

| | |
|--|--|
| APPLICATION NO: 21/00279/FUL | OFFICER: Mrs Victoria Harris |
| DATE REGISTERED: 24th February 2021 | DATE OF EXPIRY : 21st April 2021 |
| WARD: Leckhampton | PARISH: LECKH |
| APPLICANT: | Mid-Counties Co-Operative |
| LOCATION: | Co-Operative Retail Services, Leckhampton Road, Cheltenham |
| PROPOSAL: | Proposed demolition of existing bungalow to create additional car parking for adjacent foodstore, new external cladding and signage to foodstore |

REPRESENTATIONS

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Number of contributors | 10 |
| Number of objections | 8 |
| Number of representations | 1 |
| Number of supporting | 1 |

14 The Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PH

Comments: 1st March 2021

Re: Objection to Planning Application 21/00279/FUL

I submitted a letter of objection on 13 October 2017 relating to the previous planning application (17/10794/FUL) for this site. I understand that the planning application was subsequently withdrawn.

I set out below concerns and objections from my previous letter that remain relevant to this new proposal.

1.1. To demolish any house in the light of the current and future housing crisis without providing replacement housing is fundamentally wrong.

1.2. This proposal would leave No 1 Church Road isolated and living on a Co-op island with the food store at the rear of the property, store rear access to one side and busy car park with its entrance to the other.

1.3. Local residents will have continual noise and disturbance from vehicular activity of both the Leckhampton Road and proposed Church Road car park entrances from 7.00am-10.00pm Mon-Sat and 7.00am-11.00pm Sundays.

(The current listed opening times appear to be 7.00am-10.00pm Mon-Fri, 7.00am-11.00pm Sat & 7.00am-11.00pm Sunday and at present are, no doubt, subject to change during Covid).

1.4. Traffic on and approaching Leckhampton Road, Charlton Lane & Church Road, their junctions and mini roundabouts is already a bottleneck problem. The existence of a larger car park will exacerbate this and add more fumes and danger to pedestrians.

1.5. Many young children (there is a primary school nearby), parents with buggies and toddlers, people with disabilities and those in wheelchairs regularly use these walkways, as well as many secondary school pupils catching the local and school buses in this vicinity.

1.6. The existing car park and pedestrian entrance/exit in Leckhampton Road has been, and still is, an ongoing problem. Vehicles travelling up Leckhampton Road continually block the junction by stopping suddenly and waiting to turn right, then crossing over the clearly marked lane dividers located mid-way between the two mini roundabouts. Consequently this creates congestion from all directions involving both mini roundabouts and junction.

The right turn here can be highly dangerous, especially to pedestrians as, once there is a brief lull in oncoming traffic, drivers find themselves having to speedily cross road and pavement to access car park. The same dangers can be said of the vehicles exiting the car park.

1.8. Leckhampton Road is also a busy route for the Emergency Services travelling to and from the numerous incidents at the notorious Air Balloon/Crickley Hill/A417 black spots. Any added delays would be life threatening.

My further concerns/objections relating to this new proposal are as follows.

2.1. Ref paras 1.4 & 1.5. The nearby Primary School is in the process of being expanded with increased pupil numbers. A new secondary school (The High School Leckhampton) with an eventual capacity of 900 is under construction nearby. These two developments will further increase pedestrian and vehicular traffic on Leckhampton Road, Charlton Lane & Church Road.

2.2. On leaving the car park on Church Road customers will exit via front car park onto Leckhampton Road. This, in turn, will create a bottleneck meeting customers entering to park in the proposed disabled space and other three spaces. There will also be a problem when exiting drivers meet with the large delivery lorry in the front car park.

2.3. In recent months to safeguard pedestrians/wheelchair users, etc., two extremely bold Keep Clear notices have been painted on the pavement either side of the front entrance car park. These have been most welcomed. Unfortunately, on several occasions these notices are being deliberately ignored even when there are empty spaces in the car park. Only last week both Keep Clear spaces were parked on at the same time. Such simple requests and instructions obviously for safety reasons that some drivers are not prepared to adhere to.

