their cultural and heritage values, but specifically, for the application of NPPF policy 175c, they all have irreplaceable habitat.

In relation to veteran trees, the NPPF glossary only distinguishes by age those trees that 'are not old enough to be ancient, but are old relative to trees of the same species.' Planning Policy Guidance (2019 and FC & NE Standing Advice (2018) give some further guidance in relation to age (see bold below) and also condition (see underlined below):

PPG: Ancient trees are trees in the ancient stage of their life. Veteran trees may not be very old but exhibit decay features such as branch death or hollowing. Trees become ancient or veteran because of their age, size or condition. Not all of these three characteristics are needed to make a tree ancient or veteran as the characteristics will vary from species to species.

Standing Advice: A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its biodiversity

Both of the above documents provide examples of relevant features relating to condition i.e. branch death and hollowing. But, neither these nor the NPPF glossary, give guidance or information on the amount, volume or quality of these features. In line with the available guidance, the ATF consider, that a tree to be categorised as a veteran for the application of NPPF policy 175(c) should have key decay features (including branch death or hollowing) which should be substantial by volume (in proportion to the size of the tree), long-lasting and/or significant (in terms of quality).

For a tree to have developed decay features of branch death or hollowing which could be judged to be irreplaceable habitat, it will usually be in either a mature or ancient life-stage owing to the time taken and complexity of the habitat to develop. Threshold dimensions for veteran characteristics are recommended in the Veteran Trees Initiative: Specialist Survey Method but these may not be appropriate for all species of tree, especially those of a smaller stature (Fay, N. and de Berker, N. (1997): Veteran Trees Initiative: Specialist Survey Method. English Nature, Peterborough, UK). For example, in terms of dead wood in the crown of the tree the unit of value is "each 1m length over 15cm in diameter".

According to the glossary, a veteran tree does not need to be old enough to be ancient. However, it is likely that for the condition of the tree (decay features of branch death or hollowing) to be judged as irreplaceable habitat, a veteran tree will usually be in a mature life-stage.

In conclusion

All ancient trees of whatever species or size should receive the level of protection stated in para 175c.

Mature trees, where they have the appropriate key decay features, should be considered as irreplaceable habitat and therefore veterans to which the policy in para 175c of the NPPF applies.

Tanglin
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NZ

Comments: 16th June 2020

I am writing to OBJECT to the latest application for the development of land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

I object on three primary grounds;

- The negative effects on the local community of Oakhurst Rise in particular, and the Ewens Farm estate in general, caused by a permanent rise in traffic, increased risk of flooding, and the greatly reduced chance of a doctor's appointment and loss of their quiet space due to increased noise caused by 43 new families, their friends, visitors and additional businesses run from this new site, which cannot be underestimated
- The loss of the current use of the site for recreational and educational use. These green spaces within the town's boundaries become even more important as the development of green-field sites continues unabated
- There is actually no necessity to develop this site. Draft proposals to build a new community/village to the west of Swindon Village comprising thousands of homes - a significantly large number of which will be affordable - should be fast-tracked by the Council who should coordinate with Highways for England to ensure that this plan is delayed no longer.

The fact that the developer is applying again after two failed attempts and a damning refusal at Appeal proves, if proof were needed, that this application is driven purely by self-interest and an attitude of "build at any and all costs", regardless of any and all objections made by the local community, so as to recoup the losses incurred thus far by previous failed applications.

4 Tivoli Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UX

Comments: 24th June 2020

I would like to support this application. Cheltenham is desperate for more homes, especially in the Charlton Kings area. It will provide opportunity and progression for the young, families and the older generation. The demand for private and affordable homes is very strong, and many hard-working people are deserving of their chance to have houses in this area.

There are no valid reasons for this application not to be approved. The school and the landowners require the application to go ahead. The school can improve its facilities and sort out needed maintenance. There is actually a net bio diversity gain if the site is built. The attenuation

system will reduce the flood risk as it captures and stores flash flood rainwater, and is a system which is needed far more in Cheltenham due to rises in rainwater volume from global warming. Also, with the local and national economy in pieces, the House Building Industry is vital in the recovery. These houses need to be built, to display that Cheltenham is intent on improving the lives of young people, while creating more employment and future progression.

2 Norwich Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HE

Comments: 30th June 2020

I wish to support this application specifically assisted housing.

Houses in Cheltenham is expensive. I had personal experience when my children were trying to buy and ended up having to leave Cheltenham

The government are about to put forward a development plan which this would fit well in.

Ridge and Partners
Regent House
Rodney Road
Cheltenham
GL50 1HX

Comments: 2nd July 2020

Letter attached.

154 Gloucester Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 8NR

Comments: 6th July 2020

Seems to be a very good idea providing essential private and affordable housing whilst also providing a financial boost for the school

75 Drayton Gardens
London
SW10 9QZ

Comments: 14th July 2020

Nice looking houses in a place where I would want to move to and live and bringing up my family

Flat 13
Osborne Lodge
99 The Park Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2RW

Comments: 20th July 2020

I have learnt that planning will have a disastrous impact on wildlife in the region which is unacceptable. In the world of increased sustainability, this will reflect badly on Cheltenham.

Stanley Park
Selsley
Stroud
GL5 5LE

Comments: 22nd July 2020

I believe that this is a good scheme - which should be supported - to provide more housing which Cheltenham needs, especially in Charlton Kings (where I lived for 20 years).

40 Pilley Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ER

Comments: 16th June 2020

Due to lack of affordable housing I have had to move back to my parent's home, so it would be great to have the opportunity get on the property ladder in such an area.

26 Hatherley Court Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3AG

Comments: 22nd June 2020

More affordable housing needed in Cheltenham.

Highclere
Cirencester Road
Birdlip
GL4 8JL

Comments: 23rd June 2020

- 1) Cheltenham desperately needs decent homes for many people (both able and disabled), the young, families and the old/infirm, not least in Charlton Kings where the demand for both private and affordable homes is both incredibly strong and unsatisfied. This development will deliver in short order 25 private homes and crucially a mixture of 18 affordable homes, to the approval of at least six Housing Associations. The application is supported by the CBC Planning Department.
- 2) We all understand local residents objecting, no one likes change, however they have their houses and are attempting to stop other people just as deserving having theirs, in affect the well-heeled objectors are attempting to pull the "housing ladder" up behind them!!!!.

This is a must for cutting down commuting distance to work and as I understand it the school could do with the money made from the sale of the land to improve the school facilities.

1 St Margarets Road
Alderton
Tewkesbury
Gloucestershire
GL20 8NN

Comments: 29th June 2020

As a 22 year old graduate engineer looking to venture into the housing market, it is clear the desperate lack of affordable housing within the Charlton Kings area, as highlighted in the local plan. This development offers 18 new affordable houses to enable people like myself a genuine opportunity at entering the housing market which is currently as difficult as ever. Also, as an engineer, the idea that the development will propose a flood risk 'downstream' is far from the case. Modern attenuation systems are in high demand on a national scale, due to the increase in frequency and severity of rainfall events due to anthropogenic climate change. This development offers a good opportunity to add in this needed attenuation systems to the benefit of the local community.

Westwell, Main Road
Shurdington
Cheltenham
GL51 4US

Comments: 2nd July 2020

Cheltenham needs more affordable homes and in all the different areas of Cheltenham.

Brookford cottage
Shipton Oliffe
Cheltenham
GL544JF

Comments: 4th July 2020

As we all know affordable housing is desperately needed, this is a great opportunity for this to happen.

I think it will be a massive financial benefit to St Edwards School and long term guarantee/secure there future, this would also be the case for some of the businesses at six ways, some of which have struggled for years, this would definitely be a bonus for them and more houses/people near by can only help and add to these businesses survival.

The wildlife will greatly benefit and improve there, which too will be a huge value to the pupils at the school,

The uncontrolled flood risk which is currently there will be controlled and massively reduced.

7 Naseby House
Cromwell Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5DT

Comments: 7th July 2020

Cheltenham is in desperate need of affordable housing for young, families and the old/infirm, especially in Charlton Kings where the demand for both private and affordable homes is both

incredibly strong and unsatisfied. This development will deliver in 25 private homes and crucially a mixture of 18 affordable homes, to the approval of at least six Housing Associations. I can't stress how much the need The application is supported by the CB council Both the School and the landowners, both. CharitableTrusts, require the planning

Wyndways
104 Charlton Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9EA

Comments: 7th July 2020

The key issue for my support is the construction of 18 affordable homes for the local people of Charlton Kings, who are currently finding it difficult to find affordable housing in an area where many grew up. In turn as their parents grow older and need support and care , this part of the development will allow families to offer support in close proximity.

Change is never well received and because of the site of this development more so , in turn with no impact on the running or the facilities of St Edwards school , it has plenty of positives to recommend it .

43 Hanover Court
Elkstone Close
Worcester
WR4 9XH

Comments: 14th July 2020

I have no objections to this planning application.

37 Salix Court
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3WH

Comments: 8th July 2020

Always good to see more affordable homes, and any extra business for local trades will certainly help particularly in the current climate

49 Moorend Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0LA

Comments: 14th July 2020

Any initiative which has the potential to reduce flood risk to property going forward can only be of benefit to individual homeowners and the wider community. This is certainly an issue which is likely to increase over time, with the climate becoming wetter and warmer.

In addition, particularly in the current climate, it would seem prudent to build affordable housing, particularly in an area that sees consistently high demand for housing.

Finally, as an ex-St Edwards parent I would like to support this application as it would afford the school the opportunity to improve facilities for the benefit of the pupils.

58 Alfred Rd
Alfred Road
Feltham
TW13 5DJ

Comments: 22nd July 2020

We would be very interested in moving back to this area if affordable homes such as those proposed were available.

37 Beeches Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8NL

Comments: 6th May 2020

I wish to object to this application on the following grounds:

- (a) Roads - I don't think that the roads around the site will support the likely number of vehicle movements that 43 more dwellings would generate. They are narrow and are already dangerous for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists, with cars parked on both sides in places, blocking sight lines and narrowing the roads still further. There is no reason to believe that the proposed development would have fewer cars per dwelling than the surrounding area (in spite of the generous offer of £750 per dwelling for electric bicycles...). For that reason, access and movement around the proposed development seem unlikely to be as good as described in the Gloucestershire Highways Development Management report that accompanied the most recent previous application (ref: B/2018/041670), even taking into account the fact that fewer dwellings are being planned. I would not want to be an ambulance driver trying to access the top of Oakhurst Rise in a hurry at the moment, never mind with 43 more dwellings' worth of cars moving around in the area.
- (b) The same report describes the site as being 'accessible to high quality public transport'. Any form of halfway decent public transport is only so accessible if you are a good walker - the hill approaching the site is steep and, in winter, treacherous (not gritted). The buses that actually run through Ewen's Farm are infrequent - describing them as 'high quality public transport' is imaginative in the extreme. The B bus (on the London Road) is better, but what the impact of COVID on local public transport will be remains to be seen. I realise that this is speculation, but I will be surprised if the B bus returns to pre-COVID levels of regularity.
- (c) Accessibility to local amenities is also only available to the fit or to those with cars - they are all at the bottom of the self-same hill - or further away, at Oakley!
- (d) The ecological survey of the site suggests that replanting should be 'native species'. That's all well and good, but at the end of the day what people plant in their own garden can't be controlled - changes to the amount of water in the soil and to the chemical balance of the soil could easily endanger the ancient trees and hedgerow that are primary points of interest on this site.
- (e) Flooding - I understand that the area is already at risk of flooding. Concreting over yet more land, and adding further waste water to the drains in the area, is only going to make that worse.

11 Beaufort Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JS

Comments: 8th May 2020

I am a council tenant next to Oakhurst Rise. The meadow has been an integral part of my community life, with my son winning his gold medal for cross country there. And respectfully recording the flora and fauna within this area and the unique symbiosis of this oasis nestled in an urban area, which makes it unique. My life times work with ecology and it's health importance, sees me as a Qualified Hedgehog first aid person, years of experience at vale wildlife hospital as a volunteer, badger conservationist and hedgehog conservationists and wildlife gardener. It has never been more imperative at this crucial time, to acknowledge the importance of preserving nature and it's health, that working with David Attenborough's program is high on my agenda to keeping this space for the natural world to continue to flourish, with an ancient badger sett, a healthy deer population, red kites nesting to name but a few of the local residents here, who's ancestors have been here since medieval times and before. I ask that great consideration is given over to a healthy wildlife population, who in truth will not be able to deal with being displaced. I monitor the badgers, who are a frequent visitor to my garden as well as hedgehogs, foxes and birds of prey who all visit me from the meadow. On a practical side, my home has been under pinned due to subsidence, and flooding, but will leave that to the experts, high lighting a on going problem. Please consider leaving this ecological wonder to the future of our children, the health towards our planet and consider not leaving relegating it to history in favour of a concrete, and lifeless wonder of what use to be. Thank you

Wadleys Farm
Ham Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NJ

Comments: 21st May 2020

Letter attached.

32 Barbridge Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 0BX

Comments: 12th June 2020

This scheme ticks all the boxes in terms of policy compliance. Cheltenham and especially Charlton Kings need the homes so hopefully the nimby's won't succeed in stopping these desperately needed houses.

Viking
Walton Lane
Bosham
PO18 8QF

Comments: 12th June 2020

I no longer live at the above address but have been lodging in Ashley Road (GL52) during lockdown and have walked endless Covid-miles around the surrounding area and the site. I moved out of Bosham prompted in part by the ruination of the area by a relentless series of local planning applications by well-heeled developers which took up a disproportionate amount of cash-strapped planners' time and eventually led to their capitulation - I trust CDC are made of sterner stuff.

There is no evidence that these applicants have any interest in or understanding of the site other than for short term material gain; if the site with outline permission were land-banked, any personal assurances/statements of intent would of course be worthless and public trust in the allocation of affordable housing is long gone; gaming of the system with secret 'viability assessments' has seen to that.

Repeated inconsistencies in the supporting documentation suggest at best incompetence, but possibly bad faith? In the Design and Access Statement, the applicants claim that their design 'respects the urban characteristics of the vicinity.' Later on in the same document they promote their sensitivity to the 'parkland setting'... with plans for post and rail fencing. (The displaced badgers would appreciate that - more gardens to dig up but they are savage if threatened - a pet dog or cat would stand no chance; something that would probably not appear in sales promotion for houses on the site?)

The description of the site as 'unkempt grassland' is presumably meant to disparage; it shows a complete lack of understanding. The extraordinary range of flora and fauna thrives on this site precisely because it is not cultivated, and the carbon sequestration that the grassland and trees quietly get on with should be treasured in a post-Covid world where air-quality will be of paramount importance. The air quality on London Road/Sixways is below standard at peak times; this development would exacerbate the situation.

As for the single attenuation pond (not ponds as stated in the text of the application), its siting as shown on the latest plan beggars belief; on clay subsoil with nearby houses in Charlton Court Road having already experienced historical movement? On the boundary with St.Edwards School, downhill of the site, where surcharged water will flood? A planning authority has a statutory duty to cause 'no unacceptable harm to local amenity including the amenity of neighbouring occupants' and must 'ensure that the flood risk is not increased elsewhere'. Add to that the civil liability set out in Kane vs New Forest District Council: (CA June 2001) where the Court of Appeal decided that NFDC could not shelter behind technical compliance with planning law in order to evade normal civil liability, and CDC should be rightly concerned. They have been alerted to flooding issues, particularly of unpredictable springs, in normal weather; there is no evidence that 'normal' will be the pattern for the foreseeable future. Equally important are the real difficulties of residents in Oakhurst Rise with regard to the proposed access road which by any reasonable view is difficult in normal conditions and downright dangerous in extreme weather (the inspector described it as 'tortuous'). No amount of delegation or desk-top assessment can remove that knowledge from the planning authority or erase their ultimate responsibility.

This site would be expensive to develop, very expensive to develop well. With mounting costs (and the possibility of more - (judicial review? Another appeal?) the prospect of providing housing that fulfils a local need diminishes, assuming that was ever a genuine intention.

60 Mendip Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5EF

Comments: 18th June 2020

Best schools in county but catchment area is currently too small due to lack of housing. New affordable housing needed.

Hillside
Undercliff Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9AA

Comments: 23rd June 2020

I fully support this Application as it clearly meets all Council Guidelines and Policies.

There is a particular need for affordable homes in this area of town and opportunities of this nature are rare so the Council must take advantage and follow the recommendations of its Planning Officers by GRANTING PERMISSION.

The Applicant has addressed previous concerns and no reason for Refusal on Planning Grounds.

28 Robert Burns Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6NT

Comments: 1st July 2020

I am writing to let you know my objections to the building of forty-three houses, adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

The main reason for the objection is the threat to the wildlife on the land. Any sort of building will wipe out protected species as bats, newts, slow worms and adders. Also a lot of bird species will be lost. Old oak trees and hedgerows will go or be damaged. Also the organic meadow will be lost. Having this wildlife environment near or in an urban area is very important for it's wellbeing.

There are lots of reasons the planed development is not good for this area, flash flooding and traffic impact. Also impact on GP surgerys and schools.

We only hope the Planning Committee do the right thing and not let this development go ahead.

12 Malleson Road
Gotherington
Nr Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 4ER

Comments: 18th June 2020

I have been waiting to buy a new house in this area for some time now and there is nothing of any quality available. This will make a fantastic place to live for a lot of people and is exactly what the area needs.

Valley View House
Charlton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9NE

Comments: 24th June 2020

This is a long awaited and needed development that includes valuable affordable homes. This development is supported by the Cheltenham Borough Council. Environmentally this development will reduce the risk of flooding to the homes down stream. Also environmentally many trees will be planted. There will still be a lot of open space.

Many of the objectors who are living around this site are in very comfortable properties and may be looking after themselves rather than thinking of helping the wider community.

Having the support of the CBC is so important. If this has to go to appeal again it is the local tax payers who will have to subsidise this massive cost - more people who could potentially lose out.

37 Pegasus Gardens
Quedgeley
Gloucester
GL2 4NP

Comments: 10th July 2020

I would like to object to this application for outline planning permission on the land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise for the following reasons:

Oakhurst Rise has a very steep gradient which in the winter months becomes very icy and almost impossible to use for the current residents, luckily due to the fact that most of the current residents are retired this doesn't pose too much of a problem, however if you add another 43 dwellings aimed at families and young people most of whom will need to drive out down the steep, narrow road of Oakhurst Rise at least once a day I believe this will cause more accidents along this road. The increase in traffic as most of these new dwellings will have 2 or more cars will change the currently very quiet and peaceful road to a busy and noisy road and cause chaos as it is a very steep, narrow and twisty road with very little opportunity to allow cars to pass side by side, the entrance to Oakhurst Rise is practically a blind entrance and this has to be taken into account.

Due to the steep gradient of Oakhurst Rise it is unlikely that many people will choose to walk or cycle up and down it there is very limited public transport in Ewan's Farm currently so again this is not likely to encourage people to use this method of transport therefore more vehicles is the only viable option for most of the potential residents meaning that there will be a vastly increased number of vehicles using Oakhurst Rise which was only ever designed for the small number of bungalows in the street currently, I believe that this development would bring between 75 and 100 more vehicles along Oakhurst Rise everyday excluding deliveries not a viable option really the road won't be able to cope with the increased traffic.

There is only one road in and out of this proposed development so all construction traffic will be using Oakhurst Rise which currently even the ambulances struggle on occasion to access due to the narrowness of the road.

All the utilities will have to come through Oakhurst Rise causing further disruption to the residents.

The wildlife on the site currently will be lost during the building stage and won't have homes to return to once work is complete. My understanding is that there is currently a badger sett on the land which they intend on removing and relocating the badgers too this is not ideal. There are also adders, slow worms, deer and many species of birds that nest and feed on the land many of which will be lost forever.

I am all for providing affordable houses however this is not the place for it.

5 Beaufort Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JS

Comments: 16th May 2020

I am writing to object to the plans as they will have considerable impact on the road - Oakhurst Rise which is very steep and inadequate for the increased traffic.

As well as creating the issue adjoining Beaufort Road which is already a problem for the current residents as it is a tight corner that joins the heavy traffic that runs through the estate.

We are also very concerned regarding the wildlife that this will impact that live there and have done for generations.

Glenwhittan
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 22nd May 2020

I write to object to the above planning application, on the grounds of the serious damage it would cause to part of a unique landscape - the Cotswold escarpment; in line with comments submitted on 20th March 2017 to the Cheltenham Plan (part one) Public Consultation; and for other reasons, relating to environment and wildlife habitat and also in respect of the proposed access.

Landscape

The first objection is that the application would allow damaging development and construction work on high ground forming part of the Cotswold escarpment. Ground contour levels for the site rise from about 100m AOD at the south end of the site, to about 125m adjacent the rear of Birchley Road properties, on the north side of the site; whereas almost all major development in Cheltenham over the last 100 years or so has been limited to ground levels of about 105 - 110m AOD. The site is not a non-descript field in Gloucestershire: it is part of the Cotswold escarpment. As proposed in the comment for the Cheltenham Plan: Public Consultation, there should be no development on ground above 110m, in order to protect the escarpment; which, from south of Gloucester to the north of Cheltenham (past Prestbury, Bishops Cleeve, Woodmancote, Oxenton, Teddington), remains a largely undeveloped, unspoiled landscape of great natural beauty.

The only major development on the east side of Cheltenham is Battledown, which was planned and laid out about 150 years ago; with the significant requirement that every property should be sited on an half acre plot. This allowed most of the properties built to be planted with major trees, so that it is now visually a green tree-covered landscape with many properties part hidden when looking from the west (Gloucester, Staverton, Churchdown, Tewkesbury) eastwards. The properties proposed for the Oakhurst Rise development are generally on plots of limited size, which will not allow the planting of large trees (because of the disruptive effect they would have on the properties themselves).

In this sense, the proposed development, with houses on ground rising to about 125m, is as undesirable and damaging to the landscape as development of the middle slopes of any hills, escarpment or coastline would be. It would also set a terrible precedent for higher level development of the south side of the existing village of Charlton Kings, below Daisybank Road. Regarding levels, a limit of 110m would approximately match the extent of recent development on

the south side of Charlton Kings: there is a spot level of 109m at the top of Sandy Lane, near Southfield Manor. Adjacent the Oakhurst Rise site, the ground level round the highest of the school buildings is about 108m.

Environment and Wildlife

This problem with the proposed development is compounded by the planned removal of parts of a major old hedgerow, which has developed over the last century at least into an area of wild woodland, which extends to an area of about 4,000m², about 1 acre. As a consequence of its age and size, and its continuity from the north to the south of the site, across ground levels from about 125m to about 100m, at present it shelters, and provides a wildlife corridor for foxes, deer, bats, birds, especially owls and wood-peckers, a wide variety of small mammals and reptiles (newts, snakes and slowworms), and butterflies and insects: some of which wildlife is rarely seen elsewhere, or is documented as rare. It is proposed that the section between about contour levels 115 and 120 would be removed to make way for the access road and housing. This would destroy the wildlife corridor.

Near the north end of this woodland area there is a very large veteran oak tree (tree T8 on the original tree survey, with a girth of about 5.5m). This tree requires at least the detailed protection measures set out in BS 5837 (Trees in relation to construction) including a construction exclusion zone; (as required in cl. 3.1.2: to be established "before works commence on site (which) is essential as the only way to prevent damage being caused to retained trees by operations in their vicinity"; (such 'damaging operations' to be prevented would include any construction or arboricultural works within the exclusion zone).

There is a second small wild wooded area about 30m to the east, about 600m² in area, on high ground (levels about 121 - 124m) on the north side of an existing large badger sett. It is proposed that this is to be removed entirely, including the badgers.

There is really no planning or intellectual argument to justify destruction of wild woodland, in the absence of confidence in the developer's willingness and determination to protect important features of the existing environment as they are now. The developer's justification is that many of the individual trees to be removed are not of specimen value, not being individually planted and nurtured, i.e. being wild; overlooking the fact of the unbroken length and size of the woodland area, that can be seen for miles around. Over at least the last century this woodland has become home to wildlife, and a wildlife corridor in a natural environment without any human interference: the adjoining meadows are mown once a year, about a day's work with a tractor.

The objection to the Developer's proposals, in relation to existing mature areas of trees forming woodland, is supported by another recommendation of BS 5837: Trees in relation to construction: cl. 4.2.4: "Trees forming groups and areas of woodland (including orchards, wood pasture and historic parkland) should be identified and considered as groups particularly if they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long term management. It may be appropriate to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals." That recommendation is reinforced strongly when the area of woodland is also home to a wide variety of species of wildlife, as in this case.

Furthermore the Office for National Statistics is now mapping and valuing environmental assets as part of a government project to 'improve understanding of our natural capital': (Report: The Times: July 23rd, 2019); which continues: 'It estimated the worth of Britain's green spaces...in terms of carbon sequestration (the ability of vegetation, especially trees, to absorb carbon dioxide), the removal of air pollution from the atmosphere, and recreation. Valuing natural capital has become a critical issue because, without a price, markets automatically treat the environment as worthless. Costing natural services helps to correct that mistake and improve decision-making.'

Though the main reasons for objections on these grounds, (and therefore for rejection of the application), are first, preservation of irreplaceable landscape and wildlife undisturbed, and second, retention of woods and trees as by far the best method of carbon sequestration currently and definitely available, (all within a thriving community); the retention of natural habitat and ecology is also of great value, especially when available to a school, and through the school to other young people.

Finally, a recent 'Nature Notebook' from The Times (March 2019) reports the typical decline in abundance of wildlife resulting from tidy and managed development in an English county:

"Visiting my father, who still lives in the village where I grew up, I was struck by how busy the roads were, how tidy and managed it seemed compared with the rambling, slightly ramshackle place I remember - and how little space was left for the natural world. Everything that wasn't built on was strimmed and pruned, every green glimpsed was a monoculture paddock or tightly manicured golf course, the tangled woods I once played in tidied and fenced off for paintball. It looked pretty and prosperous, but as money poured in to create this the wildlife was quietly forced out.

In the past thirty years 11.5% of the county's plants, birds, invertebrates, fish, reptiles, amphibians and mammals have become locally extinct, a far higher figure than the national rate of 2%. A further 4.4% are threatened with extinction. There's no agribusiness or heavy industry to blame; ... but the area ranks in the top 25% of England's most densely populated counties Nature needs untidiness to flourish; it must be allowed to be self-willed, not made to look like something from a glossy magazine. 'O let them be left, wildness and wet; Long live the weeds and the wilderness yet.'

If development goes ahead there will be ecological surveys, and 'biodiversity offsetting' should be put in place, which can mean little more than planting non-native saplings in place of mature native trees. But some site-faithful birds such as sparrows (which are in decline) rarely move more than a kilometre from their place of birth; the loss of suitable breeding habitat for a couple of seasons can wipe out a small colony. This is how we lose our wildlife: bit by bit."

Access to site and Transport

The road proposed for access to the site, Oakhurst Rise (OR), is seriously inadequate in several ways. The road design standards required for the access road are set out in at least two relevant documents:

Glos. C. C.: 'Highway requirements for development' (GCC:HRD)

Vehicular Access Standards: Development Control Advice Note 15, 2nd edition; produced by the Planning service, an Agency within the Department of the Environment. (The purpose of this Advice Note is to give general guidance to intending developers, their professional advisors and agents on the standards for vehicular access.) (VAS)

In addition, the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 are relevant to all aspects of the proposed development; particularly Regulation 27 Traffic routes. (CDM Regs)

- The road gradients (of OR) are too steep: almost 15% gradient for the upper length leading to the site entrance; about 13.5% for the lower length joining Beaufort Road (BR): both far in excess of the standards: GCC:HRD gives 8%, VAS gives 10% but with one important qualification. The consequence is that, at those gradients, the access road will be unusable by many vehicles after snowfalls, and will be hazardous in icy conditions; with a potential risk of accidents at the junctions, because of cars and lorries failing to stop in time, or sliding into or across the two T-junctions, one at the bottom of the upper slope opposite 17 OR, and the other being the BR/OR junction which is extremely critical, because of the potential volume of traffic. At the BR/OR junction in particular the gradient of the lower length of OR (about 13.5%) continues until close to the junction without a reasonable 'dwell' area of level or reduced gradient length of carriageway in OR to assist vehicles having difficulty in stopping. In view of this potential hazard, the VAS requirements are that

'the gradient of the access shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary' and 'The remainder of the access should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather'; but it is impossible to achieve anything even close to this: see VAS cl. 10.3.

- The width of the access road (OR: 5.5m) is too narrow: VAS requires 6.0m for a two-way access; and in addition, because the road is narrow, the entry radius for the turn from ER into OR is tight without straying into the opposite (downhill) carriageway. This is important because of the proposed shared use by OR residents and construction traffic.
- The OR pavement widths (1.7-1.8m) are rather narrow: GCC:HRD requires 2.0m.

In summary OR does not comply with requirements for an access road to serve 67 dwellings, instead of the 24 it serves at present; i.e. as well as not meeting standards given by the documents noted, there would be a very high intensification of use.

Beside the unsuitability of OR as the access road to the site, the assessment of the effect of the development on the local roads immediately affected is flawed because there would be a substantial increase in traffic on the two roads leading away from OR: Ewens and Beaufort Roads (ER/BR):

- oCurrent dwellings: Ewens Road 19
Pine Close, OR 43
Beaufort Road 41
- i.e. the total number of dwellings: 103 at present, would increase to 146.
- Therefore there would be a substantial increase in traffic on Ewens and Beaufort Roads leading away from OR: whereas on-street parking on these roads and Haywards Road (the next affected road for traffic towards Cheltenham) was described as 'sporadic': definition 'occurring only here and there, separate, scattered'; the street parking is nearer constant and widespread than sporadic, and already severely restricts vehicle movements on these roads, and on Oak Avenue.
- All these roads are residential roads, not suitable as transitional roads, and certainly not as local distributor roads: (a through traffic route suitable for moving traffic between different parts of the town).
- In discussing overall design concepts the GCC:HRD recommended: 'The creation of large cul-de-sac estate layouts, where a large number of houses rely on one access road, and pedestrian access is similarly restricted, must be avoided'.

In summary, the traffic generated by the development would feed into local residential roads which are also steep, narrow and already congested by traffic and on-street parking.

The CDM Regulations are relevant in particular because of the very significant variation of the actual parameters of the access road (OR) from reasonable road parameters (particularly gradients) recommended in the appropriate standards (VAS or GCC:HRD). As an example, the OR gradient up to the junction with Beaufort Road is about 13.5%, whereas the VAS standard requires that: 'the gradient shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary The remainder should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather.' That discrepancy, by such a large margin between actual gradient and DOE recommended values and the absence of a dwell area, implies a potentially serious hazard, with the associated risk certainly including a traffic accident or one involving a vehicle with a pedestrian or cyclist.

Under the Regulations, it is one or more of the CDM dutyholders (the Client, the Principal Designer and other designers, and the Principal Contractor) who are responsible, when preparing or modifying designs for the project or development as a whole, for identifying, eliminating or controlling foreseeable risks, by following the general principles of prevention set out in the Regulations. That process (a fundamental part of the project design) should have been started before the first planning application was made. In persisting with what appears to be a completely inappropriate access to the site, there appears to be a failure to comply with the CDM

Regulations, which are statutory provisions; in which case, the present Application should be rejected on these grounds alone.

Comments: 6th June 2020

Further to our comments objecting to the development, forwarded on 21st May 2020, we write to amplify these comments on two points:

Access to the site: Relevance of published standards, and of the CDM Regulations:

The road proposed for access to the site, Oakhurst Rise (OR), is seriously inadequate in several ways. The road design standards required for the access road are set out in at least two relevant documents:

Glos. C. C.: 'Highway requirements for development' (GCC:HRD)

Vehicular Access Standards: Development Control Advice Note 15, 2nd edition; produced by the Planning service, an Agency within the Department of the Environment. (The purpose of this Advice Note is to give general guidance to intending developers, their professional advisors and agents on the standards for vehicular access.) (VAS)

Even if these documents are not followed precisely and in detail they represent a reasonable and objective standard against which any actual proposals can be judged. The inadequacies of OR, as the access road to the site, are set out in our initial comments; and include that the road gradients are too steep, the width of the road is too narrow, and the pavement widths are too narrow.

The CDM Regulations: Reg. 1: These Regulations may be cited as the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 and come into force on 6th April 2015 The duties of the Client (the Applicant for planning permission) are set out in Part 2 (Regs. 4-7). They include the appointment of the principal designer and principal contractor (Reg. 5); whose own duties and roles are set out in Part 3 (Regs. 8-15). The duties of the principal designer are, in turn, set out in Reg. 11; which states (Reg. 11(3)): the principal designer must identify and eliminate or control, so far as is reasonably practicable, foreseeable risks to the health or safety of any person .. carrying out or liable to be affected by construction work; ..

In this case, the foreseeable risks arise from the greatly intensified use of the badly laid out road junction (particularly in context of the increased use) of the access road (OR) with Beaufort Road (BR). The access road use rises from serving 24 properties to serving 67 properties, about 180% intensification, when VAS states (cl. 1.2): 'A well designed access is important for the safety and convenience of all road users - those proceeding on the public road (BR) as well as those using the access (OR). So, when the Department considers proposals for a new access or the intensification of use of an existing access , it will normally have a number of requirements to promote safety Intensification is considered to occur when a proposed development would increase the traffic flow using an access by 5% or more.'

The existing road junction (OR/BR) is badly laid out by comparison with the vehicular access standards given in VAS (cl. 10.3): 'The gradient of the access shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary ... The remainder of the access should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather.' The actual OR gradients are about 13.5%, from very close to the OR/BR junction, increasing to about 15% for the rise up to the site entrance.

In respect of the CDM Regulations, these were foreseeable risks from the first consideration of the development by the Client and principal designer; and if they could not be eliminated or controlled, an alternative access to the site would have been needed to make the development viable under the Regulations.

Environment and areas of trees forming woodland

BS 5837: Trees in relation to construction: cl. 4.2.4: 'Trees forming groups and areas of woodland should be identified and considered as groups particularly if they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long term management. It may be appropriate to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals.'

Since much of the discussion about trees, which should be retained and which trees or groups of trees removed, was on the basis of considerations set out in this British Standard, it seems illogical and unreasonable not to consider such groups of trees as a whole, as the British Standard suggests, and as areas of woodland to be retained as a whole: part of irreplaceable landscape and wildlife to be left undisturbed.

1 Pine Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JR

Comments: 22nd May 2020

I find myself protesting for the third time with regards to the planning proposal for Oakhurst Rise.

This is a beautiful, organic meadow with ancient oaks and hedgerows. The loss of green fields and a unique habitat will be a threat to wildlife. There are seven species of bats, newts, adders, slow worms, dozens of bird species and a family of deer, often seen in the meadow during the day. There are also badgers, that would not survive if relocated.

The increased risk of flash floods will have consequences for local people, including myself who live below the proposed site.

Local schools are already over subscribed and the local GP surgery has a six year waiting list.

To quote from Planning Committee minutes 19/07/18 "only one access to the site, which is torturous and ridiculous via a windy, congested rat run" Steep gradients, blind junctions and dangers in snow and ice have all been ignored. The junction at sixways is already over capacity and this problem has not yet been addressed. The traffic impact of forty three dwellings (at least an extra eighth vehicles) will be severe.

The local plan has already met the affordable housing need, providing enough housing for the town until 2031.

Until all of these problems have been addressed and the developers have a satisfactory solution, then planning permission must be refused

Ash Tree House
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 8th June 2020

I strongly object to this current proposal - 20/00683/OUT, for all the same reasons that the CBC Planning Committee cited for its refusal of the previous applications on this site, namely 17/00710/OUT & 18/02171/OUT. This application is merely a further amendment to the previous

applications by the same developers which were comprehensively rejected by CBC twice in the last two years!

All the previous objections and comments from both applications 17/00710/OUT and 18/02171/OUT should still be considered by the planning committee as they remain relevant to this application. From CBCs own refusal decision letter, five key reasons were recorded and a mention was made of the NPPF. None of these reasons have been adequately addressed by the latest application so this application should also be rejected.

With regards to the above concerns it is respectfully requested that planning permission for the above development be refused.

Flat 4
11 Montpellier Grove
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2XB

Comments: 21st July 2020

My objection is that all reasons for the previous refusals of earlier applications are still valid. Nothing has changed so why should this one go ahead? The proposed site is valuable green belt land and is home to a variety of species of wildlife. It is also currently being rented by a local school and is home to several alpacas and hives of bees. It would be unacceptable if this planning application were to be approved.

28 Copt Elm Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8AE

Comments: 21st August 2020

Letter attached.

54 Fairview Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 2JJ

Comments: 12th June 2020

I find it staggering that this application is still ongoing, given the concessions already made and the urgent need for more affordable housing in the area.

Given the overwhelming support from professional consultees and young, working families, surely at some point the public interest should prevail over the objections of a small minority who are unrepresentative of the local demographic at large.

56 Leighton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6BD

Comments: 25th June 2020

I understand that this proposed housing on this site is contained within the Local Plan.

There is a dearth of affordable housing in Cheltenham in general and most certainly in the Charlton Kings area. Unfortunately young local people can not afford housing in the area they may have grown up in and have to move further afield which is a sad reflection of the cost of properties in Charlton Kings. This application provides 18 affordable homes which would be of great benefit to the area. We need to encourage young people to work and live in Cheltenham for the sake of the local economy and one of the ways to do that is to provide more affordable housing.

The school would benefit financially which could improve their facilities and assist greatly with ongoing maintenance.

The developer has made many concessions to try to accommodate the local objectors but still they object. Is it a case of not in my back yard?

This is not overdevelopment as much green space is proposed along with retaining existing trees and adding to the tree population, which is great.

I believe that planning consent should be granted.

46 The Park
Northway
Tewkesbury
GL20 8RH

Comments: 2nd July 2020

There is a massive shortage of affordable homes within the area, this development is a huge step in allowing locals to stay within the area and those who have moved away to return as well as being on the property ladder in a desirable area

Mark Annett & Company
Hook House
High Street
Chipping Campden
GL55 6AT

Comments: 7th July 2020

Having previously worked in Cheltenham in property I can see that there is good demand for this type of development and support the application.

Wistley
Charlton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9NE

Comments: 6th July 2020

I understand that this application allows for the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing to be created. I think it is important that community development promotes the provision of affordable housing to allow for the diversity of need of housing needs in each locality and that applications involving the provision of affordable housing are given the most careful consideration and supported where possible and appropriate.

17 Sheens Meadow
Newnham
Gloucestershire
GL14 1BP

Comments: 8th July 2020

Being a grandmother with children with young families of their own I support the construction of new and affordable homes for their generation.

21 Chosen Drive
Churchdown
Gloucester
GL3 2QS

Comments: 9th July 2020

I am in whole hearted support of this application. As a number of the dwellings will be supported housing, it will be a great opportunity for youngsters to get on the ladder.
Great project.

Cedar Cottage
Brimpsfield
Gloucestershire
GL4 8ld

Comments: 18th June 2020

I'd like to support this application as it brings some very much needed affordable housing to the area, on a site ideal for development.

18 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 22nd May 2020

I wish to object to the outline application on the land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise. Our primary concerns relate to infrastructure issues and disturbance to the environment.

The approach to the site along Oakhurst Rise has two steep gradients, two bends and is narrower than roads built today. Of particular concern is the second gradient which has proved dangerous to us on the last three relatively mild winters. On two occasions we have been unable to leave our home by car for a couple of days due to icy road conditions. On one of those it needed the kindness of a neighbour, whose car was fitted with snow chains, to drive us down the hill. On a separate occasion we had to meet a taxi at the bottom of the rise because he was unable to drive to the top. An increase in traffic from the development would therefore increase the risk of accidents thus endangering life in poorer weather conditions. Much more frequently there is already considerable traffic congestion through Ewans Farm in the morning and evening weekday peak periods which would be worsened by additional inflow outflow from the proposed development.

The impact on amenities in the locality would also be worsened by this proposal. Our understanding, from waiting lists, is that there is already pressure on the GP surgery, the dentists and local schools to meet the needs of local residents.

Finally the proposed development would cause considerable loss of habitat for the small gain in housing. Over the lockdown period we have naturally spend a great deal more time in our garden and have seen many different animals entering from the safe haven of the fields adjacent to our property. These personal sighting of fauna have included badger (there is a large sett in the field), roe deer, muntjac, foxes, squirrels, as well as numerous birds including woodpecker, magpie, jay, thrush, blackbird, dunnock, sparrows,nuthatch, chaffinch, pigeon, great-tit, longtail-tit, blue tits, robins, and wrens. When we have walked into the field we have also seen varied flora including oxeye daisies, bluebells, cowslips, champions, oxslips, field buttercups, bugle and alkanet to name just a few of the meadow flowers in this undisturbed haven for wildlife.

16 Bowen Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5EG

Comments: 2nd July 2020

I would support any building of houses considering the great shortage at this time,common sense must prevail especially round the charlton kings area ,and in any area in Cheltenham.

2 Fairhaven Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7PL

Comments: 6th July 2020

The most recent landscape plan confirms various benefits for the scheme: low density, open space/wildlife for the residents, and a significant open area retained by the school.

Coupled with the windfall of affordable homes, and financial benefit to the school to reinvest, I am in favour.

3A Oxford Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6DT

Comments: 18th June 2020

I believe that the planning committee should support this application on the grounds that the site is within the Principal Urban Area, it provides much needed open market and affordable homes within Cheltenham, and Cheltenham is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.

Garden Cottage
Park Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3NG

Comments: 2nd July 2020

I've been trying to move back to Charlton Kings for some time. Affordable housing in the village is really needed.

15 Old Common
Minchinhampton
STROUD
GL6 9EH

Comments: 18th June 2020

There is a desperate need and major shortfall for housing and affordable housing in Cheltenham with many people on waiting lists. I also believe that this will be of huge financial benefit to St Edwards which will give them the opportunity of improving their facilities both to those at the school and the community as a whole.

5 The Gables
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TR

Comments: 1st July 2020

This is a sustainable development located within the urban area that provides 43 much needed new homes including 18 affordable homes.

The proposal will also bring huge financial benefits for St Edwards School, which will secure its long-term future as well as providing the means to improve their current facilities, which are enjoyed by other schools and the local community.

84 Clyde Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5QL

Comments: 7th July 2020

I completely support this application as Cheltenham is in desperate need of affordable housing as well as private. Obviously the residents who are objecting this don't want change but they have their houses and therefore stopping other people just as deserving having theirs.

The development will deliver 25 private and crucially 18 affordable homes

The school and landowners are both charitable trusts and require the planning application to go ahead

2 Vineyard Farm Cottages
Charlton Hill
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9NE

Comments: 7th July 2020

It is great to see at last that there could be some affordable housing in Charlton Kings .To give the younger generation the opportunity to hopefully get on the property ladder

Orchard Bungalow
Little Shurdington
Cheltenham
GL51 4TY

Comments: 9th July 2020

This development has many merits and I believe should be approved. It delivers 18 affordable homes which are in very short supply in Cheltenham. It will provide jobs and income to the local community which is crucial in these extraordinary times. As a former Whitefriars student I am pleased that it will also provide much needed income to the school.

Montrose
3a Lime Grove
Welland
WR13 6LY

Comments: 21st July 2020

We object to this development on the grounds of losing more habitat, this area has a lot of wildlife, badgers, fallow deer, munck jacks, and other species all clammering for somewhere to live. There will be more pressure on the environment with extra traffic, maybe an additional 86 cars using the small roads to gain access to the site, the added problem of flooding, surely there are other "brown" sites that can be used to build more homes without taking away natural habitats for our wildlife.

4 Beaufort Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JT

Comments: 2nd June 2020

Objects

Flat 2
35 St Georges Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3DU

Comments: 6th June 2020

Evidence was taken over 4 days at the planning inquiry only 6 months ago, about why this site was not suitable for development above the allocation in the local plan.

The site is still not suitable for development above the allocation in the local plan.

Please upload my comment to the CBC pages which are not allowing comment.

21 Ravensgate Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8NR

Comments: 2nd June 2020

There are so many reasons against this development! Already overburdened sewage systems, building on a green space used and loved by locals, issues with the planning application, destruction of protected trees despite wording to suggest otherwise, little thought to eco friendly housing solutions, poor access from an already small and overburdened road and issues with drainage. There are more and I've forgotten them! Please don't allow this development - the space is way too precious.

15 Mandarin Way
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4RP

Comments: 17th June 2020
New affordable homes are needed

Greenmount
12 Christchurch Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2PL

Comments: 3rd July 2020

I am shortly to move to my registered address in Cheltenham. I noted that there was a revised planning application for the construction of 43 dwellings at Saint Edwards school. Since I was aware of the earlier application I thought it would be appropriate for me to submit my thoughts on the revised proposal.

It seems to me that the applicants have had full regard to the comments of the previous inspector (Mr Sims), insofar as the new proposal provides full and ample screening for the designated heritage assets nearby. The effect of this is that in my opinion the harm to the significance of those assets will be minimal. Even allowing for the fact that there is a statutory requirement to give considerable weight to the protection of historic buildings, I find it difficult to see how This should outweigh the very considerable weight that should be attached to the need for new housing. In this context I note that the latest residential housing land supply report produced by the Borough Council in December 2019, demonstrates that the authority can only supply 3.7 years supply of available housing land which is well short of the minimum requirement of five years availability set out in the NPPF.

When this fact it is taken into account, together with the importance which attaches to the severe economic difficulties caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the Prime Minister is exhortation is to "build, build, build", I see little reason to withhold granting planning permission for this well design scheme. The additional benefits to be gained from the construction of a significant proportion as affordable housing (especially given the shortage of such accommodation within the borough compared to its targeted requirements), represents a further I see little reason to withhold granting planning permission for this well design scheme. The additional benefits to be gained from the construction of a significant proportion as affordable housing (especially given the shortage of such accommodation within the borough compared to its targeted requirements), represents a further justification for granting pp.

Finally I note that since the last appeal, the Borough Council has produced its local plan which identifies this site as a suitable residential application for a minimum of 25 dwellings. Although the plan is not yet fully adopted its position in the overall procedure leading to adoption suggest that significant weight should be attached to the emerging policies.

Overall I consider that the application should be fully supported and granted planning permission. I would be grateful if you could classify this letter as well as support for the proposals.

34 Wells Close
Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3BX

Comments: 5th July 2020

There is a desperate shortage of affordable homes available for young people, affordable homes should not be a privilege but a necessity, earning a decent salary does not come close to being able to put a deposit down and start the process of a mortgage.

These houses would help the school gain valuable funds to improve facilities and to give jobs for the economic recovery of trades people in the area.

16 Landsdowne Rd
Falmouth
TR11 4BE

Comments: 22nd July 2020

I lived in Cheltenham for 45 years and regularly walked in this area, which is already overdeveloped. The wildlife and ecology of this beautiful area needs to be preserved.

Clovelly
High Street
Upton St Leonards
GL4 8DG

Comments: 22nd July 2020

With reference to this planning application for a residential development.

I strongly object to this application.

The main reasons being the effect this would have on protected trees and the absolute devastation of wildlife which is so important to the local community.

8 Detmore Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8QP

Comments: 8th June 2020

I wish to add my wife and myself to the list of objectors to this proposed development.

We are particularly concerned about the effect that more housing will have on the already over-prescribed schools and medical facilities in the area.

One day soon we may be living at Home Farm Court - very close to the area under threat.

Two Rivers Housing
Rivers Meet
Cleeve Mill Lane
Newent
GL18 1 DS

Comments: 4th June 2020
Letter attached.

60 Church Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8AS

Comments: 8th June 2020

Your website registration has failed twice, so I am writing to you directly with reference to the field for which there are plans to develop this land for housing. This is the field above Oakhurst Rise - between Oakhurst Rise and Ashley Road.

There is a huge diversity of wildflowers and grasses; I've seen roe deer; grass snakes; slow worms; and toad species here. Furthermore, this area has dozens of natural springs welling up in the hill face. I am deeply concerned that if the land gets redeveloped this oasis within Charlton Kings will be lost.

On the basis of wishing to preserve the wildlife both flora and fauna, and the natural structure of the hill and its unique spring water system, I oppose the plans to redevelop this land.

Ash Tree House
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 8th June 2020

I strongly object to this planning application - 20/00683/OUT, outline application for 43 dwellings at Land Adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

This development proposal is similar to the previous two applications on this site both rejected by CBC in the last two years - 17/00710/OUT & 18/02171/OUT. The scale of the planned development remains completely inappropriate for this site and very much out of character with the local area. The local plan states a maximum of 25 homes should be built on this land. Access to the proposed site is restrictive, with a very steep aspect to the approach and narrow roads that are in no way adequate for such a development. The site is located close to the AONB and is an extremely valuable resource for the school, local community and wildlife. The new documentation does not attempt to address or resolve any of the core issues already recorded by the previous CBC refusal decision regards the previous applications, nor in the many common comments submitted online.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that planning permission for the above development be refused.

24 Bushel Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3NA

Comments: 18th June 2020

As a young couple who have lived in the area all of our lives, we have always found that there needs to be more affordable housing in desirable areas. This area is in desperate need of developing to open up more opportunities for the younger generation to get on the property ladder.

50A King William Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7RP

Comments: 21st June 2020

This plan would go towards the shortfall in houses in this area.

It has approved in the draft Local Plan

Flat 4
Cameron House
Glencairn Park Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2ND

Comments: 30th June 2020

'Supports' Comments on the CBC web-portal pages, claiming that Cheltenham Borough Council and/or its Planning Officers already support this Application !

One does wonder exactly who told these four different Supporters that the Cheltenham Borough Council, the CBC Planning Department, the Planning Officers and the CBC Planning Committee all support this Application for planning permission.

Most residents in Oakhurst Rise, the Ewen's Farm Estate and the wider Charlton Kings community are under the impression that the Planning Officers / Planning Department do not make up their minds until ALL the evidence has been gathered and ALL the comments have been received -- at which point the designated Planning Officer reviews ALL the data and writes a Report, for review and discussion with the Head of Planning, before deciding whether to recommend Approval or Refusal to the Planning Committee Councillors.

Furthermore, it has always previously been understood that the Planning Committee does not make up its mind whether to Approve or Refuse an Application until it has itself reviewed all the data, received verbal submissions from interested parties and debated the matter fully at a Planning Committee Meeting, after which a Vote is taken.

Is this no longer the case ?

Which Planning Officer or Planning Committee member could possibly have advised the below Supporters that the Planning Officers and the Planning Committee had already decided to

support this Application ? It does seem most irregular and beyond any possible coincidence that four different supporters, living many miles apart, can all have been given this same information.

Valley View House Charlton Hill Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 9NE (Supports)

Comment submitted date: Wed 24 Jun 2020

This is a long awaited and needed development that includes valuable affordable homes. This development is supported by the Cheltenham Borough Council Having the support of the CBC is so important.

34 Tommy Taylors Lane Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 4NJ (Supports)

Comment submitted date: Wed 24 Jun 2020

The shortage of good quality housing in Cheltenham is acute, particularly in Charlton Kings, where there is a significant shortfall.

The application is supported by the CBC Planning Department.

163 London Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6HN (Supports)

Comment submitted date: Tue 23 Jun 2020

I am writing to comment on what I consider a complete scandal by certain residents regarding the above Planning Application and their objections to it. The Carmelite Order is happy with the sale of the land, St Edwards School is happy and will benefit substantially and indeed CBC's own Planning Committee support it

Hillside Undercliff Avenue Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 9AA (Supports)

Comment submitted date: Tue 23 Jun 2020

I fully support this Application as it clearly meets all Council Guidelines and Policies so the Council must take advantage and follow the recommendations of its Planning Officers by GRANTING PERMISSION.

62 Albemarle Gate
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4PJ

Comments: 23rd June 2020

If approved, this is a much needed addition of 18 affordable houses in Charlton Kings. It will enable the school to invest in much needed improvements and still leave a 4 acre meadow.

29 Pennance Road
Falmouth
TR11 4ED

Comments: 23rd July 2020

I am moving into the area and have been to see the proposed site. I was concerned when a neighbour spoke about the development about two main issues. The first relates to the roads the roads / additional traffic as all the roads up to Oakhurst Rise and out of the area are packed with cars and cars parked on the pavements, rendering the pavements impassable. Further traffic would be a safety hazard.

Also, having looked at the site on a rainy day, I would question whether the area is liable to flooding and where the water run-off goes.

I therefore object to the development.

Pages
Chargrove Lane
Cheltenham
GL51 4XB

Comments: 7th July 2020

I attended St Edwards school and spent many enjoyable days on the sports fields. I am in favour of this application because I think it will benefit and help the school continue to be maintained to a very high standard and looking at the plans, I do not think it will take anything away that is required. I am also in favour of more affordable homes in Cheltenham especially in Charlton Kings which is a very sought after area to live. I think this will help the younger generation and continue to help move Cheltenham in the right direction. I am always concerned around flooding with new builds so am very pleased to hear the attenuation system is being put in place.

1 st georges square
Worcester
Wr1 1HX

Comments: 14th July 2020

I think it would be a very good development.

Charlton House
Cirencester Road
Charlton Kings Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8ER

Comments: 23rd July 2020

The impact on the wildlife will be devastating. Cheltenham is special because of the balance between people and nature, not because it has lots of houses. The long-term impact on Cheltenham itself will also be devastating.