2.4. The Co-op say their Leckhampton store is already very successful, which pleases me, but any extra business created by this proposal will, in turn, increase stock supplies and the demand for more storage space. My concern is that if this planning application is agreed the Co-op will, in time, seek to acquire more residential properties and land to further expand the store and parking facilities. To achieve this, more perfectly habitable nearby residential properties will be demolished.

To sum up, whilst I am very pro Co-op as my main supermarket shopping is done in both the Leckhampton Road and Bath Road stores, my main concern is for the protection, safety and preservation of the local residents and surrounding community.

If this application is allowed my concern is it would be difficult to turn down further applications by businesses to acquire and demolish other neighbouring residential properties, thus turning this established residential area into a mini business park with heavy lorries coming and going at all hours of the day and night.

The roads in this area are not designed for such traffic volume of these variations and proportions.

I strongly object to this proposal.

14 The Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PH

Comments: 1st March 2021

My objection is on the following grounds:-

Policies SD 4 and INF 1 Joint Core Strategy (JCS) adopted 2017
Traffic congestion and vehicle/pedestrian conflict and pollution.
Policy HM 3 Cheltenham Borough Council Local Plan approved 2020
Loss of residential accommodation

Traffic congestion/pedestrian conflict

This area is very congested with traffic especially at peak times.

The application site is located on the corner of what is essentially a staggered crossroads where the movement of traffic is guided by two mini roundabouts, traffic islands and painted road markings.

Traffic frequently backs up on all of the approach roads as large volumes of traffic try to negotiate the road junction. Traffic is often at a standstill, generating noise, pollution and congestion.

The current access to this Co-op store is located in Leckhampton Road directly between the two mini roundabouts. This compounds the congestion as vehicles try to move in and out of the existing car park to the Co-op. On a regular basis, large delivery lorries add to the congestion and further disrupt traffic and pedestrian movement across the car park. The present access is in a dangerous location but it is historic, designed to serve a small local shop in the days prior to mass car ownership and when people had very different life styles. Residents of the area and the Co-op can only live with this.

The Cop-op states one of the purpose of the extended car park is to accommodated customers who might potentially use the store - not necessarily to attract new ones but to allow parking for to those who might otherwise move on. It is a fact of life that his store has outgrown its location and and the Co-op should live with it. As they state in the application, the store is already successful; what more do they want? There is another Co-op store within a one mile distance.

The proposed additional car parking will do nothing to relieve this congestion and in my opinion makes it worse. The existing car parking on the Leckhampton Road frontage will be reduced to allow access to the proposed extended area on the site of the bungalow which currently adjoins the site.

At present vehicles frequently enter the site only to find there is no parking available; this results in inappropriate car parking outside the limits of the existing car park on two areas of public pavement are very clearly marked in BOLD letters which say KEEP CLEAR. This is designed to allow pedestrians to use the area more safely and to allow unimpeded access for wheel chair users.

The extension to car parking, which the applicant clearly states is designed to attract more vehicles to the site, will inevitably contribute to more awkward manoeuvres as cars enter the area and fail to obtain a space to park thereby increasing danger to pedestrians crossing the car park to enter the shop and conflicting with users of the one and only proposed space for disable peoples' car parking. Unable to find a convenient space, the increase in traffic will only encourage drivers to further ignore the Keep Clear areas and park on them.

The proposed "in only" access from Church Road will add further to congestion and conflicts with other road users. Already traffic backs up in this area where the road is just adequate for two-way traffic but not overgenerous. Vehicles frequently have to give way in order to pass safely. Those turning left will inevitably slow down and there could be a traffic movement conflict with the occupiers of 1 Church Road where I understand there is already an issue with the Co-op. Any traffic turning right will inevitably cause a back up of traffic, not only impeding the flow of vehicles but also pedestrians as they try to cross over at the island refuges at the junction.

Many pedestrians, cyclists and people with movement difficulties use this area which is predominantly residential where local residents use to go about their day to day business. It is a main thoroughfare to/from the local primary school and a local bus stop. There is NHS health unit in Charlton Lane and a Leonard Cheshire residential home and other residential homes for persons with complex needs who rely on the shopping facilities and who should expect to be able to use them safely.