Tall Timbers
Ashley Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
GL52 6NS

Comments: 3rd August 2020

I have just had the opportunity to read the excellent report by the well-respected leading independent UK environmental consultancy Bioscan (www.bioscanuk.com) on the negative impacts on Bio Diversity that would occur if this development were allowed to proceed. It is clear from the report that, with the additional species that have been identified during the last 18 months, the planning authorities should perhaps be considering this site as a Key Wildlife Site of County value.

There are very many reasons why this development should not be permitted but this report provides grounds for refusal solely on its contents.

Comments: 12th May 2020

Letter attached.

32 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 3rd June 2020

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

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

- The local plan says a maximum of 26 homes should be built on this land. A forty-three house estate is being proposed in a completely unsuitable location. Such development has been rejected 5 times in 40 years.

34 Sisson Road
Gloucester
GL2 0RA

Comments: 12th June 2020

This application should defiantly be permitted, it's just NIMBYISM which prevented the last two applications.

young family's like mine are crying out for new and affordable homes in this area.

60 Haycroft Drive
Matson
Gloucestershire
GL4 6XX

Comments: 19th June 2020

I strongly support the application. I've been looking to move into the area for some time given the catchment area for some outstanding schools. Unfortunately the availability of houses in the area is in short supply which has made any move almost impossible.

I believe there is a genuine need for this application to proceed.

18 Beaufort Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JT

Comments: 12th May 2020

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

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

Faringdon
4 Langton Grove Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JA

Comments: 3rd June 2020

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

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

The increased levels of residents resulting from 43 new dwellings will require increased numbers of pupil places at local schools which are already oversubscribed and also at the doctors' surgery once again where patient numbers are already at a higher than acceptable level.

Coversdown
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL526NY

Comments: 20th May 2020
Letter attached.

98 Colesbourne Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 6DN

Comments: 15th June 2020
I support this application as I believe this will really enhance the trading potential and income of a large number of retailers at Sixways.

Darien
Stanley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PD

Comments: 5th August 2020
Just how many more times are these proposers going to attempt to try and force this application through? Surely the Planning Committee can see that the access via Oakhurst Rise/Ewens Road/Beaufort Road is totally unsuitable. Have they actually inspected this? Are you going to allow Appeal after Appeal after Appeal? I have no personal axe to grind - it's just common sense.

46 School Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8BD

Comments: 8th June 2020
I would like to register my opposition to the proposed development off Oakhurst Drive.

This land should not be developed for many reasons:

Inappropriate use of land for housing due to steep gradient, limited accessibility apart from by cars, increased likelihood of problems with flooding and lack of community infrastructure such as school places and doctors surgeries.

The residents of Oakhurst Rise live in a quiet cul de sac of small bungalows and this would be transformed into a through road to a new estate with multiple vehicles passing through.

The land is a rich wildlife habitat as well as being used for community activities such as forest school, wildlife walks and as a cross country course for multiple schools across the county. The annual bonfire night event welcomes huge numbers and raises a large amount of money for good causes.

Whilst there is of course a need for housing, focus should be on redeveloping brownfield sites rather than removing green areas. Once built upon, these green spaces are lost and this negatively affects the locality. We need to protect these areas from development and ensure more appropriate areas are considered ahead of this land.

Tanglin
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NZ

Comments: 12th June 2020

Many detailed submissions have already been made by a number of highly qualified experts and professionals OBJECTING to this application, which list in precise detail the various Planning Regulations (NPPF etc) which would be contravened were this application to be permitted. The planning policies contravened by this proposed development cover a large number of areas including, but not necessarily limited to, heritage, access, ecology, flooding and the environment. It is therefore not necessary to repeat all those reasons here, since the Planning Officers and CBC Planning Committee have already received more than sufficient information to require this application to be refused.

However, one area which has not been addressed in such detail is the application of Common Sense; unless the application of Common Sense is now forbidden by those assessing this application, it would be sufficient grounds merely in itself to refuse planning permission. Indeed, so much so, that it is bewildering that this new application has even been submitted (after two previous refusals and an appeal dismissal by HM Inspectorate). This use of common sense relates simply to geography and topography. Anyone visiting this site via the only possible road access (Oakhurst Rise) would immediately appreciate that the narrow, twisting and very steep roads leading to the site mean that any development at the top of Oakhurst Rise of anything more than one or two houses would lead to unacceptably increased dangers for all the residents in that area. This was recognized by the Charlton Kings Parish Council Planning Committee Members, who recently voted unanimously to object to this application. The site is completely unsuitable for social or 'affordable' housing, as it would require virtually 100% car use for access; so it would be a most unsuitable location for those of restricted financial means who may wish to rely on public transport -- both the access to the site and the roads within have such steep gradients, it would make foot or cycle access completely impracticable, especially for those with wheelchairs, physical impairment, child-buggies and those carrying heavy shopping.

Despite the application documents concerning travel and access containing numerous misleading and disingenuous statements, it would appear that the applicants are actually well aware that the site is unsuitable for normal foot and cycle access, as it is stated that they are "prepared to provide each household a voucher of £750 towards the purchase of an electric bike", as though this would somehow lead to a reduction in car use. If the permanent damage which would be caused by this proposed development was not so serious, such a statement could be

considered merely laughably absurd. Apart from the fact that such a voucher would be less than half the cost of a decent electric bike, what will happen when such bikes break, or get lost or stolen -- or the initial resident moves out and takes the electric bike with them ? As even a partial solution to the major access problems, the electric bike voucher proposal is simply ridiculous.

The local opposition to this application is overwhelming and is caused by concern for the local ecology and environment as well as the permanent danger and distress that would be visited upon the current residents of Oakhurst Rise and the other roads within the Ewen's Farm Estate. There are around 100 letters of Objection on the CBC web-portal and only a handful of 'supporters', none of whom actually live in Charlton Kings. Some supporters say they wish to 'move to the area'; the good news is that this development is not required for such a desire to be fulfilled, as there are around 90 houses and apartments available for sale right now, across all price bands, within half a mile of the meadow land on which the applicants wish to build. Some of these 'supporters' don't even live in Cheltenham and some of the commercially-driven housing associations that wish to manage a proportion of the proposed properties are headquartered as far away as the Forest of Dean and Oxfordshire. Cheltenham has more than sufficient land already allocated for non-controversial housing development in order to cover its requirements; the destruction of this environmentally delicate, sensitive and precious meadow-land is NOT necessary in order to provide the social and affordable housing which many people rightly wish to be built for Cheltenham's residents. As one Borough Councillor so eloquently put it at a Planning Committee meeting when considering a previous application to build on this land, these houses may well be excellent houses and the layout may well be visually attractive BUT they are totally unsuitable for building on this location. Common sense indeed.

Oakley Lodge
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NZ

Comments: 18th June 2020

We wish to object to this application.

This is yet another attempt to obtain outline planning permission to build a large housing estate on a beautiful unspoilt meadow in a prominent location in Cheltenham.

Access. The only access to the site is via Oakhurst Rise, a cul-de-sac in a very quiet and peaceful hillside residential area. The road is narrow and extremely steep. It would therefore be wholly unsuitable as the access road during construction for the huge number of large lorries and construction vehicles needed to clear the site and then bring in materials, as well as for the transport of site workers. Once built, the 43 new houses would generate a considerable volume of traffic, as owners, visitors, contractors, refuse lorries and delivery vans came and went - all via a narrow road with a 90 degree turn at the bottom of its steepest section.

This steep gradient makes the road extremely dangerous, particularly when roads are wet or icy, both for vehicles and for pedestrians. For the residents of the properties facing the steep section at the top of the cul-de-sac, there is also the real danger that lorries coming down this section of road could slide into their properties in icy conditions.

For the residents of Oakhurst Rise and those of the roads nearby, the negative impact of the development would be enormous, both during the time it would take to clear and build the roads and houses and then thereafter. There would be an increased volume of traffic and noise; traffic pollution; vibration shaking their properties as lorries struggle to turn the tight corners and change gear; as well as difficulty in accessing their own properties. The existing peace and quiet of their

neighbourhood would be shattered by the volume of cars, lorries and delivery vans associated with the new development, coming and going, day and night.

Flooding. We share the concerns raised elsewhere about the increased risk of flooding to nearby properties if this green space at the top of a hill is built over. In view of climate change and more and more severe weather events (such as the extremely heavy rain over the last two days), there is a very real and increasing risk of flooding.

Access to local facilities. As the only access to the development would be via Oakhurst Rise, any resident of the proposed development would have a very long and steep walk to shops, schools or other facilities. Any wheelchair user, parent or carer pushing a child in a pushchair or pram, or indeed anyone with limited mobility would find the gradient impossible and would therefore have to rely on a car or car transport to get anywhere outside the housing estate. This would make it difficult for residents to integrate into the local community and access local facilities as these would not be within easy walking distance.

Ecology. The site is of great ecological importance. It is a beautiful ancient wildflower meadow, providing a natural and unspoilt habitat for a wide and important variety of wildlife: animals, such as deer and badgers; birds, such as treecreepers, blackcaps and dunnocks; insects including rare moths; reptiles such as grass snakes and slow worms; veteran trees; and wild flowers. It has both a rare beauty and unique biodiversity and should be preserved in its entirety, rather than destroyed.

Loss of community amenity. If the proposed development went ahead, there would also be a great loss to the local community which would lose a valued amenity. County cross-country competitions, open to primary and senior school children from across Gloucestershire, are held on the site, as well as the school bonfire night in November which thousands of local people attend.

Heritage. The site lies between and forms the setting for two important historic buildings, Ashley Manor (Grade II* listed) and Charlton Manor (Grade II listed), which are an important part of Cheltenham's heritage. If the development went ahead, the setting of these historic buildings (and the Ice House which lies between) would be greatly harmed. At present a green meadow forms the backdrop to these buildings, can be seen from within them, and allows the relationship between them to be seen; however if the development went ahead, this unity would be lost and a modern housing estate would dominate instead. The heritage of Cheltenham is precious and should be preserved for future generations, not spoilt through development. Once the setting has been harmed it cannot be restored.

Visual impact. Moreover the site lies in a prominent position on top of Battledown Hill. This green and wooded hill, and the site within it (including the heritage buildings mentioned above), are clearly visible from right round the surrounding Cotswold escarpment (an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and from numerous vantage points across Cheltenham, including from the Charlton Kings conservation area to which it forms a backdrop. If the development were to go ahead, a built-up area of modern houses, with high rooflines, would be inserted into an otherwise green and wooded hill, visible from miles around.

Finally, we request that the wider context of Cheltenham as a heritage town and tourist destination is also taken into account when considering this application. Cheltenham attracts thousands of visitors a year and is renowned for its natural beauty as well as its festivals and architecture. The natural beauty of the site, highly visible as one approaches Cheltenham, is part of Cheltenham's heritage and should be preserved for future generations.

For these reasons we object to this planning application.

Wellswood House
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 15th June 2020

In line with other objections regarding strain on infrastructure, flooding concerns etc

12 Haywards Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6RH

Comments: 17th May 2020

Reference: Application 20/00683/OUT

This application for 43 dwellings on land adjacent with single access from Oakhurst Rise follows on from the refusal by the Appeal Inspector B.J.Sims on 20th September 2019 for development submitted under 18/02171/OUT made by the same applicants. That in turn followed the refusal by the Borough Council for planning application 17/00710/OUT, again from the same developers.

I object to this application on the following grounds

1. Drainage/Flood risk

Schemes to deal with foul and surface water drainage have been developed by Simpson Associates. Their view is that both can be dealt with via gravity systems connecting to existing infrastructure within the locality.

However, there is significant failure to take into account the previous flooding encountered by properties on the Battledown Estate, Ewen's Farm Estate, in particular those on Oak Avenue, and Haywards Road in 2007. The impact additional properties, as a result of the proposed development, would have on the risk of future flooding in the context of these historic flood events has not been properly addressed. Proposals for the removal of foul and storm water from the site include linking into existing infrastructure on Charlton Court Road. This subsequently drains down towards to the previously affected properties.

The document titled, 'Flood Risk Assessment Land off Oakhurst Rise, Charlton Kings Cheltenham, Gloucestershire (C21505 Oakhurst Rise, Charlton Kings / FRA Rev M April 2020, prepared, by Simpson Associates Consulting Engineers LLP) identifies the land as being located within Flood Zone 1, i.e., a low probability of river or sea flooding (See Section 5). It goes on to acknowledge (Clause 5.11) that while the area is considered to be of no risk of surface flooding, this may be due to the current greenfield site conditions of trees, shrubs and grass.

Clause 5.12 goes on to acknowledge that the site is steeply sloping with a fall across the site towards the south west and as such it is assumed that the risk of surface flooding on the site is low. Figure 5, on page 8 of the report shows an embedded Flood Map of Surface Water (extracted from the Gov.uk website in Jan 2017). This clearly shows an area with a high risk of flooding in the area of Charlton Court Road near the south west corner of the site, extending down to Oak Avenue. Areas that have suffered as a consequence of foul and storm water flooding in the past.

Furthermore, clauses 5.13/5.14 record that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment includes information on past flooding incidents in the local area and by inclusion of the DG5 register. This

provides post codes of the affected areas and while the exact locations of the affected properties are reported to be unknown it does indicate that CBC has shown that 3 incidents of flooding from sewers have occurred in the vicinity of the site when looking at the postal area GL52 6. The authors go on to assume that due to the low number of occurrences the site is at low risk of sewer flooding.

While the authors assumption that the proposed development site may be at low risk of sewer flooding it pays scant regard in this respect to properties in the surrounding area that have been affected historically. This is based in part due to the information apparently being held in official records that is inaccurate. In Jun/Jul 2007 multiple homes in the GL52 6 postcode area flooded including at least eight properties in Haywards Road due to backing up of the sewer system. Numerous others in Oak Avenue were also affected.

Since the time that these flood events occurred there has not been, at least to my knowledge, any investigation or report to identify the root cause and responsibility for the flooding. There has been no obvious remediation and none of CBC, STW or the EA have made any attempts to actively engage with residents that were affected.

The proposal to remove foul water is via a connection to the existing manhole SO96214401 within the St Edward's school grounds. If this is not feasible then an alternative connection under gravity to an existing sewer located within Charlton Court Road to the South West of the development was proposed.

Should the development be approved one condition that should be imposed is to ensure connection is made to the existing foul water sewer within St Edward's School grounds to the south of the site via the existing manhole SO96214401. There appear to be no obvious impediment to achieving this. The option to connect via Charlton Court Road should be removed. The proposed development will significantly alter the characteristics of the site with respect to flood risk for properties in the surrounding area and approval of the proposed development will add significant additional burden to the storm water and sewer systems that are already operating at high capacity.

The FRA indicates that Severn Trent Water (STW) confirmed that their system has capacity to take the new flows from the site. This was communicated in 2016. An up-to-date appraisal should be required as a condition of the planning.

The report also recommends that a further capacity check should be undertaken downstream of the proposed outfall connection during the detailed design stage once proposed flows have been finalised. Should the scheme be approved in principle, a satisfactory outcome from the check of the downstream capacity should be a required condition of its approval.

The plans presented on pages 30, 32 and 34 of the Planning Statement indicate the proposal to introduce of an attenuation pond at the southern end of the proposed development. Similarly, section 7 (Drainage) of the Design and Access Statement, prepared by Coombes Everitt Architects, indicates, "... a pond is proposed at the bottom of the site to assist with the attenuation of the surface water run-off."

Both these statements are inconsistent with and contradict Clause 8.7 of the FRA that states clearly that the pond is not part of the attenuation scheme.

The Design and Access Statement also indicates that, "To ensure the system is not overloaded a number of attenuation tanks are proposed". However, plans show only a single attention tank.

Due to concerns over potential flooding as a consequence of storm water run-off, it is requested that should approval for this or any revised scheme be granted, a condition of approval is to increase the amount of attenuation on the site. Specific consideration should also be given to

utilising the green space to the east of the site to mitigate storm water run-off from the proposed development. This land is owned by the applicant.

Furthermore, the submitted the Drainage Strategy fails to meet a condition outlined during refusal of previous applications, namely to:

'...provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.'

It is requested that the application is refused until such time as a viable strategy to fulfil the requirements of the condition are presented for review as part of a complete application.

Given that the proposed strategy must last for the lifetime of the development, it is also requested that should approval for the scheme be granted now or in the future, a condition of approval should to place a requirement on William Morrison (Cheltenham) Ltd., the Trustees of the Carmelite Charitable Trust and their successors, to make financial provisions to ensure this obligation can be met.

As a consequence of the flooding to my property encountered in June and July 2007, any sustained periods of heavy rain are now associated with a significant and heightened sense of anxiety. Furthermore, the insurance premiums on the property increased dramatically subsequent to the incidents and have remained at elevated levels since that time despite there being no apparent flood risk to the area.

I would therefore request that consideration is also given to the implementation of a condition that requires the applicant(s) and their successors, to make financials provision to compensate victims of flooding in the surrounding areas that would otherwise not have occurred had the development not been approved. This request is considered to be entirely reasonable based on the expectation that the applicants are confident that their proposed development will not contribute to an increased risk of flooding in the surrounding areas.

2. Transport Assessment (TA) / Residential Travel Plan (RTP) / Non-Motorised User (NMU) Assessment

Clause 5.12 of the TA considers the degree of car ownership and predicts that in 2021 the level of car ownership will be 1.78 per dwelling for privately owned properties and may be greater for shared ownership rented or affordable homes. The scheme allows for parking of up to 86 vehicles. It is therefore reasonable to think that this capacity could be exhausted fairly rapidly. In relation to Section 6 of the TA relating to forecast trip generation and impact on the Local Highway network, the assessment was performed over three years ago in December 2016 during which time the traffic burden on the local highways infrastructure is perceived to have increased significantly.

Prior to any approval, the applicant should be required to undertake an up-to-date assessment and revise their proposals accordingly.

Section 6 of the TA goes on to forecast that there will be roughly 0.33 outbound trips per residence during AM peak time and this will be repeated during the PM peak hour. I would assert that the majority of purchasers in the proposed development will be professionals or those that need to travel a reasonable distance to their place of work. Given the predicted number of cars per dwelling it would seem to be more appropriate to model this assessment using an increased average of trips per dwelling, e.g. one trip per dwelling, during peak times.

Clause 6.11 - the number of minutes per vehicle trip during peak hours is missing. This should be updated.

Clause 6.21 Indicates that GCC's preference throughout the traffic modelling of the Joint Core Strategy strategic developments assessment was to ensure that traffic uses the principal routes, rather than residential routes.

However, the TA has failed to appreciate that the roads on the Ewen's Farm estate, Haywards, Road, Rosehill Street, King Alfred Way, Saxon Way and Athelney Way are already used as a 'rat run' by commuters seeking to avoid congestion at the A40/A435/Haywards Road and the A40/Hales Road junctions.

Therefore, while the approach taken to modelling the impact of the development has been to assign traffic to the quickest principal routes rather than to residential streets, the approach having been approved by GCC during scoping discussions, it is outwith the realities of the actual current situation. Nothing in the current proposal suggests this is likely to change other than to the detriment of those living in the surrounding areas should the proposed development. Be approved now or in the future. This is disappointing.

Clause 6.24 states that vehicles can travel from the A435 to Haywards Road, but that a right turn movement to the A40 east is prohibited. While the latter point is correct, a movement from the A435 to Haywards Road is also prohibited, yet regularly flouted.

It is requested that a condition of approval for this scheme is for the installation of traffic enforcement cameras at the junction of the A40/A435/Haywards Road violations with respect to the prohibited manoeuvres.

With regard to the quickest proposed routes. From Cheltenham 012, both Routes 1 and 3 would not typically be those used by through traffic. In both cases cars typically turn right out of Beaufort Road onto Oak Avenue/Churchill Drive then left onto Haywards Road towards the junction with the A40/A435.

Appendix A includes data relating to modelling of distribution and traffic impact. The outputs indicate that the junctions at Sixways, Haywards Road/A40/A435 Cirencester Road and A40/Hales Road/A435 High Street are already over capacity for some if not all the time. Additional traffic burden as result of the development will add to this.

The only proposed mitigation is to widen the lanes heading west on the A40 at the junction with Hales Road and to implement a new/updated control system for signals. It is not clear how either of the proposed interventions will significantly improve the situation.

Given that the existing traffic load already creates congestion at Haywards Road/A40/A435 and Charlton Court Road/A40 junctions during peak hours, the additional traffic burden will undoubtedly induce through traffic to rely even more heavily on the existing 'rat run' between Hales road and the A40/A435 heading east.

It is therefore, requested that serious consideration be given to blocking access to the Ewen's Farm estate and Haywards Road from King Alfred Way as a condition of approval. While this will undoubtedly result in some inconvenience for some of the residents of the above mentioned areas, this will be offset by a significant reduction in through traffic. The final positioning of the closure should be taken in consultation with impacted local residents.

The RTP/NMU assessments highlight some deficiencies in the existing pavement infrastructure and also the ability to cross the London Road at various points.

A request for the addition of a specific timed signal to allow the safe pedestrian crossing of the A40/A435 at the junction with Haywards Road is also made. While pedestrian notionally have right of way, the crossing of this junction is particularly difficult and can be dangerous particularly when attempted with young children. Implementation of a specific phasing to allow pedestrians to

cross would remove any issues that will arise due to increased burden on this busy junction as a result of the proposed development.

While the RTP and NMU indicate that local amenities fall within the Institution of Highways and Transport (IHT) guidelines for journeys on foot, it fails to take into account the nature of the approach to Oakhurst Rise which is incredibly steep. A number of the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise have objected to the plans during earlier submissions on the basis that the nature of the access will prompt a significant number of potential NMU trips to be undertaken by car. In particular the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise have indicated that the footpaths are virtually unwalkable when they become icy. This will be a particular problem for the elderly and those making trips with young children.

One option with regard to access to the site may be to introduce a pedestrian access from Charlton Court Road at the point where a potential connection to the STW sewer system has been proposed. If a foot path following approximately the suggested line of the sewer were constructed this may result in a less arduous climb back to the development. Similarly the planning committee is requested to consider the possibility of constructing a footpath through the grounds that are currently used by St Edwards school that would provide a more direct access to the amenities and could be constructed in a way that made them less steep than the existing access. This would be in keeping with the cited Manual for Streets (MfS) that states walking offers the greatest potential for replacing short car trips, particularly those under 2 km.

The offer of a £750 contribution per household to purchase an e-bike as part of the RTP is nothing more than a gimmick and essentially amounts to a discount from the sales price for each property. This offer makes no contingency for change of property ownership (which could be within a short period of time) and future purchasers which would essentially be in the same position as the bikes not having been offered. It is unclear how this contributes to the sustainability aspect the remit laid out in the clause 2.1 of the Travel Plan as follows

A Travel Plan is a long-term management strategy built on a package of site-specific measures that seeks to deliver sustainable transport objectives.

Clause 2.19 goes on to indicate that while not an obligation based on the size of the proposed development the applicant has agreed to provide and fund a RTP that will further enhance the sustainable credentials of the site. It is not clear to me what the exactly the specific sustainable credentials of the site are. Furthermore, it is disappointing that properties in the surrounding area that will be affected by the increase burden on its transport infrastructure are not included in any proposed consultation or to be beneficiaries of the RTP. Surely it would not have been too difficult to include the properties on the adjacent roads cited in the TA/RTP/NMU so as to positively engage residents with a view to increasing the beneficial outcomes from the proposed development and its surrounding environs.

It is requested that as part of any potential approval, the applicant will be required to distribute the proposed Travel Information Pack to residents of the surrounding residential areas.

3. Number of properties too great

Policy HD4 within the Cheltenham Plan 2011-2031 (CP), submitted for review by the Secretary of State on 03 October 2018, provided for approximately 25 dwellings on the site at Oakhurst Rise.

The plan has been the subject of review by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State and report titled, 'Report on the Examination of the Cheltenham Plan 2011-2031', by Wendy J Burden (BA DipTP MRTPI) was published on 17 March 2020. The report includes a number recommended main modifications (MM) and is still awaiting formal adoption by CBC.

Reference to the report and its associated appendix is made in the Planning Statement prepared on behalf of William Morrison (Cheltenham) Ltd. and the Trustees of the Carmelite Charitable Trust, by Frampton Town Planning (FTP).

Selective reference by FTP is made in clause 2.7 of the Planning Statement to MM016 in the Inspectors Report that refers to Policy HD4.

In MM016 the wording relating to the site specific requirements of HD04 was changed from, 'Approximately 25 dwellings...', as documented in the submitted CP, to, 'A minimum of 25 dwellings...'

As part of the examination process of the proposed CP, a submission was made to the Inspector on behalf of applicants by SF Planning (M3_1326_W_Morrison (SF Planning)). Their supposition was that the proposal for 25 houses was based on a flawed interpretation of a report by ECUS. However, on page 4 of their submission SF Planning go on to state,

'What is certain is that the suggested allocation of site HD4 is sound, and doing so would not be harmful to the significance of heritage assets. Approximately 25 dwellings can be delivered on site HD4 without any harm.'

In spite of these comments, an application for 68 dwellings (18/02171/OUT) was submitted but was duly rejected.

FTP also neglects to highlight MM014 in the Inspectors report that relates to Policy H1 of the CP - Land Allocated for Housing Development. This section of the CP contains a Table 3 (Table 2 in the amended CP) that lists the number of dwellings that each potential development can support. In MM014 a number of the proposed sites listed show a change to the number of dwellings that it is now proposed are built. Despite a minor modification to the wording in HD4, as stated above (see MM016) the number of dwellings designated for the Oakhurst Rise site remains at 25.

The attempts by FTP to selectively use the change in wording in MM016 to support an application to build 43 dwelling against a proposed number of 25 is at best unjustified.

While the CP has yet to be adopted the spirit and its intent with respect to HD4 (Land off Oakhurst Rise) is to limit the development to approximately 25 dwellings. This approximation can realistically be interpreted as between 23 and 28 dwellings.

The proposed development is significantly greater than is intended within the CP and should be rejected on the basis that the number of proposed dwelling cannot be supported without harm to the site.

If approval for this or any future applications is granted, it should be done based on an appropriate number of dwellings, i.e., 23 to 28 equating to approximately 25 dwellings.

Given the concerns over the damage to the heritage of the area, potential impact on flood risk and the increased burden on local traffic, the proposal to build a number of dwellings significantly above the number set out in the proposed CP is inappropriate and the application should be rejected.

High Grove Greenway Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6LA

Comments: 29th June 2020

I object to the current outline planning application to build a large number of houses (originally 110, now reduced to 43) on the south facing slope of Battledown Hill because I believe that the land concerned is of far more value to Cheltenham maintained as it currently is than ever it could be if covered in a modern residential development. Cheltenham has many features which set it apart visually from other towns - the consistency and extent of its Regency architecture, its absence of high-rise development, its extensive central gardens and green spaces and its views of the surrounding Cotswold escarpment, for example. All of these will be preserved for future generations, and I believe that the contribution to the townscape made by a green Battledown Hill is of similar importance, and that this generation should take great care of it, just as previous generations have looked after Cheltenham's other key assets.

The western and northern slopes of the hill are already rendered irretrievably suburban by residential development (albeit moderated by the large number and variety of mature trees), the

eastern aspect is (hopefully) offered protection by virtue of its AONB status, and only the beautiful south facing St Edwards ground (so close to the AONB boundary) appears to be at risk of despoliation. Its value as an oasis of brilliant green, visible from miles around, is immeasurable. We have flat land to the north, west and south of the town - there is no need to build on the hill, not 43 houses nor even the 25 mentioned in the Local Plan. The visual intrusion is unacceptable and unnecessary.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to navigate the turns and gradients to reach the top section of Oakhurst Rise will appreciate extent of the adverse impact on the local community that would result from permitting this proposal. The location of the proposed site and the arrangements proposed to access it are bizarre. An excellent paper has been submitted by the Friends of Charlton Kings (June 8th 2020) which describes these impacts in detail and I concur with its conclusions and all its many other arguments from a wide variety of perspectives in favour of rejecting this proposition.

Fermain
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PG

Comments: 21st August 2020

There are many reasons why this development should not go ahead, and all reasons have previously been highlighted in the objections.

1. AONB - there are many brown field sites within the local area which should be developed prior to anyone being able to consider building on land such as this.
2. Access to the site would be via a very narrow up hill residential street, that is itself surrounded by other narrow residential streets. Cars are parked everywhere and on pavements. All this makes access to yet another 43 dwellings completely inappropriate and dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians.
3. The local infrastructure cannot cope currently. Both doctors and schools are over subscribed, this would only make this considerably worse.

There are many other reasons why this should not be granted planning permission, but these are just my top 3.

15 Battledown Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6RD

Comments: 22nd May 2020

The timing of this application in view of the exceptional circumstances (Covid-19 pandemic) gives the applicants an unfair advantage. Many residents are fully occupied by simultaneously home-schooling and working or dealing with other extraordinary circumstances. Some named consultees are likely to be working in a reduced capacity or furloughed. The application should be delayed or at the least held in abeyance until circumstances allow proper consideration.

The application should go to committee - not just to the planning officer - to ensure it is fully considered.

We object to this application for the following reasons:

1. Increased flood risk for properties downhill of the site, some of whom already suffer from flooding problems. Whatever reassurances are made, it is unlikely that measures taken by the developers will be able to compensate for the loss of natural drainage.

2. Traffic congestion (and resulting pollution) in the London Rd/Hales Rd/Ewens Farm area is already bad & will be worsened.

3. The proposed access road - a very steep & narrow cul-de-sac - is completely unsuitable. In snowy/icy conditions it cannot be used safely. Furthermore, it is wrong and unfair for residents who have chosen to live on a cul-de-sac to have it transformed into a through-road used by possibly a hundred cars every day, increasing noise, pollution & danger. The whole character of those roads will be changed and the quality of life of residents will be adversely affected, through no fault of their own.

4. Loss of amenity for children from the neighbouring school who use it regularly for outdoor education and all those from other schools in the county who regularly use the site for athletic pursuits. Loss of amenity for the local community who attend the annual bonfire-night event.

5. Loss of valuable habitat for the countless species of birds, bats, animals, insects etc which inhabit the (undisturbed, and therefore valuable) grassland, trees and hedgerows which will be destroyed. Felled trees cannot simply be 'replaced'; a newly planted tree does not compensate for the loss of a mature tree in respect of visual amenity, wildlife habitat or removal of pollutants from the air. We accept that new houses are needed but to refuse a brownfield site development (Tim Fry Landrovers application) and then allow building on nearby green fields would be wrong.

6. The scheme falls foul of CBC Policy GE2: Private Green Space (supplementary planning guidance June 2009, available on the CBC site) which states:

"The development of private green areas, open spaces and gardens which make a significant townscape and environmental contribution to the town will not be permitted."

This site borders the AONB, forming a visual centrepiece to the unique village environment that is Charlton Kings. The proposed density of housing is far higher than, and out of keeping with, that of the surrounding area.

3 Coxhorne Cottage
London Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6UY

Comments: 8th June 2020

I object to this application on the basis of the importance of the archaeological interest of the site. This area has not been fully investigated and needs to be preserved.

Evidence from LiDar imaging, clearly shows medieval ridge and farrow across all of the site. There are areas where the ridge and farrow continues over the top of a very clearly marked villa shape, indicating that the remains of a roman villa exist on the site or possibly the remains of a building predating Roman. If you refer to the tithe map for the area of 1840 and there after, it is clearly marked in this area as 'ruins'. This can be seen on the Ashley Road side. Further investigation must be carried out.

On the other side of the site near Oakhurst Rise you will note that the ridge and farrow extends over two very clear circular markings, indicating that these could be Iron Age. Just up from these circles you will see a rectangular shape with two clear, semi circular entrances on either side, depicting the outline of a possible burial mound. There are also further circular images under the medieval markings. All of which are of historical interest to the area.

Please refer to grid reference SO9652121561 when looking at the LiDar imaging.

The site is significant, not only because of the history that it preserves, with its archaeology, ancient trees, medieval markings and ancient hedges (all of which are protected by law) but it also holds onto the diverse array of wildlife, which must also be preserved. Even more so in today's current climate.

I will state clearly that I object to this application.

34 Sisson Road
GL2 0RA

Comments: 16th June 2020

I'm supporting this application due to the high number of affordable housing it brings to the ever in demand Charlton Kings area.

Having a young family myself and currently having to think about re-housing for schools, this brings a much needed and affordable opportunity to relocate to the area.

8 Montpellier Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1TX

Comments: 8th July 2020

The economy is struggling at the moment. The House Building Industry is central to our economic recovery. These houses will help Cheltenham and the wider economy generally.

The Ridge
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6QE

Comments: 16th June 2020

I strongly object to this proposal which threatens a beautiful green lung in the heart of Charlton Kings. The developers have not chosen a brownfield site which would be suitable but instead an incredibly beautiful wildlife meadow which we should be doing all we can to preserve, not destroy. The area is incredibly valuable in terms of the huge variety of wildlife and plants, which once lost will never return.

I cannot see how this new proposal addresses any of the issues already noted which informed the two previous CBC refusal decisions and an Appeal Inquiry which dismissed the developer's Appeal and it appears to be a desperate last ditch attempt to push something through.

There are many more practical reasons that this is a very poor site for development that have been mentioned in all of the hundreds of objections already lodged and I hope that common sense and real thought for the environment above all else, prevails.

32 Copt Elm Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8AH

Comments: 7th May 2020

I object on the grounds that this site is still unsuitable for 43 new homes to be built at this location. From the very beginning it was planned for 90 new homes to be built at this location. This was refused. Then it was planned for 69 new homes to be built at this location. This was refused. The access road to the site is totally unsuitable, its too narrow and steep. The extra volume of traffic trying to use this road would be intolerable for residents already living in the area. With the proposed 43 new homes being built at this location, there would be on average an additional 86 cars trying to access this site two or three times a day. That's without the extra traffic from utility services, internet deliveries, supermarket deliveries, friends and family visits. This does not alter the fact the only road leading to this proposed location is too narrow and steep. Also the different weather conditions throughout the year especially in winter with snow and ice to contend with, trying to access this narrow road to the proposed location.

In the Travel Plan for this site, to encourage alternatives to using a car, it gives examples of approximate distances and travel times to the local amenities at Sixways by walking and cycling. On paper this sounds to be acceptable, but there is no mention of the elevation for this journey. Has anyone tried to walk to the local Charlton Kings shops and back. Maybe walking/cycling downhill is bearable but the return journey uphill will surely deter people from this method of transport and return to their cars quickly.

The loss of another Area of Outstanding Beauty destroyed for profit. The wildlife that is within the area will be lost. More artificial street lighting spoiling the night skies. Where are the extra hospital beds coming from to cater for all the new builds in and around Cheltenham. Extra school places plus the doctors surgery appointments these are already stretched with long waiting times.

Penn House
Tivoli Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TF

Comments: 22nd May 2020

I have watched this application being submitted in various ways to grind down the 'system' until approval is given. This seems to be a typical plan practised by developers who should comply with previous legitimate planning refusals.

I also feel that the full Planning Committee should continue to decide on the application as they will have a broader view for Cheltenham.

The objections remain:

1. Open land, green spaces and the environment need to be protected from the concrete jungle we are heading for
2. Trees create such a different ambience to nature and need to be protected, especially if they are hundreds of years old!
3. I have seen other sites flooded out after water has been denied its normal flow by fields being converted into housing developments. This should not be another one!
4. Access to the site will create yet more traffic delays and safety issues especially in the winter

5. GP surgeries were already seriously stretched before Covid and will be again. Let's not overload the infra-structure any more!
6. Schools fall into the same category and over-sized classes are not the way for Cheltenham to educate its future generations.

We sincerely hope that CBC will continue to support the lovely relaxing Cheltenham environment and reject this application once and for all.

Woodlands
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PA

Comments: 5th August 2020

All previous objections points apply and are captured in full in other impassioned and expert residents' views.

Please make the inspector's commentary available to the planning committee in full.

How we can be here again, only 6 months after a dismissed appeal, is unfathomable. Almost none of the points raised at that appeal have been more than superficially addressed, other than moving back the boundary of the notional build (but with no management strategy for the resultant "fallow space" which will become a dumping ground for fly tippers, a short cut for criminals into back gardens not protected or designed to be secured from access in that direction; what it won't be is the beautiful wildflower meadow that is already in situ.)

A range of areas of concern such as flooding and spring water handling have been erased, presumably due to a tick box approach to the appeal findings - that isn't adequate and needs additional scrutiny.

This series of applications have been the opposite of community engagement and good master planning - the civic society comments encapsulate residents' sentiments concisely.

Please can this entire process be audited to ensure nothing similar can happen again and lessons are identified and processes changed?

Comments: 23rd May 2020

My objections have been previously submitted in some detail, all of which remain relevant to the current planning application. Herewith my summary of previous objections:

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

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

In addition to my comments above and in the best interests of democracy, the decision on this application should be taken by the democratically elected Planning Committee rather than the Planning Officer.

Field House
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PH

Comments: 14th May 2020

We object to the above application. We also objected to the previous applications in 2017 and 2018. No houses should be built on this green meadow, and we strongly feel that there should be a limit in the number of times an application is allowed to be put forward to the Council. It takes time and money from the tax payers to keep going through the formalities which cannot be afforded. If the planning committee turns it down three times that should be the limit. We wish the letter that we wrote on 8th September 2017 objecting should be circulated to the planning committee, as the objections we made then still apply today.

May I also say that in our democratic society we strongly feel that this matter is too important for the decision to be taken by the council officers, as it should be made by the planning committee of the council, an elected body. If, because of the situation, and until the planning committee can meet together, which I am sure they will be able to do so before too long, THE DECISION SHOULD BE DEFERRED.

Comments: 7th August 2020

With reference to the planning application we wish to object.

I have driven to see for myself the traffic situation at Ewens Farm. There were cars parked along all the associated roads, making them extremely narrow, and especially dangerous during the busy times of the day. The access out of Ewens Farm is either onto the A40, which comes to a complete halt in rush hour, or via King Alfred Way with cars parked all over the pavements awaiting repairs at the garages. At rush hour during the morning the traffic along Hales Road down to the London Road traffic lights backs up as far as Battledown Approach and sometimes further. What will happen when you have another 100 cars trying to filter into these roads. It is no good thinking people will walk or cycle, the majority do not. The Planning Committee must take this into account. The roads are not designed to take the amount of traffic already using it and planning to build another 43 houses will result in a huge increase in traffic in the Battledown area. The previous letter of objection from the resident in Tall Timbers (I do hope this letter of objection regarding the previous planning applications will be available to the Planning Committee) who obviously has detailed knowledge regarding traffic flow, plus the case much more succinctly than I.

Regarding the risk of flooding. We happen to live on the top of Battledown and our house is built on clay soil. Having lived here for many years, we have always been grateful of where we live, having seen the excess rain water flood down the hill, even right through some houses lower down. The building of so many houses and the taking away or permeable green fields could have a direct impact on existing properties.

I note others, some living beyond our County, remark we need more affordable housing. However we also need open green spaces for the well being of the general public. Squeezing houses onto any open green space will be toying with peoples' mental health. May I suggest affordable housing needs to be put on brown field sites, which developers reject, as the easier option is to cover green fields with houses.

Whilst I realise that the Planning Committee does not have to take into consideration the other aspects of the result of having maybe 150 extra residents in the area. It must be aware that there are not enough doctors, spaces in the local schools, or beds in the hospital for such an increase in population.

Battledown is a unique habitat and it is tragic to think that our local flora and will life would be destroyed if planning was granted.

14 Ewens Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JP

Comments: 22nd May 2020

It will create a bottleneck of traffic in a very narrow entrance at Oakhurst Rise.

Comments: 26th May 2020

As has been outlined eloquently elsewhere here, the latest revised plans make NO difference whatsoever to the problems this would create. The site would still increase traffic through a narrow,steep bottleneck of an entrance which is the only proposed access to the site; there is still an increased danger of flooding; there is still an increase on the already over-burdened infastructure. If the inspection in August highlighted numerous problems, why is this still being persisted with?

Comments: 26th May 2020

As has been outlined eloquently elsewhere here, the latest revised plans make NO difference whatsoever to the problems this would create. The site would still increase traffic through a narrow,steep bottleneck of an entrance which is the only proposed access to the site; there is still an increased danger of flooding; there is still an increase on the already over-burdened infastructure. If the inspection in August highlighted numerous problems, why is this still being persisted with?

80 Beeches Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8NU

Comments: 8th June 2020

I wish to lodge the strongest of objections to the proposed development in respect of the above planning application.

We are suffering too much building creep into our rural areas, and if such developments as this are approved, then Cheltenham and it's environs will not only lose its identity, but will become yet another "urban sprawl."

There has been a major and positive seed change in attitudes toward nature and the environment, and any development on this site must be rejected in line with the public attitude that prevails today.

This is not the first attempt by the developer to obtain planning consent, and in line with previous decisions, must be rejected out of hand.

9 Ewens Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JW

Comments: 8th May 2020

I object to this proposal for the same reasons as the last two applications, namely:

- Increased traffic on the surrounding roads, which are already far too busy.
- Increased traffic equals extra emissions. I would expect the aim would be to reduce emissions wherever possible.
- Unsuitable access via Oakhurst Drive, which is narrow and extremely steep.
- Extra strain on local amenities such as schools and health services. It already takes over three weeks to get a doctors appointment, this development will only make matters worse.
- Detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside and wildlife. Surely the objective should be to protect our green spaces and wildlife, not bulldoze them out of existence.

10 Warwick Crescent
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6YZ

Comments: 1st August 2020

I wish to object to the proposed application for 43 dwellings. Although I appreciate the need for affordable housing, the area cannot cope with the additional traffic and impact created with having additional housing. There is the social aspect of the loss of events being held in the grounds, to the local community and there is the loss of important flora and fauna.

I have only given a brief synopsis of my objections, but whole heartedly agree with the eloquent letters of objection and all the points raised therein.

24 Castlefields Avenue
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6YR

Comments: 2nd June 2020

This is an unsuitable site for development due to poor access, the impact on wildlife, the impact on a nearby grade II listed building, and the increased flood risk that will result.

8 Pine Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JR

Comments: 25th May 2020

I find myself protesting in writing for the third time regarding the planning application for Oakhurst Rise.

This is a beautiful organic meadow with ancient oaks and hedgerows. The loss of green fields and a unique habitat will be a threat to wildlife. There are badgers that would not survive if relocated, seven species of bats, newts, adders, slow worms as well as dozens of bird species. There is also a family of deer that can often be seen during the day in the meadow.

The increased risk of flash floods will have consequences for local people, including myself who live below the proposed site.

Local schools are already over subscribed and sixways surgery has a six year waiting list.

To quote from Planning Committee minutes 19/07/18 'only one access to the site, which is torturous and ridiculous via a windy, congested rat run. Steep gradients, blind junctions and dangers in snow and ice have all been ignored.

The junction at sixways is already over capacity and this problem has not yet been addressed. The traffic impact of forty three dwellings (resulting in at least eighty more vehicles) will be severe.

The local plan has already met the affordable housing need, providing enough housing for the town until 2031.

Until all of these problems have been addressed and the developers have a satisfactory solution, then planning permission must be refused.

5 The Gables
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6TR

Comments: 30th June 2020

Affordable homes are desperately needed. There is a huge shortfall and there are currently 2500 people in Cheltenham on the waiting list for affordable homes

133 New Barn Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 3LQ

Comments: 17th June 2020

I don't understand why this is back in planning again. The land is allocated for housing development in the draft Local Plan so why does it keep getting refused.. and reduced in size? We need these site delivered in Cheltenham for much need housing and this is clearly a very logical site within the town.

Ash Tree House
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 7th June 2020

I wish to reiterate my strong objection to this 'new' planning application having reviewed the latest documentation with regards potential development on this site - 20/00683/OUT.

Furthermore, I do not see any evidence that the rationale regards the previous two planning applications on this site, which the Council recently turned down, have since been addressed. This application is merely a minor amendment to the previous application by the developers which was comprehensively rejected by CBC. From the council's refusal decision letters, a number of key reasons were recorded and a mention was made of the NPPF. None of these

reasons have been adequately addressed by the latest application so this application should also be rejected.

36 Suffolk Parade
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2AD

Comments: 11th June 2020

I support this application as the site is within the draft local plan and it will provide much needed housing in the area, specifically the eighteen affordable houses that will go some way to reduce the number of people on the waiting list in Cheltenham for affordable homes.

The sale of this site will provide local shops and businesses with increased revenue after the loss of turnover during the Covid 19 lockdown.

St Edwards school will benefit financially enabling them to improve their existing facilities which long term will ensure the students at the school a brighter future.

I support this application in full.

40 Pilley Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 9ER

Comments: 8th May 2020

This is surely an asset to the area and my son would like to move back to the area that he was bought up in.

Flat 5
Cameron House
Glencairn Park Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2ND

Comments: 28th June 2020

I wish to strongly oppose the updated planning application for a housing development situated off Oakhurst Rise. I am outraged by the continuous attempts of the developers to build on a beautiful, preserved meadow - not to mention the disastrous effects that this would have on the diverse wildlife found in the area.

ACCESS

Oakhurst Rise is a completely unsuitable access point for the development, as raised countless times prior. Oakhurst Rise is set at such a steep gradient and is incredibly narrow - any increase in traffic up this road (by circa 80 cars) would almost certainly lead to unavoidable accidents.

Please also consider the worsening of the situation in winter months - when the roads are icy, breaking and parking becomes incredibly risky - this is because of the incredibly steep gradient.

Another concern is the wider road network of the Ewens Farm estate which is extremely narrow and winding. I have lost track of the number of times that I have found myself stuck in traffic on

many occasions due to the nature of the roads - with lots of cars parked on either side of the road, it is hazardous for road users during peak times.

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

HABITAT

I do also share the concerns raised regarding the permanent loss to the environment this development will cause. The important green space is much used by dog walkers and local children, making it such an important community amenity. It is also a very ecologically diverse area, home to rare species of bats, birds, badgers and rare moths, amongst countless other species. I am also incredibly concerned by the finding of the Ancient Tree Forum that has found at least 2 irreplaceable veteran trees which are in danger of being permanently destroyed. All ancient trees of whatever species or size should receive the level of protection stated in para 175c. Mature trees, where they have the appropriate key decay features, should be considered as irreplaceable habitat and therefore veterans to which the policy in para 175c of the NPPF applies.

SOCIAL HOUSING

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

SUPPORTING COMMENTS

I would like to comment on the wide array of supporting comments that I have recently seen which indicate that Cheltenham Borough Council and/or its planning officers support this application. I cannot get my head around how this could be the case before all of the facts and comments have been presented? This seems entirely undemocratic if this is indeed the case and that a decision has been made before being presented with both sides at a Planning Committee Meeting, with a vote being taken.

I would like to know how these households know that Cheltenham Borough Council and/or its planning officers support the developers' cause and just how democratic this process really is.

Brereton House
Stow Road
Andoversford
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL54 4JN

Comments: 29th June 2020

I cannot understand the objection to this development. It meets all the criteria, most notably providing affordable housing that is urgently needed by the Borough. The school will benefit as well which will be hugely important to them and the local area especially during such unstable times. As a former pupil, I am in favour of their benefit on the back of such a much-needed development for the local area. Any objection cannot be taken seriously other than somebody not wanting some more housing built near their home, which doesn't make sense when all authorities back the development.

2 Imperial Square
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1QB

Comments: 17th June 2020

I am in support of this development proposal. The re submitted scheme has been carefully thought through and provides much needed homes in a popular sustainable location, and in particular provides much needed social housing to local young people and young families.

216 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AW

Comments: 19th June 2020

Having young adults myself this development will offer huge potential for anyone wanting to have affordable housing in the future.

Southern Lawn
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NU

Comments: 23rd May 2020

Thank you for your letter of 1 May 2020 concerning this Planning Application.

I am not sure whether previous objections are brought forward - I sincerely hope so, as many older people do not have access to the internet or, at present, the library. Nor can meetings be held by residents to share their thoughts about or collaborate on a response. It is disappointing that such a sensitive application is not being deferred until after the period of lockdown.

So: please can consideration of this application be deferred until after lockdown, and please can it then be submitted to the full planning committee?

Many of the previous objections express our concerns in an extremely thorough and careful way. Rather than repeat points, we wish therefore to endorse in particular those expressed by Meadow View (06.09.2017) and 17 Oakhurst Drive (17.09.2017).

We object to this application on the following grounds:

- It fails to resolve the reasons for refusal at Appeal
- demonstrably unsuitable access route
- the visual impact on the environment from the AONB
- the loss of amenity to local schools
- the flood implications of additional hard landscaping across the spring line,
- all the disgruntled bats, badgers, deer, neighbours and newts.

To lose this greenfield site, used by local schools and visible from miles around would be a shame. To deal with the consequences, such as the increased flooding risk and traffic mayhem would be expensive. The benefits to a few developers would be significant, but it is difficult to see any benefits at all to the community.

Kind regards to all Officers and Councilors during this difficult time.

Comments: 4th August 2020

We object to this application. We understand that previous objections will be carried forward, because this is a revised scheme for the same plot by the same developers. However, to reiterate:

- The refusal of the previous scheme was upheld recently at appeal. The new scheme does not - despite claims to do so - negate any of the reasons for refusal.
- It does not reflect the recently published Local Plan and therefore the local planning policy, and
- the access route is obviously unsuitable
- the negative visual impact on the environment from the AONB
- the loss of amenity to local schools
- the flood implications of additional hard landscaping across the spring line,
- all the bats, badgers and newts who would be made homeless.

To lose this greenfield site, used by several schools and visible from miles around would be a shame.

To deal with the consequences, such as the increased flooding risk and traffic mayhem would be expensive.

The benefits to a few developers would be significant.

But it is difficult to see any benefits at all to the community.

Flat 4
35 St Georges Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3DU

Comments: 2nd July 2020

OBJECTION to development of the St Edwards School Meadow (20/00693/OUT)

Mr Frampton wrote to CBC (26th June 2020) saying that residents (also called teachers, children and their parents) of St Edwards School are 'trespassing' in developing an ecological understanding of the fields under threat. I have forwarded CBC some photos of "trespass" in progress today during a lockdown lesson.

We call this education, enjoyment of the local environment, and important community amenity.

This is the difference between charitable ownership and commercial ownership of a strategic land asset.

Fortunately the field in question is still (for now, and for another 30 years if this application fails) leased to the school, who permit responsible access to a whole range of community stakeholders, in accordance with child protection policies, to ensure full use of a community asset / cross country course / bee habitat and more.

I don't even live in Charlton Kings but as a parent of children at St Edwards School and qualified ecologist, myself and other residents have worked with the Friends of Charlton Kings planning team to help the community (above and beyond the school community). Opportunities like this lockdown school day in an urban environment are priceless, and the loss of this wildflower meadow would be catastrophic and in complete contradiction of sensible biodiversity policies. Residents may not be planning consultants, but they have done their best to represent the facts

without the benefit of limitless budgets and consultants paid to make the developers' case (at length). Mr Frampton has made no such efforts to understand community concerns or address them, contrary to all good planning practice.

Comments: 6th June 2020

This application fails to deliver on Cheltenham's promise to be carbon neutral. It has no sustainable features and is the opposite of what my generation aspire to for homes. Car only, inaccessible, no shops or facilities nearby, no cycle paths.

My college class could do better at master planning.

Sunnyhill
Stanley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6QD

Comments: 17th June 2020

Cheltenham needs new houses due to its shortage.

Looks like a great development, ideal for new family with some great schools nearby.

153 Prestbury Road
Cheltenham
GL522du

Comments: 18th June 2020

As a parent, it would be a great place to raise my children, and there are some brilliant school options nearby.

31 Charlton Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8DH

Comments: 20th May 2020

I object to the proposed development on this site for many reasons including:

1. impact on the environment given the historic trees and known badger sett on the site;
2. flooding risk due to the nature and location of the site;
3. additional burden on local amenities, including schools, doctors etc;
4. poor access to the site and the significant increase in traffic in the area due to the large number of additional homes; and
5. the loss of a valuable public amenity (as the site is the location of cross country running competitions and a very popular bonfire night).

Previous plans have rightly been rejected as should this application despite the reduction in the number of dwellings. All objections remain regardless of the number of dwellings.

163 London Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6HN

Comments: 23rd June 2020

I am writing to comment on what I consider a complete scandal by certain residents regarding the above Planning Application and their objections to it. The proposed development meets all the criteria necessary, in that it provides desperately affordable housing that is urgently needed by the Borough. The Carmalite Order is happy with the sale of the land, St Edwards school is happy and will benefit substantially and indeed CBC's own Planning Committee support it but some NIMBY's don't want this type of development near them, it is outrageous.

1 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 13th May 2020

My bungalow is directly on the rise of the road so all noise from passing traffic effects my garden bedrooms and living room which are on the road side. Any increase in traffic will make living here unbearable.

The application will mean an extra 80 car journeys not including all the delivery vans that make up todays lifestyle. It would not be possible to enjoy being in my house.

Visual Impact would be awful as it would mean the loss of most of those beautiful trees that I can see from my windows. We need more green spaces to combat Global Warming and Nature has proved to be calming and de-stressing any loss of this has a very negative impact on mental health. I am depressed at the thought of losing those beautiful trees and all the associated wild life.