The primary school is recently undergoing extensive alterations to increase the number of pupils by as much as 50%. Already at peak times many children are taken to school using this route which is hazardous and polluted. Recent traffic studies in this area have identified Church Road as being one of the most polluted streets in the town during peak times. The pavements are not wide and even well supervised children can stray onto the road.

This proposal all too clearly contravenes Policy INF 1 (3) in the Joint Core Strategy which requires developers to assess the impact of their scheme against traffic congestion, safety noise and pollution.

Furthermore the scheme also contravenes policy SD 4 (v) and (vi) which requires developers to demonstrate they have taken into account safety of the communities and reduce any risk of conflict between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.

Traffic, road safety, congestion noise and pollution are already a problem and will only become worse if this proposal is allowed.

Although the proposed plans show a parking for disabled persons in a different location to the one currently provided. It is to a minimum standard and located adjacent to the in/out access to the extended car park. It will be awkward to use and potentially dangerous to use. It is in my opinion it is a token gesture to comply with current legislation with no proper consideration for the proposed users and their needs. The present space gets abused and I have no reason to suspect this one will not get abused too. The Co-op does little to prevent this abuse taking place and they have no interest in preventing inappropriate parking adjacent to the access to which I have referred earlier. This proposal does not fully address inclusiveness as proposed in policy SD4

Loss of residential accommodation

The proposed demolition of the bungalow will be in direct conflict with Policy HM 3 in the Cheltenham Local Plan which explicitly states that "development involving the loss of residential accommodation through change of use or demolition of existing housing will not be permitted."

The bungalow, probably built in the 1960s, is nevertheless perfectly habitable and with some relatively minor updating work could be pleasant property. There is no legitimate reason to justify demolishing it. It was lived in until comparatively recently and would make a pleasant home for many more years.

If this scheme is approved it will have an adverse effect on the residents of 1 Church Road which would then be completely surrounded by the Co-op. The residents will be subjected to increased noise, pollution and traffic congestion and their whole aspect would be dominated by the presence of the Co-op to the extent that their living conditions would be intolerable and the continued use of the property as a residence will be compromised. A further application to extend

the Co-op might be difficult to resist as it could then be argued 1 Church Road becomes one of the exceptions to your policy (a).

The approval of the current scheme could therefore ultimately result in the loss of two perfectly good and habitable residential property.

Finally I have no objection to the proposed alterations to the façade which will improve the appearance of this dated building.

180B Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AE

Comments: 1st March 2021

I support the overall plan to increase parking space for the co-op, on the basis that it currently endangers pedestrians within and around the co-op premises itself.

Large numbers of very young school children pass by every week day, and the safety of the entrance to Leckhampton Road at peak times is highly questionable.

I do NOT support access to the co-op from Church road due to the excessive traffic currently queueing and parking at peak times. The traffic will increase as further housing is developed, not to mention the building of the new secondary school.

The current pavement along Church Road cannot handle current pedestrians, never mind the additional school children for the extended primary and new secondary, and new homes.

Placing a high volume entrance to the co-op from Church road therefore will not work safely.

Certainly flatten the bungalow and increase the parking, but put safety first and better design for the twin roundabout with the co-op entrance.

22 Coombe Glen Lane
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 3LE

Comments: 28th February 2021

Unfortunately, the agent Gould Singleton has made several misrepresentative claims within their Design and Access statement.

First it must be highlighted that the property references across the planning submission are incorrect. The application states of demolishing number 1 Church Road. This is my mother's property, not the property owned by the Co-op. Clearly, this cannot be authorised. They have stated that the building at the rear of number 1 Church road is a store, when very clearly it is a garage, with a garage door and a parking space, both of which are accessed via the driveway between 1 Church Road and Holly Lodge - this is where the rights of access mentioned in the Site Constraints is exercised. The garage and parking space will also be left exposed by this plan - the parking space and garage are often used by ourselves and other family members when visiting the property.

I would also add that aside from this fact, whether the right to park or use is exercised is irrelevant, the excise of this right should neither be stated or assumed under this planning application. The fact that it is stated as a falsehood is misleading to the application.

The Transport and Access Statement details an entrance only from Church Road into the new proposed carpark, whilst simultaneously using this same route as access and egress from the rear of 1 Church Road.