1 the cottage
piccadilly
cheltenham
gl54 5uu

Comments: 23rd June 2020

I fully support this application, there is currently not enough affordable housing in the area and this scheme seems to tick all the boxes required.

26 Bracken Way
Malvern
WR14 1JH

Comments: 11th June 2020

I would like to provide my support for this revised application. This is an allocated site for residential development and the latest application for the erection of 43 units, has sympathetically considered and addressed consultant and inspectorate comments regarding listed buildings, trees and ecological matters.

Greenacres
Madresfield Road
Malvern
WR13 5AS

Comments: 14th July 2020

its about time more houses are going to be build in Cheltenham

77 Denman Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4GF

Comments: 21st May 2020

Looking to move to this area due to the quality of schools, would welcome the opportunity to purchase a new build as once people are in this area they tend not to move out.

15 Castle Street
Worcester
WR1 3AD

Comments: 14th July 2020

I have been looking to move to this area for a long time and now finally houses are going to be built. The land is not being used for anything, housing is a good ideas. My family and I would be able to enjoy living in a safe and beautifully place.

11 Wimborne Close
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3QP

Comments: 8th July 2020

This development I feel will be a great opportunity for young people to get onto the housing market and be close to family members living nearby. Cheltenham house prices are exceptionally high making it very difficult for young people to get their foot on the ladder this new development has my full support.

4 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 18th May 2020

Letter attached.

23 Beaufort Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JS

Comments: 14th May 2020

This is to my knowledge the third application for this site. Each time the housing numbers are reduced but the dangers and issues not dealt with. The main problem is that no new road infrastructure has been planned to cater for the increase in motor vehicles, nor likely to be. Beaufort Road has 44 dwellings and has an estimated 85 vehicles associated. Working on the basis of a similar number of properties then there is expectation for at least a similar number of vehicles.

My comments from my previous 2 objections remain the same. In brief, access / egress from Ewens Farm Estate is onto London Road or Hales Road - two main roads which can become highly congested and usually grid locked during peak periods. At times one has to miss sequences of lights at Holy Apostles / London Road because of the gridlock. The estate is supposedly subject to a 20 mile per hour speed limit, one that is not adhered to nor likely to be enforceable as there is no Policing. As a resident we are subjected to noise created by the clatter of vehicles speeding over the humps.

Oakhurst Rise, the intended access to and from the site is most unsuitable. This is due to the nature of the roadway which includes a very steep hill, treacherous in wintry conditions when descending due to parked vehicles near the junction with Beaufort Road. There have been some near misses due to vehicles blindly turning left into Oakhurst Road being confronted by vehicles on their side of the road. Beaufort Road is a two-way road with numerous vehicles parked on the road which in itself causes difficulty to persons wishing to emerge from their driveways. The Southern end of the road has a No Entry sign erected but this is ignored from time to time especially as Satellite Navigations give directions to enter there.

In concluding, I again ask that this application be refused as the site is totally unsuitable for the above mentioned reasons. The numbers are not relevant as if misguidedly granted, would only lead to further applications and more potential noise and dangerous situations. If the Applicant wishes to build at this site then a safer more suitable entrance should be found from their vast land. This I question is not possible because of the high volume of traffic in this area. Perhaps they should utilise the school access/ egress points instead of creating more misery for the Ewens Farm Estate.

2 Ewens Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JP

Comments: 20th May 2020

We are amazed that the developers are submitting yet another application for this site, since all the reasons previously stated about this planning application still apply and have already been turned down twice.

The access to and from the proposed site is no different from previously, into and out of a cul-de-sac which is on a steep gradient. The extra traffic from this will add to the already large amount going through Ewens Farm from Hales Road to the London Road, very rarely at the 20 mph limit, as well as the increasing number of residents vehicles who live on the estate.

The area for the proposed site is home to wildlife that would not be able to be accommodated by moving its habitat, nature does not work that way, and the trees that have been established for many years cannot be replaced, therefore this would all be lost forever.

We therefore, once again, strongly oppose this planning application.

29 Haywards Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6RQ

Comments: 13th May 2020

I object to the new updated planning application for many reasons, the main ones being:

- Increased traffic in surrounding areas on roads that are already struggling to cope with the volume
- Increased traffic brings increased danger for those living in the area, not only from the volume of traffic passing by people's houses, but also pollution from those vehicles
- Concreting over green areas destroys wildlife and brings an increased risk of flooding. The site is at the top of the slope, with many houses below it.

82 Rosehill Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6SJ

Comments: 26th June 2020

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

ACCESS

The latest planning application does nothing to address the serious concerns regarding Oakhurst Rise as an access road for the new site.

The entire road infrastructure that encompasses the Ewans Farm estate is already questionable. Narrow and winding roads make it hazardous for road users during peak times. But the matter of Oakhurst Rise serving as the access road for this proposed housing development is a real cause for concern regarding its steep and narrow gradient entrance.

The junction suffers from being located right at the bottom of a very steep hill that cannot be seen by drivers entering the road when they turn left. All too often, visitors will turn in too quickly and if a driver is exiting the road it relies on quick thinking from both vehicles to avoid a collision.

The entrance/exit out of Oakhurst regularly has vehicles parked on the road; worsening the narrow access. Residents regularly experience near-miss incidents at this point when drivers turn left into Oakhurst Rise, oblivious to this problem.

The situation is exacerbated in winter months. Most residents of dare not drive under icy conditions in fear of losing control of their car on the steep hill. Many residents of Oakhurst Rise are retired and can fortunately leave their cars unused during these adverse conditions.

If this planning application is approved how can the hundred or so new vehicles seriously access without incident? If Oakhurst Rise is covered in ice it's incredibly dangerous to drive up the hill unless your vehicle benefits from all-wheel drive.

Many councillors quite rightly raised the unsuitability of Oakhurst Rise as an access road for this development and it's both discouraging and distressing that developers appear to be belligerently pressing ahead regardless. I can't stress enough how dangerous this road will become from a huge increase in vehicle use.

Greenmount
12 Christchurch Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2PL

Comments: 29th June 2020

This appears to be a well-thought out development that leaves plenty of green space around it. In these tricky times, the economy will benefit from approving and advancing projects such as these.

18 Selkirk Gardens
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5LX

Comments: 1st July 2020

There is a massive shortage of housing in the area especially affordable homes. Young local residents need this type of development to go head to enable them to stay within the area.

I also believe the local economy will benefit hugely if the development goes ahead.

58 Bouncers Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5JN

Comments: 1st July 2020

Generates welcome trade and income for all the businesses at Sixways

Hillview House
Hambrook Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6LW

Comments: 23rd July 2020

I would like to object to the above planning application. The development is detrimental to the neighbouring houses and is another example of overdevelopment in this already crowded and densely populated area. Money always seems to win over the environment we live in. Ideally it would be wonderful if this land was preserved as a nature reserve for the enjoyment and wellbeing of the community as a whole rather than lining the pockets of a few greedy developers.

4 Charlton Park Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7RX

Comments: 22nd June 2020

Looking at the development plan, there are 18 affordable homes for residents of Charlton Kings to rent or buy. My understanding is there hasn't been this volume of affordable homes built in the parish for some considerable time. Affordable homes that more than likely fall into the budget of our important key workers who have kept this county and country running over the last 4 months. I also wanted to mention there are residents who live in Charlton Kings already who cannot afford to purchase a home because the prices are so high, this will prove to be a valuable asset for them and their families.

Hilcot
Stanley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PF

Comments: 13th May 2020

I am writing to object to the planned Oakhurst building scheme that would cause severe damage to the local environment. This devastation would be in the form of loss of wildlife, water run off drainage problems, traffic congestion, health damaging pollution and lost valuable landscape features. Wildlife is important for biodiversity. Green grass space is needed to allow the water to soak away into the landscape not tarmac. Another 100 or so cars causing congestion in Charlton Kings are not needed on our already overcrowded roads. More health damaging pollution is not needed by our communities vulnerable people. The green meadow hill is a very visible geographical feature from many different roads and this is an attraction for our community and visitors. In conclusion I urge you not to approve the scheme at all for the many convincing reasons given above.

Comments: 5th June 2020

My objections previously made on the scheme for the development of the land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise still stand and are extended to include comments on the changes. In addition I object to the latest plans because the highest 2 1/2 storey houses are in very visible positions at the front of the site and at the top of the historic meadow. This would further detract from the architecture of the historic school building and the geographical meadow feature particularly when the site is seen from various approaches including Charlton Kings. Also note that the large area of mature trees drawn on the plan are proposed and are in fact new and do not exist therefore the new houses may be very visible and may significantly detract from the geographical site and the historic school house for many, possibly 20 -30 years if the plan is approved.

Comments: 14th August 2020

Previous comments objecting to the Oakhurst Rise house building proposal are carried forward. There are some comments below on the documents submitted after the last objection. I would draw your attention to the following points.

Bioscan exceeds "qualifying criteria for causing key wildlife site significant harm."

Revised site plan Section AA does not seem to show the true impact of the highly visible housing development, the line of proposed trees will take 30 plus years to reach maturity or the true impact on the listed Villa. The creators vision and words of "the loveliest hills arranged around it" will be destroyed.

FLAC talks about trees but surely if mature trees close to veteran trees are destroyed they are prevented from being more mature trees. Again I make the point re the proposed line of trees that are shown as mature in the proposal.

I urge you to reject the proposal for the reasons above and in other comments.

Castle Farm
Ashley Rd
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NU

Comments: 16th May 2020

We strongly object to this planning application.

This is the 3rd time a proposal has been submitted in the last 3 years. Each previous proposal has been rejected, and an appeal by the developers on the most recent was also rejected. None of the fundamental issues highlighted below have changed, and surely this is now becoming a waste of valuable local council resource and taxpayers money.

The fundamental issues remain

- The proposed access is totally unsuitable
- The flooding risk to houses below this hilltop is high
- Destruction of a green hilltop space and trees, a fundamental visual asset to this end of Cheltenham, that gives the town it's unique and special appeal
- Destruction of the wildlife in such a biodiverse space

We also understand that this decision may be taken by council officers rather than the proper planning committee. This is inappropriate for such an important issue, which has been rejected on so many previous occasions. At the very least, the decision should be deferred until the correct process can take place.

Flat 4
Stanmer House
Lypiatt Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2QJ

Comments: 28th June 2020

This is a sustainable development located within the urban area that provides 43 much needed new homes including 18 affordable homes.

11A Churchill Drive
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JH

Comments: 25th June 2020

I would like to register an objection to the planned development at Oakhurst Rise.

The infrastructure of this local area can not support the building and maintenance of the proposed development. Oakhurst Rise itself is hugely inappropriate as access. It would seem that if the development was to go ahead, access via Greenway Lane If possible would be more suitable.

There are other reasons why this development is not a good idea, the protection of ancient trees and green habitat for example. One of the things that I was surprised was not mentioned in previous planning was the necessity of green space for mental health benefits. The park by Hayward's Road and King Alfred Way is a brilliant example of this, but it is also incredibly heavily used, especially during these covid times.

Fundamentally I think there are many more appropriate and less controversial areas that could be used for a similar development.

Thanks in advance for registering this concern.

10 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 20th May 2020

I object so strongly to this "yet another" application from the same developers, that still doesn't resolve the main concerns of both local residents and the Planning Committee. Oakhurst Rise is completely the wrong access for a housing development. It is too steep, too narrow and is currently full of on-road parked vehicles. The existing housing was built with driveways suitable for cars of the 1970s, not the much wider vehicles used today - hence the necessity for on-road parking.

The road simply couldn't support the number of additional vehicles that this proposal would generate. I beg to differ with the applicants when they state the residents of the new development would walk or cycle - that is currently very rare, so won't happen in the future.

The junction at the entrance to Oakhurst Rise is treacherous in good weather, with sight lines regularly blocked, but in bad weather the road becomes unusable as it is so steep and ungritted.

Public transport is very poor, with the best service provided at Sixways, but then there is the steep climb back to Oakhurst Rise on foot, carrying shopping.

Local services are already stretched, with waits in excess of 3 weeks to see GPs - I can't see this improving with a new housing development.

The field itself is a haven for wildlife, with deer and foxes regular visitors to our garden, to say nothing of the ancient trees.

This application is so wrong on so many levels and having been refused at Planning Committee stage several times before, must surely be deferred to the next full such meeting, rather than leave it to a general council officer meeting.

I urge the Planning Committee to once again refuse this application, this time once and for all.

Coversdown
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
GL526NY

Comments: 26th May 2020

Further to the amendments received, my original objection lodged on the 22 May 2020, remains in place.

Wadleys Farm
Ham Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NJ

Comments: 21st May 2020

Letter attached.

Tor
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NS

Comments: 24th May 2020

Yet again these developers come back with a scam application having reduced the number of proposed houses makes no difference, my objections are the same as previous applications, access to development from oakhurst rise is unsuitable, the flooding risk which is real, flora and fauna, and the fact we know that if outline planning is given for 43 homes it will be amended if these developers and Carmelites flip the land onto someone else for a profit which is highly likely and a strong rumour, these guys are treating the planning committee and community with contempt by not taking NO for an answer

Comments: 4th August 2020

Yes again objecting, crazy access to site narrow and dangerous loss of green space, trees, wildlife, historic flooding issues that will be worse with development

14 Greenway Lane
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6LB

Comments: 16th May 2020

We wish to register our strong objection to this application.

First and foremost, as per the JCS and local plan, development at this level, significantly beyond what the local plan targets on this site, is simply not required.

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

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

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

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

This new application does not go nearly far enough in addressing the reasons highlighted by the planning committee and inspectors when the previous application and appeal were rejected.

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

10 Beaufort Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JT

Comments: 6th June 2020

I would like to raise my objection to the planning application for 43 dwellings on the land adjacent to oakhurst rise Cheltenham

I object because if build the dwellings would cause an

- Increased flood risk, from surface water flooding, springs and inadequate sewerage capacity
- Lack of school places, particularly at primary level, and of any GP capacity (noting the problems we will face as a community post Covid)
- Impact on the AONB and the CK conservation area(exacerbated by the new roof profile at the top of the site)
- Loss of amenity to local residents
- Increased traffic and pollution levels. The estate is already used as a short cut. This would also leads to increased risks of car accidents involving local pedestrians

I would also like to say that it has been very hard for some people to comment and raise their objections during this time and with that in mind it feels like the planning proposal is being sneaked through planning committee

Greenacre
Stanley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6QD

Comments: 7th June 2020

I objected to this development the first time round and nothing has changed in my opinion .Even though fewer houses are proposed, it makes no difference to the fact there will be building on wonderful greenfield site. My reasons for objection are:

- accessibility- no-one in a wheelchair will be able to use the site due to the steep gradients
- tree impact and damage to hedgerows - harm to ancient and veteran and mature trees and loss of habitat for wildlife
- flood risk- springs on the site, steep gradient and impact on already poor sewerage system.

- increased traffic and pressure on local services like schools and medical centre.

The current site is a beautiful wild meadow and something we should be protecting locally not building on.

Overdale House
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NU

Comments: 12th May 2020

Reference: Application 20/00683/OUT

This application for 43 dwellings on Battledown land adjacent to and with single access from Oakhurst Rise follows on from the refusal by the Appeal Inspector B.J.Sims on 20th September 2019 for development submitted under 18/02171/OUT made by the same applicants. That in turn followed the refusal by the Borough Council for planning application 17/00710/OUT, again from the same developers.

A previous planning application on the same site, albeit for 'only' 3 acres of development not the full 10 acres was rejected on 20 December 1984.

"Reasons for refusal included the loss of trees, the exacerbation of existing flooding problems, and the inability of the surrounding roads to cope with anticipated amount of traffic." Source. Cheltenham Borough Council Borough Architect and Planning Officer Records.

.In a Report to Cheltenham Borough Council by Wendy J Burden BA DipTP MRTPI, an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State Dated 17 March 2020 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) Section 20. Report on the Examination of the Cheltenham Plan 2011-2031 in para 58 she states:

"Policy HD4 provides for some 25 dwellings on land at Oakhurst Rise. MM016 provides for a restriction to the area of the site to ensure that new development does not impact on the setting of adjacent listed buildings. A recent appeal decision for some 68 dwellings was found, among other issues, to materially alter the character and appearance of the site harmful to the setting of the listed buildings and to result in a loss of protected trees. The appeal was dismissed.

59. An allocation for some 25 dwellings would considerably reduce the potential for the harmful impacts which were identified in the appeal scheme. A more modest development would enable the interrelationships between the listed buildings, the site and the Ice House to be better addressed and to avoid any harmful impact on the setting of the listed buildings. It would also enable the retention of important trees within the site, and I have made a minor change to the wording of modified Policy HD4 to require the protection of mature trees. In view of the location of the site within the built-up area and the need for residential development within Cheltenham, I find that with an appropriate layout and form of development the issues raised as part of the appeal scheme could be satisfactorily addressed and the allocation is sound."

It would seem from the outline plan in 20/00683/OUT that development in the NE area of the meadowland has been curtailed in line with the Inspectors comments but that 43 dwellings are applied for as opposed to the 25 recommended.

The Developer having submitted numerous planning applications must need a greater return on the investment than 25 houses to make a profit and so continues to seek a denser development.

Whether it is a development of 43 or 25 properties there is going to be an impact upon a wide cross section of environmental, physiological and sustainability issues.

Access to the site is inadequate for 43 houses (with upwards of 80 plus vehicles) using Oakhurst Rise, a small pre-existing residential road of about 25 dwellings, mainly bungalows; which is too steep, too narrow and leads only to other pre-existing residential roads (Beaufort Road, Ewens Road) that are also highly inadequate in width and gradient, all based upon a one way system with considerable traffic calming. Exiting and entering traffic will be in a merry-go-round over traffic calming and parked cars in what was designed as a Council Estate. The families currently living there will be a constant risk if the children go out to play.

It is already a rat run at peak times from London Road (A40) to Hales Road via the adjacent industrial estate.

Cheltenham Planning Policy GE 2; Private Green Space states "The development of private green areas, open spaces and gardens which make a significant townscape and environmental contribution to the town will should not be permitted."

The proposed development does not meet the requirements of significant townscape and environmental contribution? It clearly has a unique environmental impact with a wide range of flora and fauna, it is kept in semi-wild condition, with once per year grass cutting, occasional use by the School for cross-country events and at its lower end has a the school farm with various rare breeds, including Alpaca's. It is a unique site that it is surrounded by buildings on all 4 sides, it is visible from the AONB areas. The proposed development is as undesirable and damaging to the landscape as development of the middle slopes of any hills, escarpment or coastline would be. It would also set a precedent for higher level development of the south side of the existing village of Charlton Kings on Timbercombe and across to Daisybank Road.

Currently entering the town from Cirencester this historic land never having been built upon since before Roman times forms a wonderful undeveloped area and enhances the critical green space that goes to form Cheltenham's ambience.

At present this field within 5 minutes of the Council Chambers, with its ancient hedgerows and mature trees, is an important and unusual natural sanctuary for wildlife. Looking up from St Edwards playing field boundaries one can often see the deer roaming the site. Over the decades, local residents have observed birds and mammals raising their young without interference. It is densely populated by a wide range of creatures including foxes, badgers, different species of mice, shrews, voles, hedgehogs, newts, glow worms, bats, bees, owls, woodpeckers. Such a unique environment close to the heart of a classical town should be protected for generations to come so they may observe an uninterrupted natural habitat and to respect it and learn from its critical value in an increasingly urbanised country.

Drainage off the hill is a major issue which will be compounded by the addition of concrete and tarmac. In the 2007 storm, the head of water coming off Battledown was such that manhole covers 'blew out' half-way up Ashley Road as the water built up in the Sixways area. Battledown Approach and Harp Hill also became rivers rather than road. The holding pond at the bottom of Ashley Road overflowed and caused flooding at SixWays.

A further concern is around extra demand on an already stretched infrastructure. The local health practice is already oversubscribed, schools for all age groups are also full and the link through Oakhurst Rise is difficult for pedestrians and cyclists, hence easy access to public transport is impracticable thus additional private cars will use the local road system and require parking space in the town at their destinations.

We therefore object to the development and request our Councillors consider if this proposal is in the long-term best interests of the town and future residents. This meadowland should be considered for full preservation and Policy HD4 amended.

Ash Tree House
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 7th June 2020

I strongly object to this 'new' planning application.

This application is merely a minor amendment to the previous applications, which were comprehensively rejected by CBC. None of the reasons for refusal contained within CBCs own decision letters, have been adequately addressed by the latest application so this application should also be rejected. This application directly contravenes the provisions contained within the Local Housing Development Plan for Cheltenham, approved by CBC last year.

In my opinion, the scale of the planned development with 43 dwellings remains completely inappropriate for this site and very much out of character with the local area. Access to the proposed site is restrictive, with a very steep aspect to the approach and narrow roads that are in no way suitable. Therefore, with regards to the above concerns and my comments submitted against the previous applications on this site, it is respectfully requested that planning permission for the above development be refused.

11 Battledown Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6RX

Comments: 15th June 2020

I would like to strongly oppose this proposed new development. The access from Oakhurst Rise will devastate the local residents by overburdening the sewage and drainage system. Also to allow 80 plus additional cars to use the access in all weather's is not acceptable and potentially dangerous on such a steep and narrow access road. Flooding is a significant concern in the area on this steeply sloping clay ground with natural springs and pond.

Please do not permit this development.

21 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 12th July 2020

I am writing to object to the proposed development, it's very sad that once again we are having to do this after the last refusal. Nothing has changed with regard to the access for this proposed development, it is still steep gradients through a quiet residential area. Once this area is concreted over its lost forever..I am extremely concerned with the risk of flooding, traffic congestion, the loss of wildlife habitats ancient trees and the already overstretched local amenities.

15 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 29th June 2020

The access to the area through Oakhurst Rise is totally unsuitable, the steepness of the slope would limit journeys by foot and cycling, therefore new residents would mostly drive.

The impact on the quality of life of the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise would be very unacceptable.

As residents we currently live in a quiet cul-de-sac and we love it, that is why we chose to live here.

11 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 30th June 2020

I am a resident of Oakhurst Rise and would like to object to the plans of building 43 houses on the land adjacent to our road.

One of my concerns is the amount of extra traffic this will create. Oakhurst Rise is a steep and winding road. It has a blind junction as you come into the road and would be dangerous. The surrounding roads are already used as a rat run. Sixways, Hailes Road, the A40 and A435 also get congested. Any extra traffic would make the situation worse.

Another one of my main concerns are the increased risk of flash flooding during heavy rain. The fields which act as a natural sponge would be paved over so any run off water would run down the road into our houses. As you are probably aware the houses are all bungalows and if we were to flood we would not be able to protect our belongings by putting them upstairs.

There are protected species of wildlife that would be threatened if the building went ahead as well as veteran oak trees and ancient hedgerows.

Also Sixways surgery and the local schools are oversubscribed and would not be able to cope with the extra households in this area.

Please do not allow the building of these houses to go ahead.

Thank you

5 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 20th May 2020

Last August I sat through all four days of the planning enquiry on the previous application for this site.

Having heard all the evidence then, I am appalled that the developers have applied yet again, the only difference being the reduced number of dwellings.

Nothing else has changed, so all my previous objections are still valid. The only access is still through Oakhurst Rise which is a very steep narrow road with a very dangerous corner at the start.

Residents of this quiet cul-de-sac would suffer badly with the increase in traffic if this became the main road to a new housing estate.

The flooding continues to encroach on some residents gardens at times of heavy or prolonged rain. To cover the field with concrete would only exacerbate the problem.

In this era of mass pollution, the ecology of this unique site is priceless to the school and local residents alike. It also sustains a large amount of wildlife, deer badgers fox's etc.

In conclusion I consider that the site is totally unsuitable for the development proposed, as it was for the two previous applications

3 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 7th July 2020

My objection to the application is that all reasons for the refusal of earlier applications are still valid.

Obviously the impact on a quiet residential area with unsuitable access for heavy increased traffic is my major concern. However the proposed site is valuable green belt land and should remain so.

We can only trust that the Planning Committee will make the right decision and refuse to give consent.

33 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 19th May 2020

My comments on the above proposal are as follows:

I object to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. this is an unspoilt area which is a home to wildlife and ancient oak trees.
2. access to the site is difficult and limited by only one access road.
3. extra traffic will add to the problem.

37 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 6th June 2020

I would like to submit my objection to the proposed development on land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

I strongly object to the 43 dwellings proposed for this site. I don't believe the immediate local infrastructure is sufficient to cope with the vehicles and services associated with the number of people who would reside there. The local access roads are narrow and further narrowed by parked cars. With increased traffic to the new dwellings (and it would increase, very few journeys would take place on foot or by bike given how steep and far they would be from main roads, schools, offices, doctors etc they would be) the roads would be even more dangerous. The local schools and doctors surgeries would very likely struggle to take on further people. The drainage that the new dwellings would add onto would very likely be overwhelmed too. It would also be a very sad loss of green space that supports a range of wild birds and animals with its mature trees and grassland.

38 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 31st May 2020

We would like to object strongly to this outline application for 43 dwellings on land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise. Two previous applications by the same developer were rejected by CBC and the second one was further rejected by the Planning Inspector under appeal. This current application raises the same issues as the previous applications and therefore should not even be considered.

At minimum we request that this application is considered by the Planning Committee, when it is able to meet, as opposed to by the Planning Officers, who previously have been (correctly) overruled by the committee and the inspector.

The new application for 43 dwellings is still well in excess of the 25 recommended in the Cheltenham Plan. The main issues are:

ACCESS - Oakhurst Rise is too narrow and too steep to accommodate traffic for such a development;

TRAFFIC - local roads are already overloaded, extra traffic would cause significant problems, and local public transport is inadequate;

INFRASTRUCTURE - local facilities (doctors/schools/etc) are already oversubscribed and could not cope with an additional development;

FLOODING - this has been a major issue in the area. Further loss of green space to hard surfaces is going to increase the problem on this steeply sloping clay ground with natural springs and ponds;

ENVIRONMENT - the application involves the loss of ancient and veteran trees. It will also destroy the unique biodiversity on the site which currently supports a wide variety of flora and fauna;

HERITAGE - the proposed development will have a negative impact on the Grade II listed Ashley House and Charlton Manor.

The facile conclusion of the Heritage report provided by the developers suggests that the benefits outweigh the disadvantages but fails to mention any benefit!

VISUAL IMPACT - the development will not only have a negative impact on many nearby properties but also on the wider local views. Inexplicably the tallest buildings have been positioned on the highest part of the site where they will be most obtrusive from all aspects.

CONCLUSION - this application fails to meet many of the principles set out in the CBC local plan as well as principles in the Charlton Kings parish council plan and should therefore be rejected.

40 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 8th June 2020

We are strongly opposed to the current planning application to build the houses near St Edwards. I feel that this would cause far too many problems to the nearby community. The additional houses will cause extra unwanted traffic and noise.

I trust you will take my objections seriously.

39 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 29th May 2020

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

There have been repeated issues with the drainage and sewerage system leading down from the houses higher up, which have required Severn Trent to come and carry out emergency work involving diggers, pneumatic drills, etc in my back garden late into the evening, in their attempts to unblock and free up the current drainage system. It is becoming evident to me that the present system is already struggling to cope with our existing waste, so when I heard that there are now plans to link up a proposed fourty three new properties to the existing drainage system in the close, I was incredulous. There is NO WAY the drainage system in Charlton Court Road can handle such a large scale increase in waste and it would lead to much disruption, distress and not least, be a health hazard.

There is also the major issue of the blocked drains at the very bottom of the road, which during periods of increasingly excessive rainfall, have overflowed and had to be repeatedly pumped to deal with the back log of waste from our steep road up above. With increasing rainfall due to climate change becoming a reality of our times, expecting our existing drains to cope with even

more run off and waste from an entire new housing estate, is naive at best. The existing system quite simply was not ever designed for such a potentially heavy load.

In addition to the existing issues of inappropriate road access via Oakhurst Rise, damaging the existing ecology of the site and the interfering with the balance of an already high water table, I sincerely hope the Committee gives this issue of drainage into Charlton Court Road, some very serious consideration. What I have described above is the reality of the current drainage system. It would surely be an insanity to increase the load upon it and by such a massive degree. Thank you for reading and registering this objection.

7 St Judes Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7RU

Comments: 17th May 2020

The River Chelt and Lilley Brook are both subject to flooding from heavy rain prior to entering Cox's Meadow and any reduction in green areas that absorb water upstream from my property must increase the risk of future flooding. Therefore, I object to this development proposal.

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

Comments: 15th May 2020

This development proposal is similar to previously rejected ones 17/00710/OUT which was for 90 dwellings and 18/02171/OUT for 69 dwellings This proposal is for 43 dwellings which is a reduction of merely 26 dwellings and the objections I raised for the previous two applications still stand. As someone who would be adversely affected by the extra traffic caused I strongly object to this plan. I will concentrate on some of the main objections:

(1) Contrary to Cheltenham Plan

The new "Cheltenham Plan Pre-Submission Version (Regulation 19) February 2018" states under policy HD4 that the site for land off Oakhurst Drive would only be suitable for 25 dwellings.(Page 62) The proposed development represents 172 % of the Cheltenham Plan number.

https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/file/6532/sd001_-_cheltenham_plan_pre-submission_reg_19

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

The small reduction in the number of proposed homes does little to change the fact that given 1 to 2 cars per family there will be significant extra traffic along the narrow and steep residential approach roads. Indeed HD4 of the Cheltenham Plan makes reference to the "Steep gradients across the site", which are also a feature in the access roads to the site.

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

It is absurd to suggest that most residents would go on foot or use public transport to get to Six Ways, because of the gradients (especially on the return journey carrying heavy shopping up Beaufort Road). The only bus going past Oakhurst Rise (bus P - Pulhams) passes at 08.55,

11.55 and 14.55 during the weekday (<https://bustimes.org/services/p-cheltenham-little-cleeve-mount-ewens-farm-charlton>), so it is unlikely that anyone "popping out" to Sixways for a pint of milk would wait 2 hours to come back - clearly most would take a car.

Section 5.17 of the developer's Transport Assessment April 2020 specifies there will be 86 car parking spaces in the development.

In the developer's Residential Travel Plan. Table 4.1 in section 4.9 it clearly shows that the developers consider there will be 255 extra trips to and from the site in a single day. There is just one road that allows cars to enter Oakhurst Rise and just two ways to exit from Oakhurst Rise, so the residents of the surrounding roads can expect a substantial increase in the number of cars going up and down their roads.

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

It should be noted that the developers do not propose an alternative access to the proposed development via the grounds of St Edmund's school.

(3) Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Drawing SK07 in appendix G of the developer's Transport Assessment April 2020 clearly shows the comparative size of the site compared to the nearby Ewens Farm Estate. It covers around the same area as that bounded by Beaufort Road, Oak Avenue, Churchill Drive and Ewens Road - an area which includes a high percentage of social housing with young families, who will suffer from the additional traffic.

The application site is located in an elevated position above the town, outside of, but in close proximity to, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The scale of the proposed development in this tranquil location would have a negative impact on existing landscape character, and on views into and out of the AONB.

(4) Proposed housing density

According to the Battledown Estate site <http://www.battledown.co.uk/covenant.asp>, in the Deed of Covenants and Regulations, number 5 states "No person is to build on the Original Lots of Estate land more houses than in proportion of one house to each half acre of land". This Estate is adjacent to the site and the proposed density of the site (shown in the Design and Access Statement) is 11 units per hectare (2.47 acres) which equates to 2.225 units per half acre of land. This is double the allowed adjacent density of 1 unit per half acre of land. The developer also states that the area to the west of the site has a similar density to the rest of the town, which I would also dispute, because the estate was laid out in the 1950s with substantial green shared areas and gardens. It does not exhibit the same housing density as other areas below the estate.

I urge you not to grant planning permission and to also withdraw this land from policy HD4 in the Cheltenham Plan under consideration, so that we are not plagued with constant revisions of this ill-thought development.

9 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 6th June 2020

In reference to the above we would like to raise our concerns and register our objection to any proposed development on the Oakhurst Rise site.

At this stage, we feel the need to mention the below points;

The historical difficulty in getting insurance for living on what the insurance companies consider to be a flood plain already.

Any further house development efforts will exasperbate the issue and likihood of flooding at the bottom of the road, as the ability of the land to soak up and dissipate the water will be compromised.

The additional traffic volume and vehicle space would place further strain on Charlton Court road.

The increased burden on the social structure with the area. Specifically the schools and doctor surgery.

We hope once again the council will decline the application,

12 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 5th June 2020

I strongly object. My objections remain the same as stated on previous applications. The current plan for 43 dwellings does not change anything. The negative impact on the local area regarding transport, communications, accessibility, flood risk, etc. is immense. However, most important of all is that this area is a key wildlife and nature reserve. We must preserve and protect our biodiversity and this wonderful habitat is a perfect example. Surely, the importance of this has been more than demonstrated within the current situation we find ourselves of the coronavirus pandemic.

Tall Timbers
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NS

Comments: 6th May 2020

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

- 1) Unsuitable access and increased traffic: the roads surround ewens farm and oakhurst are already crowded and dangerous hence the 20mph speed limit. A higher volume of traffic through this area is not suitable or safe especially for the high number of cyclists and children who use the route to get to the local schools. Oakhurst rise gradient is not safe for increased traffic.
- 2) The damage to environment. The area proposed for development is a large field which homes lots of wildlife including newts, bats and badgers and also contains protected trees.
- 3) The increase in flood risk. As a local resident we were affected by the local flooding in Cheltenham. The field holds a huge quantity of water when there is heavy rain and helps reduce this risk of further flooding.

Fremington
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NS

Comments: 23rd May 2020

We would like to object strongly to this outline application for 43 dwellings on land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise. Two previous applications by the same developer were rejected by CBC and the second one was further rejected by the Planning Inspector under appeal. This current application raises the same issues as the previous applications and therefore should not even be considered.

At minimum we request that this application is considered by the Planning Committee, when it is able to meet, as opposed to by the Planning Officers, who previously have been (correctly) over-ruled by the committee and the inspector.

The new application for 43 dwellings is still well in excess of the 25 recommended in the Cheltenham Plan. The main issues are:

ACCESS - Oakhurst Rise is too narrow and too steep to accommodate traffic for such a development;

TRAFFIC - local roads are already overloaded, extra traffic would cause significant problems, and local public transport is inadequate;

INFRASTRUCTURE - local facilities (doctors/schools/etc) are already oversubscribed and could not cope with an additional development;

FLOODING - this has been a major issue in the area. Further loss of green space to hard surfaces is going to increase the problem on this steeply sloping clay ground with natural springs and ponds;

ENVIRONMENT - the application involves the loss of ancient and veteran trees. It will also destroy the unique biodiversity on the site which currently supports a wide variety of flora and fauna;

HERITAGE - the proposed development will have a negative impact on the Grade II listed Ashley House and Charlton Manor.

The facile conclusion of the Heritage report provided by the developers suggests that the benefits outweigh the disadvantages but fails to mention any benefit!

VISUAL IMPACT - the development will not only have a negative impact on many nearby properties but also on the wider local views. Inexplicably the tallest buildings have been positioned on the highest part of the site where they will be most obtrusive from all aspects.

CONCLUSION - this application fails to meet many of the principles set out in the CBC local plan as well as principles in the Charlton Kings parish council plan and should therefore be rejected.

Charlton Manor
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NS

Comments: 6th June 2020

All previous objections points apply and are captured in full in other impassioned and expert residents' views.

Please make the inspector's commentary available to the planning committee in full.

How we can be here again, only 6 months after a dismissed appeal, is unfathomable. Almost none of the points raised at that appeal have been more than superficially addressed, other than moving back the boundary of the notional build (but with no management strategy for the resultant "fallow space" which will become a dumping ground for fly tippers, a short cut for criminals into back gardens not protected or designed to be secured from access in that direction; what it won't be is the beautiful wildflower meadow that is already in situ.)

A range of areas of concern such as flooding and spring water handling have been erased, presumably due to a tick box approach to the appeal findings - that isn't adequate and needs additional scrutiny.

This series of applications have been the opposite of community engagement and good master planning - the civic society comments encapsulate residents' sentiments concisely.

Please can this entire process be audited to ensure nothing similar can happen again and lessons are identified and processes changed?

Savoy House
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NS

Comments: 2nd July 2020

I write to object to the renewed attempt for planning at Oakhurst Rise.

The natural beauty retained within this domain is special and there should be consideration for retaining the space and habitat that already exists here in its natural environment.

The pursuance to build homes that are clearly for the pursuit of monetary gain is clear, seeing access to this development would be extremely difficult and only add unnecessary congestion to an area which has thrived on its peaceful nature since one can remember

Meadow View
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 22nd May 2020

As a property owner of Meadow View, Birchley Road, my property forms part of the northern boundary of the proposed development site. I have been fundamentally opposed to the proposed developments since they were introduced in 2017. I am also aware that there have been numerous previous applications over the years, which have all been rejected. It is inconceivable to see why 2020 is the correct time to reverse all the past judgements of history.

I have responded to all of the previous applications that have been rejected by Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Committee. This includes 17/00710/OUT, 18/02171/OUT and the response to the Cheltenham Plan 2011 to 2031, where the site is classified as HD4. Plus, the

recent appeal. In fact, there have been so many changes to this application since it was first proposed in January 2017, it is difficult to understand exactly what the developer is really trying to achieve, other than maximization of profit with disregards to environmental protection and ignoring local community feedback. From my perspective, the developer strategy seems to include: -

- Have extremely poor engagement with the local stakeholders including the local community
- Totally ignore stakeholder engagement and responses, fail to respond to the knowledge of the local community who live in the area and understand the complex issues associated with this site
- Use of arrogant, high profile "out of town" consultants who deliberately fail to engage with the local community and are not prepared to see their analysis challenged
- Wear down the spirit of the stakeholders, to the point at which they so confused as to the process being followed that they fail to object to the latest version of this badly conceived project
- Throw in multiple applications, with each one being a slightly "watered down" version of the last
- Previously we have seen "developer tactics" such as the Wheatcroft principle, proposing the use of independent lawyers to act as a quasi-public response forum.

In general, the whole process has been deeply frustrating, though I applaud the action taken by the Cheltenham Planning Committee, who have on two occasions strongly rejected the advice of the Cheltenham Planning Officer, who had recommended that both 17/00710/OUT and 18/02171/OUT should be permitted. Plus, the view of the inspector who in 2019 rejected the appeal. I would hope that the same Cheltenham Planning Committee will reject this application as well.

I have read the latest documents in detail and all of the comments, I strongly object to the proposed development and a I note the following: -

1. The stakeholder engagement for this process by the developer has been non-existent. At least in 2017, there was an initial public exhibition, however responses from the developer team were fundamentally arrogant and unhelpful. Subsequently there has been no effort to engage with the local community, other than some bizarre threats around trespassing, car parking etc. Irrespective of the merits of any application, if any developer does not follow NPPF, he should not be allowed to ignore the principles of community stakeholder engagement, just to save money and force through his proposed development. On this issue alone the appeal should be rejected.

2. The new layout of the site is of great concern. In the design and access statement by Coombes:Everitt, they discuss the site in great detail. However, it is absurd that they have placed the tallest houses on the very highest part of the site. These are house types Painswick and Highbury on Road 4, with a height to the ridge of 9.7m. The highest part of the site is on the northern boundary of the site, exactly where these houses are located. These houses can best be described as tall town houses on 3 floors or 2 ½ story in "developer speak". This will make the proposed development extremely obtrusive and visible from all over the area. It is astonishing that Coombes:Everitt who did a detailed topographical survey for 18/02171/OUT, did not recognize this issue when they re-designed the layout for this latest application. It questions their competence and professionalism. On this issue alone the appeal should be rejected.

3. At the very start of the first application in 2017, I believed that a major failure with the application was the lack of a secondary access for a site of what was going to be 100 homes, later 69 and now 43. The access point chosen, Oakhurst Rise is totally inadequate for the purpose, being both a current narrow residential cul-de-sac and with extremely steep gradients. A great deal has been said about the access, however any inspection by any "normal person" would conclude that the access pint is fundamentally dangerous and inadequate. Clearly if the appellant is finally allowed to construct, we will be tacitly agreeing to numerous road traffic accidents in the future. The appellant could have obtained a secondary access, and this was a

key point raised in the refusal of 17/00710/OUT. However, he failed to address this issue in 20/00683/OUT, presumably as a money saving issue. On this issue alone the application should be rejected.

4. As a property owner on Battledown, I am aware of the clay nature of the site and the operation of numerous natural springs on site and complex drainage patterns. As an example, just over the boundary of my property there is a medium size natural pond. This has been listed on maps for hundreds of years, though the developer does not even recognize this. In the latest application the ecologist again describes it as an ephemeral pond. Having owned Meadow View for over 10 years, I can assure you that the pond level does vary and will dry out during dry summer periods, however for most of the year it is wet and a source of life and used for birds and animals to drink. I do not know how this pond works, we do know there are springs in the area and the level increases rapidly after rainfall, hence there must be significant drainage entering the pond. There is no mention in the planning documentation as to what is proposed for this pond. It does not feature in the drainage plans. At present it appears to be ignored, not featuring on any of the site layouts. However, it does appear in Aspect Ecology's map 5487/ECO3. Of great concern is in 5487/ECO4, it has disappeared entirely. I presume it will be filled in, causing flood risk to properties to the north on higher ground, forming part of the Battledown Estate. If it is not filled in, it will of course be a health and safety concerns and a flood risk to properties below. This type of lack of attention to detail has been typical of the developer. Aspect Ecology, an Oxfordshire based, national consultant to property developers, has made no effort to discuss the function of the pond with the local community, but happy to carry out desk top assessments and produce misleading and biased reports. Again, this is a poor example of the arrogance and disregard shown by the developer to this project and the local community. I assume there are multiple issues like this on the proposed development and again I would state that on this issue alone the appeal should be rejected.

There are numerous examples that I could cite of poor design, incorrect analysis, ignoring difficult issues, twisted data, lack of community engagement and so on. The process has been extremely time consuming and expensive for those wishing to object, when up against the almost limitless funds of the developer. Surely this is the time to say a firm "no" to this development and hopefully secure approval for this site to be designated a Local Green Space for the benefit of future generations.

I trust the Planning Committee will listen to the community wishes, the previous judgement of the appeal and not just be "brow beaten" by the power of a wealthy developer, with his army of "experts" and their Carmelite partners.

Newlands
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 23rd May 2020

Reference: Application 20/00683/OUT

I strongly object the application for 43 dwellings on land adjacent with single access from Oakhurst Rise.

This application follows a subsequent application which was refused by the Appeal Inspector B.J.Sims on 20th September 2019 for development submitted under 18/02171/OUT made by the same applicants. The following application was also refused by the Borough Council for planning application 17/00710/OUT, submitted by the same developers.

Local plan

As per the JCS and local plan, the proposed development at this level is significantly beyond what the local plan targets on this site, therefore confirming that a development of this size is not required.

Access

At the last planning enquiry, a paper was presented and is now public record, of the deficiencies in the proposed site access. The original approval was from the Highway's authority based at Tewksbury, who admitted that it had been done without even a site visit. The access to the site is inadequate to support the increase volume of road traffic that would be generated by so many houses in such a location. Access to the site remains a key issue and is yet to be resolved.

Traffic

The transport assessments in the application are inaccurate. The number of cars that would inevitably be used to access the site means considerably more car journeys will be generated than suggested, and Oakhurst Rise is not a suitable access road to support that. In addition to the access concerns, the current traffic issues on the busy London Road and Hales road intersections would be stressed further. The area cannot handle an increase in traffic.

Flooding

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

Loss of natural habitat and ecology

The loss of valuable biodiverse habitat for wildlife is a major issue, both in conservation terms and for residential amenity. A great variety of flora and fauna is thriving in this field. There is an established badger set and many buzzards, red kits and owls are seen frequently in and around the ancient hedge line surrounding the area.

Local infrastructure

The local infrastructure including schools and doctors' surgeries in particular, do not have the capacity to support the additional pressure an application like this will create.

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

Glenwhittan
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 21st May 2020

I write to object to the above planning application, on the grounds of the serious damage it would cause to part of a unique landscape - the Cotswold escarpment; in line with comments submitted on 20th March 2017 to the Cheltenham Plan (part one) Public Consultation; and for other reasons, relating to environment and wildlife habitat and also in respect of the proposed access.

Landscape

The first objection is that the application would allow damaging development and construction work on high ground forming part of the Cotswold escarpment. Ground contour levels for the site rise from about 100m AOD at the south end of the site, to about 125m adjacent the rear of Birchley Road properties, on the north side of the site; whereas almost all major development in Cheltenham over the last 100 years or so has been limited to ground levels of about 105 - 110m AOD. The site is not a non-descript field in Gloucestershire: it is part of the Cotswold escarpment. As proposed in the comment for the Cheltenham Plan: Public Consultation, there should be no development on ground above 110m, in order to protect the escarpment; which, from south of Gloucester to the north of Cheltenham (past Prestbury, Bishops Cleeve, Woodmancote, Oxenton, Teddington), remains a largely undeveloped, unspoiled landscape of great natural beauty.

The only major development on the east side of Cheltenham is Battledown, which was planned and laid out about 150 years ago; with the significant requirement that every property should be sited on an half acre plot. This allowed most of the properties built to be planted with major trees, so that it is now visually a green tree-covered landscape with many properties part hidden when looking from the west (Gloucester, Staverton, Churchdown, Tewkesbury) eastwards. The properties proposed for the Oakhurst Rise development are generally on plots of limited size, which will not allow the planting of large trees (because of the disruptive effect they would have on the properties themselves).

In this sense, the proposed development, with houses on ground rising to about 125m, is as undesirable and damaging to the landscape as development of the middle slopes of any hills, escarpment or coastline would be. It would also set a terrible precedent for higher level development of the south side of the existing village of Charlton Kings, below Daisybank Road. Regarding levels, a limit of 110m would approximately match the extent of recent development on the south side of Charlton Kings: there is a spot level of 109m at the top of Sandy Lane, near Southfield Manor. Adjacent the Oakhurst Rise site, the ground level round the highest of the school buildings is about 108m.

Environment and Wildlife

This problem with the proposed development is compounded by the planned removal of parts of a major old hedgerow, which has developed over the last century at least into an area of wild woodland, which extends to an area of about 4,000m², about 1 acre. As a consequence of its age and size, and its continuity from the north to the south of the site, across ground levels from about 125m to about 100m, at present it shelters, and provides a wildlife corridor for foxes, deer, bats, birds, especially owls and wood-peckers, a wide variety of small mammals and reptiles (newts, snakes and slowworms), and butterflies and insects: some of which wildlife is rarely seen elsewhere, or is documented as rare. It is proposed that the section between about contour levels 115 and 120 would be removed to make way for the access road and housing. This would destroy the wildlife corridor.

Near the north end of this woodland area there is a very large veteran oak tree (tree T8 on the original tree survey, with a girth of about 5.5m). This tree requires at least the detailed protection measures set out in BS 5837 (Trees in relation to construction) including a construction exclusion zone; (as required in cl. 3.1.2: to be established "before works commence on site (which) is essential as the only way to prevent damage being caused to retained trees by operations in their vicinity"; (such 'damaging operations' to be prevented would include any construction or arboricultural works within the exclusion zone).

There is a second small wild wooded area about 30m to the east, about 600m² in area, on high ground (levels about 121 - 124m) on the north side of an existing large badger sett. It is proposed that this is to be removed entirely, including the badgers.

There is really no planning or intellectual argument to justify destruction of wild woodland, in the absence of confidence in the developer's willingness and determination to protect important features of the existing environment as they are now. The developer's justification is that many of the individual trees to be removed are not of specimen value, not being individually planted and nurtured, i.e. being wild; overlooking the fact of the unbroken length and size of the woodland area, that can be seen for miles around. Over at least the last century this woodland has become home to wildlife, and a wildlife corridor in a natural environment without any human interference: the adjoining meadows are mown once a year, about a day's work with a tractor.

The objection to the Developer's proposals, in relation to existing mature areas of trees forming woodland, is supported by another recommendation of BS 5837: Trees in relation to construction: cl. 4.2.4: "Trees forming groups and areas of woodland (including orchards, wood pasture and historic parkland) should be identified and considered as groups particularly if they contain a variety of species and age classes that could aid long term management. It may be appropriate to assess the quality and value of such groups of trees as a whole, rather than as individuals." That recommendation is reinforced strongly when the area of woodland is also home to a wide variety of species of wildlife, as in this case.

Furthermore the Office for National Statistics is now mapping and valuing environmental assets as part of a government project to 'improve understanding of our natural capital': (Report: The Times: July 23rd, 2019); which continues: 'It estimated the worth of Britain's green spaces...in terms of carbon sequestration (the ability of vegetation, especially trees, to absorb carbon dioxide), the removal of air pollution from the atmosphere, and recreation. Valuing natural capital has become a critical issue because, without a price, markets automatically treat the environment as worthless. Costing natural services helps to correct that mistake and improve decision-making.'

Though the main reasons for objections on these grounds, (and therefore for rejection of the application), are first, preservation of irreplaceable landscape and wildlife undisturbed, and second, retention of woods and trees as by far the best method of carbon sequestration currently and definitely available, (all within a thriving community); the retention of natural habitat and ecology is also of great value, especially when available to a school, and through the school to other young people.

Finally, a recent 'Nature Notebook' from The Times (March 2019) reports the typical decline in abundance of wildlife resulting from tidy and managed development in an English county:

"Visiting my father, who still lives in the village where I grew up, I was struck by how busy the roads were, how tidy and managed it seemed compared with the rambling, slightly ramshackle place I remember - and how little space was left for the natural world. Everything that wasn't built on was trimmed and pruned, every green glimpsed was a monoculture paddock or tightly manicured golf course, the tangled woods I once played in tidied and fenced off for paintball. It looked pretty and prosperous, but as money poured in to create this the wildlife was quietly forced out.

In the past thirty years 11.5% of the county's plants, birds, invertebrates, fish, reptiles, amphibians and mammals have become locally extinct, a far higher figure than the national rate of 2%. A further 4.4% are threatened with extinction. There's no agribusiness or heavy industry to blame; ... but the area ranks in the top 25% of England's most densely populated counties Nature needs untidiness to flourish; it must be allowed to be self-willed, not made to look like something from a glossy magazine. 'O let them be left, wildness and wet; Long live the weeds and the wilderness yet.'

If development goes ahead there will be ecological surveys, and 'biodiversity offsetting' should be put in place, which can mean little more than planting non-native saplings in place of mature native trees. But some site-faithful birds such as sparrows (which are in decline) rarely move

more than a kilometre from their place of birth; the loss of suitable breeding habitat for a couple of seasons can wipe out a small colony. This is how we lose our wildlife: bit by bit."

Access to site and Transport

The road proposed for access to the site, Oakhurst Rise (OR), is seriously inadequate in several ways. The road design standards required for the access road are set out in at least two relevant documents:

Glos. C. C.: 'Highway requirements for development' (GCC:HRD)

Vehicular Access Standards: Development Control Advice Note 15, 2nd edition; produced by the Planning service, an Agency within the Department of the Environment. (The purpose of this Advice Note is to give general guidance to intending developers, their professional advisors and agents on the standards for vehicular access.) (VAS)

In addition, the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 are relevant to all aspects of the proposed development; particularly Regulation 27 Traffic routes. (CDM Regs)

- The road gradients (of OR) are too steep: almost 15% gradient for the upper length leading to the site entrance; about 13.5% for the lower length joining Beaufort Road (BR): both far in excess of the standards: GCC:HRD gives 8%, VAS gives 10% but with one important qualification. The consequence is that, at those gradients, the access road will be unusable by many vehicles after snowfalls, and will be hazardous in icy conditions; with a potential risk of accidents at the junctions, because of cars and lorries failing to stop in time, or sliding into or across the two T-junctions, one at the bottom of the upper slope opposite 17 OR, and the other being the BR/OR junction which is extremely critical, because of the potential volume of traffic. At the BR/OR junction in particular the gradient of the lower length of OR (about 13.5%) continues until close to the junction without a reasonable 'dwell' area of level or reduced gradient length of carriageway in OR to assist vehicles having difficulty in stopping. In view of this potential hazard, the VAS requirements are that 'the gradient of the access shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary' and 'The remainder of the access should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather'; but it is impossible to achieve anything even close to this: see VAS cl. 10.3.

- The width of the access road (OR: 5.5m) is too narrow: VAS requires 6.0m for a two-way access; and in addition, because the road is narrow, the entry radius for the turn from ER into OR is tight without straying into the opposite (downhill) carriageway. This is important because of the proposed shared use by OR residents and construction traffic.

- The OR pavement widths (1.7-1.8m) are rather narrow: GCC:HRD requires 2.0m.

In summary OR does not comply with requirements for an access road to serve 67 dwellings, instead of the 24 it serves at present; i.e. as well as not meeting standards given by the documents noted, there would be a very high intensification of use.

Beside the unsuitability of OR as the access road to the site, the assessment of the effect of the development on the local roads immediately affected is flawed because there would be a substantial increase in traffic on the two roads leading away from OR: Ewens and Beaufort Roads (ER/BR):

- Current dwellings: Ewens Road 19
Pine Close, OR 43
Beaufort Road 41

- i.e. the total number of dwellings: 103 at present, would increase to 146.

- Therefore there would be a substantial increase in traffic on Ewens and Beaufort Roads leading away from OR: whereas on-street parking on these roads and Haywards Road (the next affected road for traffic towards Cheltenham) was described as 'sporadic': definition 'occurring only here

and there, separate, scattered'; the street parking is nearer constant and widespread than sporadic, and already severely restricts vehicle movements on these roads, and on Oak Avenue.

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

- In discussing overall design concepts the GCC:HRD recommended: 'The creation of large cul-de-sac estate layouts, where a large number of houses rely on one access road, and pedestrian access is similarly restricted, must be avoided'.

In summary, the traffic generated by the development would feed into local residential roads which are also steep, narrow and already congested by traffic and on-street parking.

The CDM Regulations are relevant in particular because of the very significant variation of the actual parameters of the access road (OR) from reasonable road parameters (particularly gradients) recommended in the appropriate standards (VAS or GCC:HRD). As an example, the OR gradient up to the junction with Beaufort Road is about 13.5%, whereas the VAS standard requires that: 'the gradient shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary The remainder should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather.' That discrepancy, by such a large margin between actual gradient and DOE recommended values and the absence of a dwell area, implies a potentially serious hazard, with the associated risk certainly including a traffic accident or one involving a vehicle with a pedestrian or cyclist.

Under the Regulations, it is one or more of the CDM dutyholders (the Client, the Principal Designer and other designers, and the Principal Contractor) who are responsible, when preparing or modifying designs for the project or development as a whole, for identifying, eliminating or controlling foreseeable risks, by following the general principles of prevention set out in the Regulations. That process (a fundamental part of the project design) should have been started before the first planning application was made. In persisting with what appears to be a completely inappropriate access to the site, there appears to be a failure to comply with the CDM Regulations, which are statutory provisions; in which case, the present Application should be rejected on these grounds alone.

29 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 18th May 2020

I object to the above application.

This latest application for 43 dwellings follows on from two other rejected applications since 2017 from the same developers, with the last one rejected on appeal. A previous planning application on the same site was rejected in 1984.

Access and Traffic: the sole access road is unsuitable. Oakhurst Rise is narrow, bendy, and very steep. In winter it is often impassable and many cars on the road are left stranded when snow falls or ice forms. The road is not gritted by the council. The increase in traffic will have a detrimental effect on our amenity with the noise and pollution. Residents of the new development would be very likely to use a car to leave the estate to access local amenities at Sixways due to the distance and steepness of the road. Most of the residents of Oakhurst Rise use their cars even for short trips due to the steep gradient. The inevitable traffic increase in the local Ewens Farm estate would make what is already a busy rat-run even more unpleasant for the residents.

Visual Impact: the design and layout of the dwellings is disappointing and not at all imaginative. If houses do have to be built on this meadow, could they not have been designed to blend in, be eco-friendly and show some sympathy for the surroundings? Green roofs would reduce the visual and flooding impact. The visual impact on the view from Leckhampton Hill should not be underestimated and there will be an obvious loss of a large chunk of green land at that contour, which is currently predominantly green up to the top of Cleeve Hill. Developing this land would set a precedent for covering all of the hillsides around Cheltenham with buildings.

Amenity: we live at the top of Oakhurst Rise, and we chose to live here because it is a cul-de-sac, with all the benefits of privacy, lack of pollution and peace and quiet that we are lucky enough to enjoy now. This would all go if this development went ahead.

Flooding: Devastating "once in a hundred years" flooding took place again this winter. This is clearly going to happen again and paving over a large tract of this field will exacerbate the problem. Whatever the developers do, they will not catch all the extra water run-off. We have seen the effects of this first hand as there is a spring in our garden that spouts water a few days after heavy rainfall, showing how the land above us soaks up the water like a giant sponge and releases it slowly rather than in a torrent. We are also concerned about the flooding threat caused by the construction work; some years ago, our neighbour experienced a flood threat to his property caused by run-off from a small house construction site nearby in Battledown. The entire site is on deep, solid clay.

Ecology: There are keen amateur naturalists living in the neighborhood, and we have observed a great variety of flora and fauna on this field through the seasons. Whilst the latest iteration of the plans is a vast improvement on the 2 previous recent applications, it is disappointing to read the dismissive report on biodiversity in this application. It is clearly wide of the mark. No mention for example of the Red Kites and Buzzards seen frequently hunting over the field, or the noisy Tawny Owls in the hedge line near Oakhurst Rise. The surviving fauna will be confined, left to forage in relatively small areas and will quickly come into conflict with new house owners. The term "no special conservation status" seems to be used to justify ignoring much of the resident wildlife. Presumably, those ignored species will eventually move on to the "red list" of endangered species as their habitats are removed by developments such as this one?

Trees

Ash trees are under threat from Ash die-back, and the Woodland Trust now want to conserve the type of Ash tree located in habitat found commonly on this site. The Ash trees that are threatened by this development could survive the disease and help to protect the future of this iconic species.

Badgers

There is a large, long established, and active badger sett on the site. The colourful ecology map makes no mention of it, and in the text, it states that "legitimate parties only" can see the appendix 5487/3 relating to the badgers. The previous plan to re-locate the sett to the southern boundary seems to have been abandoned and St. Edward's School have created a farm in the area previously designated for a re-located sett. If they are to be left where they are, the badgers will be confined to a tiny, totally inadequate foraging area surrounded by housing. The foundations of the nearby houses are likely to need piling; it is illegal to do such work within 100m of an active badger sett.

Affordable housing

The small amount of "affordable" housing on the plan may or may not appear as this is an outline planning application only. If it does materialise, it will be very expensive if the "20% below market value" approach is used. It does not seem at all suitable as a site for affordable housing.

I strongly urge the planning committee to once again reject this application to develop this special piece of land and preserve it as part of Cheltenham's carbon-neutral strategy.

27 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 22nd May 2020

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

1. If this development is allowed to proceed, how would the developers ensure the prevention of mud being carried onto the highway? My wife attends the local day centre, three days each week. It would only take one instance of a dangerously muddy road for the day centre to refuse to transport my wife on health and safety grounds - the danger of transporting a wheelchair across a steep / muddy road.

I am sure the developers already have extensive documentation covering this but what would be their position when it fails (as it will) and my wife is denied access to the day centre? I am equally sure they will be very apologetic but this will be of no use to my wife and her loss of amenity and mental health.

2. Building on this land at the top of a hill will lead to more flash floods of the River Chelt and the brooks/streams that feed into it. One small pond will not catch all of the water previously absorbed by 10 acres of green fields and dozens of oak trees. Please take time to read the Consultee document written by the Cheltenham Flood and Drainage Panel which highlights the serious shortcomings and omissions of the FRA for this application.

3. The proposed access via Oakhurst Rise would have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network, and the amenity of local residents. The volume of traffic from the proposed development would overwhelm the existing infrastructure of the estate. All of the roads feeding Oakhurst Rise are narrow and congested with on-road parking. The existing traffic flow throughout the estate is already chaotic and dangerous at the best of times.

Oakhurst Rise is a small, narrow and steep cul-de-sac with a blind junction leading into Ewen's Road. Oakhurst Rise is inaccessible in snow and residents resort to parking their cars further down the hill. How will the extra 86+ cars cope with snow/ice? And how will emergency vehicles access the development in snow?

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

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

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

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

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

>>>The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act came into force on 1st Oct 2006.

6. The application site is located in an elevated position above the town, outside of, but in close proximity to, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The scale of the proposed development in this tranquil location would have a negative impact on existing landscape character, and on views into and out of the AONB.

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

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

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

25 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 21st May 2020

I object to the new updated planning application 20/00683/OUT, on safety concerns and as previous subjects listed below, which are the same as prior applications.

1. Increased traffic on the Ewans Estate, which is already at a critical stage during certain times of the day, and especially on Ewans Road and Beaufort Road, the proposed 43 dwellings which will mean, in the real world (2 cars a dwelling, forget Highways statement of 1.3 cars) 86 vehicles, which could mean 172 extra movements a day, minimum, on this already grid locked estate plus delivery vans etc. From my home I may see 4 cars go out in the morning and 4 cars return and maybe 4 delivery vans, now with your proposed development I may have 192 plus go past. This cannot be right. I strongly object and so do my neighbours.
2. It has been mentioned many times by residents and council officers and stated on all previous applications including the Appeal that the approach to this proposed development using Oakhurst Rise whether it's for 25 or 43 dwellings is totally unacceptable. Oakhurst Rise, is a very steep twisted Cul-de-Sac, and due to when the bungalows were built only parking for one car was required, now residents have to park their 2nd car on both sides of this Cul-de-Sac, making it an even narrower one car lane width in places. Refuge vehicles and Emergency vehicles sometimes have difficulty with access.
3. During the severe winter weather, gritting Lorries never try to approach this Cul-de-Sac, only 4x4 vehicles or cars with chains can drive up this steep gradient.

4. Oakhurst Rise junction to Beaufort Road is now a very dangerous blind single lane junction due to parked vehicles on one side.
5. Local services such as the Doctors Surgery and Schools, are already oversubscribed with a long waiting list.
6. Concern as on all previous objections, water drainage and flooding of the field. These were discussed on many occasions, but we were never given a satisfactory answer.
7. The loss of green space, an area of outstanding beauty, with wonderful protected trees, wild life, animals and birds, rare wild flora, and bats, and the deer with their young. It's all part of the rich Cheltenham diverse natural wild life we have to offer. Do we really want to destroy all this?
8. At the last hearing I had to sit through a speech by the Highways representative on why he thought the access was acceptable. If you read my objections and then read all the other objections, not only on this application but previous applications only referring to the access, surely we as objectors cannot all be wrong. I suggest Highways take another look.
9. I strongly recommend planning permission is denied for this development of 43 dwellings.

16 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 22nd May 2020

We vehemently object to the proposed latest building application of the site off Oakhurst Rise. Apart from what seems to be an almost identical application to the last and therefore in our eyes a flagrant waste of public finance, the fundamental flaws in the proposal have not been addressed and remain:

The safety of road users and residents in and around the Oakhurst Rise and Beaufort Roads, an already well documented area of concern in its current state, this development will only exacerbate the traffic and visibility issues. The road gradients of Oakhurst Rise (OR) are too steep: almost 15% gradient for the upper length leading to the site entrance; about 13.5% for the lower length joining Beaufort Road (BR): both far in excess of the standards: GCC:HRD gives 8%, VAS gives 10% but with one important qualification. The consequence is that, at those gradients, the access road will be unusable by many vehicles after snowfalls, and will be hazardous in icy conditions; with a potential risk of accidents at the junctions, because of cars and lorries failing to stop in time, or sliding into or across the two T-junctions, one at the bottom of the upper slope opposite 17 OR, and the other being the BR/OR junction which is extremely critical, because of the potential volume of traffic. At the BR/OR junction in particular the gradient of the lower length of OR (about 13.5%) continues until close to the junction without a reasonable 'dwell' area of level or reduced gradient length of carriageway in OR to assist vehicles having difficulty in stopping. In view of this potential hazard, the VAS requirements are that 'the gradient of the access shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary' and 'The remainder of the access should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather'; but it is impossible to achieve anything even close to this: see VAS cl. 10.3.

o The width of the access road (OR: 5.5m) is too narrow: VAS requires 6.0m for a two-way access; and in addition, because the road is narrow, the entry radius for the turn from ER into OR is tight without straying into the opposite (downhill) carriageway. This is important because of the proposed shared use by OR residents and construction traffic.

o The OR pavement widths (1.7-1.8m) are rather narrow: GCC:HRD requires 2.0m. In summary OR does not comply with requirements for an access road to serve 67 dwellings, instead of the 24 it serves at present; i.e. as well as not meeting standards given by the documents noted, there would be a very high intensification of use.

Beside the unsuitability of OR as the access road to the site, the assessment of the effect of the development on the local roads immediately affected is flawed because there would be a substantial increase in traffic on the two roads leading away from OR: Ewens and Beaufort Roads (ER/BR):

o Current dwellings: Ewens Road 19
Pine Close, OR 43
Beaufort Road 41

o i.e. the total number of dwellings: 103 at present, would increase to 146.

o Therefore there would be a substantial increase in traffic on Ewens and Beaufort Roads leading away from OR: whereas on-street parking on these roads and Haywards Road (the next affected road for traffic towards Cheltenham) was described as 'sporadic': definition 'occurring only here and there, separate, scattered'; the street parking is nearer constant and widespread than sporadic, and already severely restricts vehicle movements on these roads, and on Oak Avenue.

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

o In discussing overall design concepts the GCC:HRD recommended: 'The creation of large cul-de-sac estate layouts, where a large number of houses rely on one access road, and pedestrian access is similarly restricted, must be avoided'.

In summary, the traffic generated by the development would feed into local residential roads which are also steep, narrow and already congested by traffic and on-street parking.

The importance of protecting an abundant and rewarding area of natural beauty for this and future generations of Cheltenham residents. The land proposed for development is resident to deer, bats, badgers, owls, hedgehogs, woodpeckers, buzzards, preserved trees and many more important species. There are only so many times we can say these creatures and spaces are less important than housing needs. No one wants to live in a future metropolis held together with Tarmac.

The development would represent a serious flood risk to the proposed new residents and the existing residents in the adjoining area. It takes a day of heavy rainfall for the fields to become waterlogged. The current ecology retains the water within minimum run-off but in my belief that this development will destroy what has been a fine balance between residential infrastructure and nature.

Comments: 17th June 2020

Please accept this email as notice of our vehement objection to the proposed and latest building application (20/00683/OUT) of the site off Oakhurst Rise. Apart from what seems to be an almost identical application to the last and therefore in our eyes a flagrant waste of public finance, the fundamental flaws in the proposal have not been addressed and remain:

The safety of road users and residents in and around the Oakhurst Rise and Beaufort Roads, an already well documented area of concern in its current state, this development will only exacerbate the traffic and visibility issues. The road gradients of Oakhurst Rise (OR) are too steep: almost 15% gradient for the upper length leading to the site entrance; about 13.5% for the lower length joining Beaufort Road (BR): both far in excess of the standards: GCC:HRD gives

8%, VAS gives 10% but with one important qualification. The consequence is that, at those gradients, the access road will be unusable by many vehicles after snowfalls, and will be hazardous in icy conditions; with a potential risk of accidents at the junctions, because of cars and lorries failing to stop in time, or sliding into or across the two T-junctions, one at the bottom of the upper slope opposite 17 OR, and the other being the BR/OR junction which is extremely critical, because of the potential volume of traffic. At the BR/OR junction in particular the gradient of the lower length of OR (about 13.5%) continues until close to the junction without a reasonable 'dwell' area of level or reduced gradient length of carriageway in OR to assist vehicles having difficulty in stopping. In view of this potential hazard, the VAS requirements are that 'the gradient of the access shall not normally exceed 4% over the first 10m outside the public road boundary' and 'The remainder of the access should have a gradient less than 10% so that it may be used during wintry weather'; but it is impossible to achieve anything even close to this: see VAS cl. 10.3.

- The width of the access road (OR: 5.5m) is too narrow: VAS requires 6.0m for a two-way access; and in addition, because the road is narrow, the entry radius for the turn from ER into OR is tight without straying into the opposite (downhill) carriageway. This is important because of the proposed shared use by OR residents and construction traffic.

- The OR pavement widths (1.7-1.8m) are rather narrow: GCC:HRD requires 2.0m.

In summary OR does not comply with requirements for an access road to serve 67 dwellings, instead of the 24 it serves at present; i.e. as well as not meeting standards given by the documents noted, there would be a very high intensification of use.

Beside the unsuitability of OR as the access road to the site, the assessment of the effect of the development on the local roads immediately affected is flawed because there would be a substantial increase in traffic on the two roads leading away from OR: Ewens and Beaufort Roads (ER/BR):

- Current dwellings: Ewens Road 19 Pine Close, OR 43 Beaufort Road 41

- i.e. the total number of dwellings: 103 at present, would increase to 146.

- Therefore there would be a substantial increase in traffic on Ewens and Beaufort Roads leading away from OR: whereas on-street parking on these roads and Haywards Road (the next affected road for traffic towards Cheltenham) was described as 'sporadic': definition 'occurring only here and there, separate, scattered'; the street parking is nearer constant and widespread than sporadic, and already severely restricts vehicle movements on these roads, and on Oak Avenue.

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

- In discussing overall design concepts the GCC:HRD recommended: 'The creation of large cul-de-sac estate layouts, where a large number of houses rely on one access road, and pedestrian access is similarly restricted, must be avoided'

In summary, the traffic generated by the development would feed into local residential roads which are also steep, narrow and already congested by traffic and on-street parking.

The importance of protecting an abundant and rewarding area of natural beauty for this and future generations of Cheltenham residents. The land proposed for development is resident to deer, bats, badgers, owls, hedgehogs, woodpeckers, buzzards, preserved trees and many more important species. There are only so many times we can say these creatures and spaces are less important than housing needs. No one wants to live in a future metropolis held together with Tarmac.

The development would represent a serious flood risk to the proposed new residents and the existing residents in the adjoined area. It takes a day of heavy rainfall for the fields to become waterlogged. The current ecology retains the water within minimum run-off but in my belief that this development will destroy what has been a fine balance between residential infrastructure and nature.

I sincerely hope that the scale of the community objection to this development strikes the right cord and the application is turned down once and for all.

Thank you for your time and hopefully support.

14A Copt Elm Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8AD

Comments: 5th June 2020

As a resident of Charlton Kings, I object on the grounds that this site is still unsuitable for 43 new homes to be built. The access road to the site is totally unsuitable, it's too narrow and steep. It couldn't cope with that many vehicles going up and down it and the steepness means that people would be very unlikely to regularly choose to cycle or even walk up it. Charlton Kings is already overburdened with traffic. The travel plan indicates it would be easy for people to walk to nearby amenities but, to be realistic, they wouldn't because of the steep hill, meaning more traffic.

The area the developers are proposing to build on is an area of outstanding beauty. Local people have noted the high risk of flooding and the problems in the past with this. There are so many valid arguments against this development and the only one for it seems to be financial gain. The plans have already been rejected twice and building less houses doesn't make it any better. It still isn't a wanted development.

9 Alexandria Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 5LG

Comments: 7th June 2020

The volume of traffic that cuts through this area to get to the A40 is already having an effect on the roads, with congestion this will cause more. The area around Harp Hill is naturally beautiful and take yet more open space and build housing is not in my view beneficial to this area.

12 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 30th June 2020

Severe traffic impact on our street
Threat to the wild
Ruins such a quiet peaceful area!

Little Orchard
Charlton Drive
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8ES

Comments: 21st May 2020

I object to the planning application and timescale.

I would specifically refer to the three points below.

- 1 Legal risk - access
- 2 Flooding
- 3 Full planning committee consideration

1 Legal risk;

At the last planning enquiry, a paper was presented and is now public record, of the deficiencies in the proposed site access. The original approval was from the highways authority based at Tewksbury, who admitted that it had been done without even a site visit.

This full professional on-site analysis, listed in detail, the reasons why the access in the proposal is unsuitable.

As a Chartered Engineer, if I approved the design and construction of a chemical plant knowing that part of that design was not fit for purpose, and someone subsequently died because of it, I and those responsible, could be charged with corporate manslaughter.

It follows that if this access is allowed to go ahead with the blessing of the town planners and their superiors in the knowledge that the access is not fit for purpose, and someone died on that access, in our litigious society, there could be serious consequences.

The question is, have these legal issues been properly explored and are planners and their management, justified in supporting an application when it is known that the access is not fit for purpose?

2 Flooding:

Cheltenham is subject to flash flooding despite a £25m flood defence scheme. Weather patterns are changing. Will future generations wonder what on earth planners were doing in recommending upstream developments such as this given the detailed analysis provided to the planning committee from Cheltenham Flood Defence experts?

3 Full planning committee consideration

There was some comment that this planning application may not be considered and debated by the full planning committee of Councillors. This planning application has been positively rejected on every occasion. The government inspector made a recommendation, for example regarding number of properties, that seemed to have been ignored.

If there is any change to current practice, shouldn't this decision be deferred until such time that the full committee can sit and deliberate?

Finally, the fact that the developers seem to be prepared to ignore the recommendations of the government inspector seems an affront to the planning process and should this in turn be taken up with government by our local MP Alex Chalk, who I understand, also opposed this development.

8 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 21st May 2020

I strongly object to the planning application on the following grounds:-

1. The application for dwellings on this land, for however many, has been turned down twice and also turned down on appeal.
 1. 2 The application is being considered by council officers and not the full planning committee. The date should be deferred until the full compliment of council staff is present.
 2. 3 The steep access in Oakhurst Rise is totally unsuitable for further
 3. building purposes as most residents have previously commented on
 4. 4 The infrastructure is not viable; local schools are full and there are waiting lists for doctors, dentists, etc.
 5. 5 The wildlife will be destroyed , including badgers, deer (roe and muntjacs), foxes, bats, snakes and bird life.
 6. 6 Flooding will inevitably be an issue, as detailed by many previous objectors.

My suspicions are that the developers, once given permission for 43 dwellings, will continue to develop further within the boundaries of the proposed land.

I therefore trust that this application will be turned down forthwith.

32 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 20th May 2020

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

- Pressure of traffic throughout the Ewens farm estate and local access roads. These roads are already very busy and frankly dangerous at times, especially during rush hour. The 20mph limit is rarely observed by motorists using it as a rat run from London Road/Hales Road and many cars are parked on the roadsides. It is already hazardous and unpleasant to walk on these streets at busy times.
- The access road in Oakhurst Rise is a concern due to blind bends and gradient. The approach is steep, narrow and with limited visibility. It would be dangerous to have additional cars using it as an access road. Also, with a very steep gradient, these roads are unusable during icy weather. They are not gritted and are unsafe and unusable in icy conditions.
- The density of the proposed development is not in keeping with the area.
- Risk of flooding - the present infrastructure will not cope with the additional runoff water from the site. There are springs and documented flood problems on the site and adjacent to the site. The application does not take into consideration the significant flooding in the surrounding areas. Drains in the area already struggle to cope with heavy rain. I am concerned that our property may flood if this area is built on.
- Loss of wildlife habitat, hedgerows and trees. Badger sets may be extensive. Deer also inhabit the area, together with bats, woodpeckers and owls.
- Loss of a rich biodiverse site, green space and sports amenity to the community Charlton Kings.

- The development will be detrimental to the visual impact of the town and an unsightly blot on the landscape. The site is visible for miles around.
- The site is not included in the strategic plan of development for Cheltenham and therefore should not be built on.

30 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 1st May 2020

The original planning application (Ref. No: 17/00710/OUT) was rejected for numerous reasons, which may or may not have been addressed, however, it is clear that the proposed access via Oakhurst Rise has not been changed.

It was originally held that this access would have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network, and the amenity of local residents.

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

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

Since this application the number of dwellings was reduced (Ref. No: 18/02171/OUT) but the access remained the same other than the reduction of dwelling numbers and so it was also dismissed .

There remains in the plans just one single route in and out of the site, a steep gradient, accessed at the top of an already steep hill.

Access from London Road to the site is via Charlton Court Road, then Oak Avenue, then Churchill Drive, then Ewens Road, then up Beaufort Road, then up Oakhurst Rise-these roads have much on-street parking in place for much of the time.

It is acknowledged that though there may be no 'technical' objections to the route in traffic or highway safety terms, whether with regard to width, gradient or alignment of the carriageways, junction or forward visibility, or existing traffic flows with regards to the access arrangements for new development consideration must be given to the genuine local concerns that the additional traffic from the proposed development, amounting to a likely 30 or so vehicle movements in any peak period which would add to congestion and inconvenience to existing adjacent housing of the entire Ewens Farm estate.

The singular access route, as a whole, is tortuous and far from ideal.

The solution being proffered with this application (an offer of each household upon the first occupation of a dwelling / apartment on the new development of £750 towards the purchase of an electric bike to be secured via a Section 106 Agreement) will not compensate the surrounding residents nor is it likely to mitigate the impact on neighbouring residents.

The roads are impassable on foot in winter when snow and ice coat the hills and the pavements are treacherous as neither they nor the roads are cleared or gritted by the local authority as it is.

I am unconvinced that educating the new owners of the benefits of not using cars, as indicated in the traffic survey the developer has commissioned, will have any impact since every dwelling is being planned with parking for at least one car. If the developer was serious about reducing the impact of traffic to local residents they would insist all vehicles of all new residents be environmentally friendly or have no parking facilities at all.

Clearly this is impractical but would serve to demonstrate how essential people view their cars to be when they live on the top of a massive hill. I should know, my house is just below Oakhurst Rise at the top of the same hill.

There are no cycle paths nor footpaths anywhere near this development and there appears to be no plans to introduce any on these plans.

Walking up this hill to the entrance of Oakhurst Rise is arduous for most people, let alone on a bike. Residents of Oakhurst Rise rely on their cars and should the presence of an emergency vehicles be necessary this is will block access to this site's access entirely-as do the refuse vehicles every week during rush hour.

29 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 6th June 2020

As on previous objections, nothing has changed with regards to supporting this request. Living at 29 Charlton Court Rd the current drainage Channel does not suffice the proposed houses being built. The drainage is not managed now for the houses on the side of the school. It seems the developers are insisting in ignoring what has been recently said at council meetings and appeals regarding the environment issues money talks!!

Also loss of wildlife would be tragic as the deer are seen at the rear of the gardens every morning and evening, albeit some carcasses having been found in the past since the first planning application.

The area is already over run by cars speeding through as a short cut with an ever increasing child population it's a tragic event awaiting to happen.

The schools and go surgeries are already over subscribed.

The houses would not be of any help to low income and especially with the covid-19 situation of job losses and poor income.

27 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 31st May 2020

Having attended at least three previous council meeting re: this proposal, I think the case against proceeding has been well and truly made under several headings such as:

1. Environmental to the fields on St Edwards

2. Traffic on Six ways and the approach road
3. Danger of subsidence in Charlton Court road (several houses have been victims of this and needed attention
4. Trees (18) to be cut down
5. Drainage systems not able to cope with more houses and concrete as well as the overflow system in Charlton Court Rd being unable to take additional water.
6. General disruption to the whole are for a considerable time
7. Infrastructure, i.e. schools, doctors and other essential cervices

25 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 1st June 2020

I wish to object to the application on various grounds

1 the detrimental effect of the dwellings on the wildlife. It has been well documented that deer are often in the field and they would be both disturbed and confused by the work and the additional houses. This could lead them to local roads with the risk of injury or death.

2 the local amenities will not be able to cope with the additional population. 43 dwellings could mean on average 160 more people looking for a nearby doctor surgery or at least 80 children looking for school places. As we know all schools (primary and secondary) are full to capacity and although it has been suggested their capacity could be increased access to the schools is very limited and this cause it's own problems on neighbouring roads.

3 allowing another 43 dwellings will also put considerable strain on the local road network. As these dwellings are "affordable housing" we should assume that residents will be young and probably driving to and from schools and work. The Sixways junction at rush hour is incredibly busy and needs no more pressure and Swans Farm is increasingly used as a rat run which it was not designed for and cannot cope with.

4 the access to the dwellings is totally unsuitable. Oakhurst Rise is very steep and narrow. To expect 80 plus additional cars to use the access in all weather's is wrong. There is limited public transport so residents would rely on their own transport.

I feel very disappointed that this proposal has again been raised despite so many objections and the overwhelming decisions reached by the planning committee each time. I cannot understand how 43 dwellings can be considered when 60 have been refused. The numbers are too similar to even consider.

23 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 4th June 2020

We have recently moved to Charlton Court Road although know of the history of these applications having moved from The Ryeworth Road area of Charlton Kings.

We are very much against this development or any future developments on this site due to the following:-

1. Increased traffic around Ewens farm area. This is already a rat run in rush hour.
2. Total unsuitability of the steep and narrow access at Oakhurst Rise.
3. When the developers find access through Oakhurst Rise unsuitable, they will likely attempt to "buy" access through Charlton Court Road which is also unsuitable due to the gradient and ancient trees in the adjacent field which would have to be felled.
4. Increased risk of flooding. We have been informed that our garage along with other properties at the lower end of Charlton Court Road have previously been flooded during periods of high rain fall. This will only increase with more building and associated runoff.
5. We are totally against the digging up of the Road in Charlton Court Road to give access to sewerage system by properties 19-23 where there are 2 elderly households and one with young children and this will give seriously curtailed access for an extended period.
6. I believe the current sewerage system in the Charlton Court Road has suffered from blockages in the past so is likely to be more marginal with significantly more waste.
7. We are highly concerned for the local wildlife, in particular the deer and badgers who roam the fields and have a habitat within the build site. The deer have recently had fawns and can be seen in the school grounds regularly. It would be appalling to find them scared off onto the streets and discovered as road kill.
8. The houses along Oakhurst rise are small to moderate but some of the houses on the proposed site are large and such households would require large removals trucks which could be very difficult in the narrow, steep approach. In addition to this there will be appliance deliveries, supermarket deliveries, amazon deliveries significantly increasing traffic on a narrow road.
9. There is little chance that residents living in this area will walk or cycle regularly as part of their day to day activities even with the small incentive of a "free" eBike. Because of the elevation and steepness even small trips will most certainly require a car journey through the already traffic calmed Ewans Farm estate. If young children will be attending local schools they will most certainly opt to drive for similar reasons. This will in turn cause more traffic in the Charlton Kings Village which is already very congested at peak times.
10. The local schools and doctors are already over subscribed.

21 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 13th May 2020

Drainage layout sheet 2of2. Project-C21505-SK02. InsertA.

The above drawing omits both the St Edwards school boundary line and the 5 houses within the Charlton Court Rd cul-de-sac, giving the incorrect impression of an open and undeveloped area. In the event of planning permission being granted, it is proposed to direct the surface water drain from the Oakhurst Dr development through this cul-de-sac, in spite of Severn Trent expressing their doubts regarding this route. The most obvious route for the surface water drain would be direct to the water course at the bottom of the incline within St Edwards school grounds. This would eliminate the unnecessary disruption and upheaval such a major undertaking would make within the Ch Ct Rd cul-de-sac and the inevitable stress and anxiety such works would have on

the health and well-being of the two households of vulnerable senior citizens who live within the cul-de-sac

22 Charlton Court Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JB

Comments: 28th May 2020

The revised plans show no alteration in the surface water and foul water drainage arrangements which should not be coming through Charlton Court Road, vis St Edwards property to the A40, or directly through Oakhurst Rise ?

Comments: 7th May 2020

The measure version of the plan would not download. The other version does, but is unreadable because of the small print. It would appear that either foul or rainwater drainage is to be brought through Charlton Ct Rd as on the previous application. Is this correct ? Even when Severn Trent have expressed doubts on this ? Why not through St Edwards property to the London Road

Birchley House
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 26th May 2020

I was very disappointed to learn that following the failure of the developers to obtain planning consent at the recent public enquiry yet another application for the development of this land has been submitted. The current application fails to address the fundamental unsuitability of the site for development. There are many reasons for this which have all been aired previously but of particular concern to me are the following:-

1. The site access is through the area known as Ewan's Farm and particularly Oakhurst Rise. These roads are narrow and steep with several tight bends. Adding considerable numbers of vehicle movements to these roads by allowing the development would add significantly to the dangers posed by these roads and this was recognised as such by the planning inspector. In addition it is necessary for many of the residents of Ewan's Farm to park on the roads fronting their properties. If allowing the development meant that these residents were then not able to park on the road then this would unfairly adversely affect the amenity of their properties.
2. The fact that the land slopes towards the Cotswolds escarpment means that it is highly visible from the Cotswold Way and other beauty spots overlooking Cheltenham above Leckhampton and Charlton Kings. Presently the land adds to the green space and general attractiveness of the view. Because of its aspect sloping towards the hills residential development of the sort proposed would be highly intrusive and (unlike other development sites) could not be adequately screened by landscaping.

There are also many other reasons why this development should not be permitted which have already been articulated by other residents. Consequently I would urge the Planning Committee to REFUSE this application.

Kerrymead
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NX

Comments: 27th May 2020

I have objected before to building on that field - and have not changed despite the reduction in housing density. I followed the application and I object for the reasons it was rejected last time:

- Ashley House - a heritage site in cheltenham harmed
- Charlton Manor - a heritage site harmed
- Loss of ancient trees, wildlife, bio diversity, clean air
- Flood risk
- Poor access - since lockdown I have walked around the area and think the site access is absolutely shocking. it is steep and narrow so unwalkable/cyclable and you can't possibly have 80 cars going up and down twice a day to commute and drop children at school.
- Unless all primary age children are going to Holy Apostles (which has minimal capacity) then there is no way anyone will walk to school because of the steepness of the hill and the distance of the nearest primary.
- The congestion onto London Road is horrendous and routes to cross cheltenham are both already busy and involve one way systems and will therefore pollute the town.
- Local authority housing sits at the bottom of the access route - kids will no longer be able to play safely in the street, there will be a lot of pollution and noise from cars going up and down.

Highcroft
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NZ

Comments: 26th May 2020

I repeat the objections which I made to the previous applications for the proposed residential development of this site .

19 Oak Avenue
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JG

Comments: 13th May 2020

We are still opposed to the development of this site for residential properties based on our original objections. The main ones are:

1. No provision has been made for proper sewerage and drainage, currently the proposals have sewers and drainage running into the Charlton Court Road system which is already at capacity. Surely the drainage etc can be directed to the larger system on London Road. Oak Avenue flooded in 2007 due to excess water entering the drainage/sewerage system and the residents continually have problems with the sewer pipes blocking. More properties on the "run" would only overwhelm the system.

2. Access issues. All traffic will be using the Ewens Farm estate roads which are not adequate to deal with extra traffic coming from a new development. There are 2 parks in the area and young

children are continually crossing the estate roads to get to them. We are concerned that the increase in traffic would result in a greater risk of accidents involving the children.

Coversdown
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 20th May 2020
Letter attached.

10 Oakhurst Rise
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6JU

Comments: 22nd May 2020

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

The impact of traffic associated with this development will have a life changing impact on the existing residents of this small, well established and compact community. This will start during construction with no doubt hundreds of lorry movements. Then later there will be, I guess, between 50 or 100 daily car journeys from the 43 dwellings.

The road is very steep and narrow and is regularly at almost bottle neck with on road parked cars and vans which makes it totally unsuitable as the sole means of access to this new development.

Another concern is that the road is regularly impassable in winter due to snow and the steepness of the first section up from Ewen's Farm. This happened on four occasions during the 2018 / 2019 winter. The few residents who commute daily leave their cars at the bottom of the hill and walk up and down. That's workable with 25 houses mostly with non-working families but what will the residents of the 43 new dwellings do with their two cars each?

I urge the interested parties to visit Oakhurst Rise on an evening or weekend and see for themselves how unsuitable it is as the sole means of access to this significant new development.

The last two applications were rejected, the access is the same this time, so I trust that the current application will also be rejected.

Meadow View
Birchley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NY

Comments: 25th May 2020

I find it hard to believe that we have yet another plan to build on this land, given the judgement by the Inspector last August.

This application should be rejected on exactly the same grounds stated in his report issued last October, which were relevant to the two previous applications.

Some of these were:

- access, I believe the Inspector was appalled that the Highways Agency thought access was suitable, but then he had taken the time to actually walk up and view the site, which no one from the Highways Agency ever did. The access is totally unsuitable.
- destruction of natural wildlife habitat. Various species living on this ancient meadow have been well documented by the previous Ecologists reports and the Friends of Charlton Kings.
- destruction/damage to ancient hedgerows and trees currently protected by TPO's
- flooding risk to London Road area and properties below this development
- rights to views from AONB
- impact on Grade II listed buildings

This application should be rejected, but if not, at least postponed until a full hearing can be given, considering the history of building applications for this beautiful and ancient meadow.

Hilcot
Stanley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PF

Comments: 14th August 2020

I object to this development on many levels. Primarily because we need to protect small pockets of nature for our mental health, wildlife and the climate. This time of Covid has shown us all how important nature is to mental health and well being and this area is a key natural beauty spot for people on this side of town. We need small wild life zones which are accessible for people without access to the wider countryside as well as to maintain wildlife corridors and reduce flooding.

We do not need to build on every bit of green. The town centres are being reimaged and could provide good housing opportunities. It is short sighted to concrete over areas which on environmental, climate and mental health grounds all add value to longterm well being and quality of life for everyone.

This is in addition to all the evidence on how disruptive on a practical level this will be to the communities around this site. There is not the infrastructure to support more housing in this area.

Cheltenham House
Clarence Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire

Comments: 3rd June 2020

I write further to our recent discussions that have taken place in relation to the site above.

In consideration of the proposed development at Oakhurst Rise, we understand that circa 18 affordable dwellings are being provided on the site, from a total of 43 dwellings. Within this locality we would strongly support the provision of affordable housing. We would be supportive of a higher proportion of rented accommodation against intermediate housing and for the smaller units to be provided for Social Rent. Any inclusion of 4-bedroom units for Social Rent would also be welcome.

The development is in an attractive and popular residential area and one where we would not have any concerns about letting properties.

As a bit of background, Cheltenham Borough Homes is the Arm's Length Management Organisation (ALMO) for Cheltenham Borough Council and are the main Affordable Housing provider in Cheltenham. Embedded in the local community, we aspire to provide the highest standards of customer service and satisfaction for all our residents, across all tenure types. With over 180 employees we cover the full range of services including an in-house repairs team and dedicated housing management and ASB team. We provide our customers with a supportive housing management and community investment function which includes providing assistance to secure employment.

With ambitious growth plans, significant low-cost funding available and appropriate approval procedures in place we would be very interested in acquiring the affordable dwellings on this site and I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this opportunity further with your agent. Please feel free to contact me with any queries.

60 Suffolk Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2AQ

Comments: 11th June 2020

I support this application as it will provide urgently needed affordable homes for Cheltenham.

There is a waiting list of people in excess of 2000 who need affordable housing.

The site is a sustainable development within the urban area which will provide 43 homes of which 18 are affordable.

Charlton Kings has very little affordable housing and this will be of benefit to the community.

The site is in the draft Local Plan and if this was permitted this would go some way towards the houses needed in the area

The layout shows substantial areas of trees, flora and fauna, providing a natural area for many birds wildlife.

I fully support this application which will help the local community, shops and businesses at Sixways.

Chota Koti
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PA

Comments: 12th June 2020

OJBECTS.

46 The Park
Northway
Tewksbury
GL20 8RH

Comments: 16th June 2020

This seems a nice looking estate, just the kind me and my family are looking for.

94 Barnwood Avenue
Gloucester
GL4 3AJ

Comments: 18th June 2020

I feel like there needs to be more available housing in Cheltenham as my partner and I are looking at moving back to the Cheltenham area. A new housing development to gives young couples opportunities wouldn't go amiss.

6 St David's Close
Tuffley
Gloucester
GL4 0PX

Comments: 19th June 2020

There is currently not enough affordable housing in the area and very limited opportunities for people to join the area due to people not wanting to leave.

6 Rotunda Terrace
Montpellier Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 1SW

Comments: 29th June 2020

I support this application which is a very well balanced development scheme providing much needed family & affordable housing, as there is an acute shortage of good quality available properties in Cheltenham. This development will provide 43 new homes including 18 affordable homes which will be greatly sought after.

It will also provide the creation of jobs during the building of the site which will benefit the economy in these difficult times.

Both the school and the landowners support the application for this development and both are Charitable Trusts. This looks like a great development, ideal for new families, allowing them access to the local schools nearby which are in need of and welcome the support.

Environmentally this appears to be a well-thought out development that leaves plenty of green space around it, not only retaining most of the existing trees, but also adding to the tree population, the plans show that the area will not be over-developed and consideration to the tree and wild life habitat have been made.

The concerns regarding flooding have also been dealt with, allowing for rainwater to be retained which will not only benefit the existing area but will in fact limit any chance of flooding to neighbouring properties.

119B Bath Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7LS

Comments: 7th July 2020

This is a sensible application for well needed homes, it improves the flooding issue in the town centre as well as providing homes in an urban, sustainable location.

58 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JE

Comments: 12th July 2020

Cheltenham is desperately in need of affordable Housing and this land has already been allocated for Housing Development.

18 of the 43 proposed homes are in this category.

The inclusion of Wildlife habitat and Tree preservation and Introduction should prevent any objection to this proposal.

Earls Croome Court
Church Lane
Worcestershire
WR8 9DE

Comments: 22nd July 2020

Hopefully, on this occasion, the councillors will follow on with the recommendation from the qualified officers of CBC. This application, as the last two, complies with planning policy. It supplies desperately needed homes - and especially affordable homes. As such - it should succeed.

Redstart House
Battledown Approach
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6RE

Comments: 15th June 2020

I am writing to express my objections to the recent plans submitted for the development of St Edward's School fields. I am disappointed to see that the developers are trying yet again to proceed with their profoundly impractical plans despite the fact that two previous applications were rejected in addition to the dismissal by the Appeal Inquiry by HM Inspector (appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government).

I believe the new version of the plans will still result in a dangerous increase of traffic locally, that the residents of Oakhurst Drive will suffer horribly from this and the ecology of the field itself and the surrounding countryside will be permanently damaged.

25 Copt Elm Close
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8AE

Comments: 15th June 2020

I want to object to the above application.

This will affect the whole of Charlton Court Road, putting them at risk of direct sewerage issues and floods. Also, the residents of Oakhurst Rise would have their lives transformed from a quiet cul de sac of small bungalows to a through road to a new estate.

I believe 4 of the submissions of support you have received are from bodies who would benefit from this. Apart from the risk to people this is a beautiful area where currently Alpacas roam. Are we going to build over the whole of this area in order to make more and more money. Does quality of life count for nothing. I'm fed up of this relentless building on green space.

I hope you will take my views and those of other locals into consideration.

Redstart House
Battledown Approach
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6RE

Comments: 15th June 2020

I am writing to object strongly to the latest planning application to build houses accessed from Oakhurst Rise. How anyone can think this steep road could be suitable to service any further housing development is beyond me...it is dangerous enough as it is and the thought of subjecting the existing residents to yet more car traffic is frankly irresponsible.

Furthermore, any development of this site would lead to the loss of very attractive meadowland. Clearly the developers have not been put off by losing twice already; they should be aware that they can apply as often as they like but none of the arguments which were previously used to successfully defeat the application have changed so they will continue to waste their money and time.

Battledown View
Oakley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PA

Comments: 15th June 2020

I wish to lodge my objections to the proposed development in respect of the above planning application.

We are suffering too much building creep into our rural areas, and if such developments as this are approved. This will cause additional traffic, noise and crowding. It was during lockdown that I really appreciated the beautiful surrounding areas that we had within walking distance. It would be a shame to spoil such area of beauty. "

1 Blacksmiths Road
Alderton
Tewkesbury
Gloucestershire
GL20 8NW

Comments: 26th June 2020

Charlton Kings urgently needs more affordable housing, this site will provide some 15/20 such houses. I urgently recommend the application for approval.

12 Goldsmith Road
Cheltenham
GL51 7RT

Comments: 2nd July 2020

I think this is a very good use of land in an urban setting. Cheltenham is in desperate need of housing, especially affordable housing.

1 glebeland
Egerton
Kent
Tn27 9dh

Comments: 28th July 2020

I object on the grounds of Increased traffic, flooding potential and absolute devastation of wildlife.

Basement Flat
Northwick House
Douro Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2PF

Comments: 21st July 2020

These fields are home to a huge badgers set, fallow deer, muntjac deer, green and lesser woodpeckers, bats, tawny owls grass snakes and lots of other wildlife ... it is currently being rented by a local school and is home to several alpacas and hives of bees

I object on the grounds of the following traffic, flooding, devastation of wildlife ... and the list could just go on

6 Cambrian Road
Surrey
TW10 6JQ

Comments: 21st July 2020

NONE GIVEN

41 Marleyfield Way
Churchdown
Gloucester
GL3 1JW

Comments: 23rd July 2020

NONE GIVEN

Hewden Hire Centre Ltd
Kingsditch Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire

GL51 9NE

Comments: 23rd July 2020
NONE GIVEN

10 Wordsworth Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 7DY

Comments: 23rd July 2020
NONE GIVEN

Haytor
65 Harp Hill
Charlton Kings Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6PR

Comments: 26th July 2020

I wish to strongly object to the proposal to build 43 dwellings on the land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise.

Firstly, it is quite obvious that developers are exploiting any piece of land in Charlton Kings because the return on their investment is higher than in other areas of Cheltenham. This latest iteration of the proposal is evidence of that. They are clearly determined to get any number of houses built on this land as the return is quite obviously worth it. This is largely because of the primary and secondary schools in Charlton Kings which are both heavily oversubscribed and are consequently pushing up house prices. This makes Charlton Kings a difficult place in which to settle, with or without a family, as it excludes people who do not have the level of financial security to afford these inflated prices. Furthermore, shoehorning houses into every available space in this area simply pushes more and more people out and families find that their child is refused a place at a school that is less than a mile away from home even when it is in fact, their local school. This situation needs to be carefully considered and addressed by councillors as it is making life increasingly difficult for local residents.

As has been outlined in other documents submitted against this proposal, the road infrastructure is unable to cope with more vehicles. The traffic around Sixways, Holy Apostles/Cirencester Road traffic lights is already heavily congested with very long queues of traffic causing serious amounts of fumes from idling vehicles, especially during peak hours, and I am certain that more housing will exacerbate this. I am astounded that if this proposal is allowed to go ahead, a small residential road (Oakhurst Rise) will be plunged into chaos, and for this reason, it must be stopped. Local residents' lives will be turned upside down as vehicles associated with 43 dwellings (which could be up to 3 cars per household - sometimes more) will be channelled through this small road; this level of vehicular activity is not conducive to a cul de sac of this nature and approval of this planning application will undoubtedly adversely affect current residents' daily lives. This issue should be given great weight in the planning committee's consideration.

There is a distinct lack of respect to the heritage of the existing buildings (Ashley Manor and other nearby buildings). The development will quite clearly dominate the vista and will damage people's experience of this heritage asset. St Edward's School is host to many events which are enjoyed by residents and visitors to the area, and so the building and its setting must be conserved. The site is also adjacent to the Cotswold AONB which is afforded a highly protected status, and development such as this will affect the vista of the AONB from around the site. Similarly, this site

can be clearly seen from several vantage points on the AONB and will undoubtedly have a negative visual impact. In my opinion, the St Edward's site, from the London Road up towards Battledown Hill and Greenway Lane, is a very sensitive and beautiful part of the Cotswold countryside. Many people move here for its inherent beauty and others visit as it's their gateway to Cheltenham's AONB. Why should our community destroy the very precious green spaces that are being extolled on a daily basis as the nature we all desperately need to connect with to enjoy fulfilled and mentally stable lives? This plan seems contrary to all the advice about the Government's Green Recovery Plan (post COVID). Charlton Kings is indeed a densely populated area of our beautiful town, and so it is vitally important that these beauty spots are not eroded and dismissed for the sake of profiteering.

In the AONB and important surrounding greenfield sites such as this one, the biodiversity must be considered with our utmost respect, care and attention. These important areas provide habitats for a diverse group of animals and plants and it is incumbent on us all, as residents and visitors, to ensure these are carefully protected and encouraged. For this reason, this site must remain as it is.

I implore CBC, local parish councillors and the planning committee to seriously consider the points raised here, and those raised in many other comments, and preserve this area within our community now, and for future generations. One of the positives that has emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic is that people have come out in hordes to walk the roads and fields of this area and long may it continue.

4 Woodgate Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6UW

Comments: 16th August 2020

While I was initially against this development I must admit this revised plan appears to be far more acceptable with a broad mix of housing (25 private homes and 18 affordable), some retained green areas and a lot of tree planting. I also like the idea of the flood defence/mitigation being installed by the developer and not at Council Tax payers expense later down the line.

The houses are certainly needed in Charlton Kings area, anyone living locally cannot get over how many houses have come to the market and have been sold in days despite the pandemic.

Having had a development up to my boundary fence I can understand how some of the neighbours feel, but sometimes you have to accept progress.

77 Denman Avenue
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4GF

Comments: 21st May 2020

I am keen to move to the area and feel there is a strong need for new, affordable housing

57 Bafford Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8DN

Comments: 8th June 2020

We understand that another updated planning application has been submitted by the developers for Oakhurst Rise on the slopes of Battledown. We strongly object to the approval of this application for the following reasons: unsuitable road access, loss of green area for Charlton Kings and Cheltenham, GP surgeries are already oversubscribed and it takes 3 weeks to get an appointment at Sixways, local schools are already oversubscribed, and the Charlton Kings Parish Council have unanimously rejected the application.

Thank you for taking our views into account.

4 College Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 7HX

Comments: 1st July 2020

As a Cheltenham resident who has been flooded twice (in June and July 2007 respectively) in College Road, I fully support this development and the improvement that it will make to flood alleviation in my part of the town, downstream. Even after the £22m flood alleviation works carried out in Sandford Park and Cox's Meadow post-2007, surface water levels and overwhelmed roadside drains continue to produce unacceptable levels of surface build-up. In the heavy rains we experienced earlier in June this year, several of my neighbour residents were forced to join me in the violent rains to brush the gathering surface water into the road drains to prevent build-up and risk of flooding to my property and others in the immediate neighbourhood. It is a shame that I can't upload a photograph of this on this website, as the evidence (at the time of writing this) is less than four weeks old! This new development with its intrinsic water attenuation tank will provide relief to our family and neighbours because of the reduced water flow in our area, and I strongly support the planning application for this development with its flood alleviation system.

57 Burton Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3NE

Comments: 2nd July 2020

Looks a good development. Much better than building on the countryside.

2 Coln Rise
Andoversford
CHELTENHAM
GL54 4HL

Comments: 2nd July 2020

Cheltenham like many towns and cities in the UK are crying out for affordable housing for the people who are finishing their education and starting out in their chosen careers. Unless they get help from their families they are not likely to be able to afford anything and have to move out of the area.

Therefore, schemes such as this one are ideal. It is introducing much needed affordable housing and not creating a huge housing estate where countryside once was. Schemes like this are excellent for this and should be encouraged over the huge ones that are being constructed by multi-national companies.

The fact that this scheme is also introducing the Flash Flood water Storage solution shows that they have taken notice of residents concerns and are investing in a sustainable solution as well as reducing the potential flood risk for neighbouring residents.

For these reasons, I believe the scheme should be approved.

34 Tommy Taylors Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 4NJ

Comments: 24th June 2020

The shortage of good quality housing in Cheltenham is acute, particularly in Charlton Kings, where there is a significant shortfall. This development will quickly deliver 25 open-market homes and, an essential consideration, 18 affordable homes to the approval of some half dozen housing associations.

The application is supported by the CBC Planning Department.

"Nimby-ism" cannot be allowed to succeed.

Both the school and the landowners support the application, and both of them are Charitable Trusts.

Granting of permission would give to the community a real sign of intent to pull Cheltenham out of the recent disastrous economic circumstances and make some accommodation provision for a hopefully expanding jobs market locally.

I understand this scheme is a significant reduction on previous proposals and, among other benefits, it reduces flood risk to downstream properties by its attenuation system.

3 Manor Park
Up Hatherley
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3HU

Comments: 22nd July 2020

I wish to lodge an objection to the planning application in Charlton Kings for 43 dwellings submitted under reference 20/00683/OUT.

I object on the grounds of wildlife preservation. There are a number of animal species, for example deer, woodpeckers and owls who have made these fields their home. Because of this I strongly believe this area should form part of the Charlton Kings conservation area.

I am also concerned about the increase of traffic in the surrounding area. The area around these fields is heavily residential and the roads are narrow and not fit for purpose for significant increased volume of traffic, and resultant pollution and safety for children is a real issue

The council have a responsibility to maintain the quality of the environment for future generations and should reject the planning application for these reasons.

14 Butterfield Court
Bishops cleeve
Cheltenham
GL528rz

Comments: 7th July 2020

Cheltenham needs decent homes for many people, the young, families and the old, not least in Charlton Kings where the demand for both private and affordable homes is both very strong and just unavailable. This development will deliver 25 private homes and a mixture of 18 affordable homes, to the approval of at least six Housing Associations.

We all understand local residents objecting, no one likes change, however they have their houses and are attempting to stop other people getting what they want in the area they would like to be in. The application is supported by the CBC Planning Department.

8 Station Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 3LX

Comments: 7th July 2020

I am of the opinion that this planning application has many merits. Cheltenham is in need of quality development and homes for many people of all abilities, the young, families and the old/infirm. The development would provide 18 affordable dwellings for which there is a deficit in the area. I also note that there will be benefits for the school by way of a much needed financial uplift to improve their facilities and to carry out essential maintenance.

First Floor
3 Lansdown Crescent
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2JY

Comments: 24th June 2020

This is a very well balanced thought out development scheme providing much needed affordable housing particularly in the Charlton Kings area. The concern regarding flooding has been dealt with allowing for rain water to be captured and stored on site which in fact limits any chance of flooding to neighbouring properties. It seems that all considerations have been taken into account and therefore this development should be permitted.

Cottsway House
Heynes Place
Avenue Two
Witney
OX28 4YG

Comments: 2nd June 2020

Letter attached.

Charlton Manor
Ashley Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6NS

Comments: 6th September 2020
Letter attached.