I raise particular safety concerns at this arrangement for the possibility of confusion, confrontation or head on traffic meeting each other at times when a vehicle would be exiting from 1 Church Road by this route meeting an incoming vehicle to the proposed car park.

In the event of which one vehicle would need to reverse to let the other by, either the Vehicle servicing 1 Church Road, or the Coop Customer, in which instance would be reversing with restricted vision, over a pedestrian footpath serviced often by the Local Primary School, and traversing traffic at a nearby congested junction. Neither option is ideal with respect to safety or impinging rights of access as a subservient for 1 Church Road. Similarly, safety concerns also arise via 'egress on foot' of 1 Church Road along this area meeting vehicular access entering the car park.

This increased health and safety risk to people living at or visiting one church road should not be an acceptable solution to the coop trying to bypass the covenant. There should be some physical separation between the new car park and the covenanted access to and from the rear of 1 church road. As this is already such a busy car park we would please urge you to reject this application on the grounds of the extra risks to people living in or visiting 1 Church Road.

The Recorded Delivery letter from 'Gould singleton Architects' Dated 3rd February states that with respect to the Property and Owners of '1 Church Road' their 'rights are [sic] fully respected and the enjoyment of this are will remain the same - this is a subjective supposition and should not be included. It is misleading the case for planning. The 'enjoyment' of the area served by the covenant will not be the same as instead of servicing two individual residential properties, as was the point in time that the property was purchased, the area under becomes accessible under this planning application by the general public at large.

Furthermore, this revised application from withdrawn application 17/01794/FUL does not take into consideration the responses made by the Councils Senior Urban Design & Projects Officer with respect to impacts to noise and disturbance to 1 Church Road, which will significantly affect the rights and enjoyments to the existing property, including privacy and security due to general public access as stated above. This is further exacerbated by the proposal of the one way floor recessed vehicular traps which have significant noise impact, and which under the proposals as the route of entry to the car park would be under constant usage. This would clearly impact on the enjoyment of the property, both in use of front and rear gardens and where opening windows.

I urge you to reject this application.

2 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PR

Comments: 14th February 2021

I live opposite to the proposed entrance and on a term time weekday morning traffic is at a standstill in both directions on Church Road. The parking restriction (faded yellow lines) on Church Road are already ignored and I am concerned that traffic on Church Road will back up further with drivers queuing to enter the car park to try to find a limited space. I agree that the current car park is dangerous but congestion and pollution here in the morning is very bad.

The other point I would like to make is outside of trading hours, especially in the Summer people could use this as a meeting point and create anti-social noise in the early hours. A solution to balance this would be a locked barrier across the entrance and exit to secure the car park when the store is shut.

Comments: 7th June 2021

If this store is to have a larger car park then the latest application is better than the original. There are some comments of concern I would like to raise.

1. The entrance and exit to Leckhampton Road should have a locked barrier when the store is closed to protect neighbours from anti-social behaviour. The car park could become a meeting area after hours causing noise pollution and litter.
2. The landscaping around the perimeter should be that people cannot walk across it otherwise it will become a shortcut to Church Road and be used by drivers that are not using the store.
3. There needs to be bollards on the pavement on Leckhampton Road to stop vehicles parking on the footway. Recently there is 'Keep Clear' painted on the footway but this is ignored by the majority of vehicles. The whole corner of Church Road and Leckhampton Road needs proper management to stop vehicles mounting the pavements. Yellow lines and painted words do nothing as it is not enforced by the local authority and vehicles know they can park wherever they wish as there is no penalty and they feel it is their right to park anywhere they please as long as they get their shopping.

Suffolk House
166 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0AA

Comments: 12th February 2021

The idea of making the Church Road access one way is sensible. The installation of a one way device as suggested in the transport letter is essential.

I am concerned that the car park could potentially be used by parents dropping/ collecting from the local primary school just around the corner in Hall Road. It is currently being expanded; therefore pupils are coming from a wider area and the number of parents driving has increased. The area surrounding the school is often gridlocked at pick up/ drop off time with cars parked dangerously. Many parents use the COOP around pick up time and it could become a convenient place to leave the car. This will need to be policed carefully.

My final concern is that a larger car park could provide somewhere for youths to gather once the store has closed. Could a barrier to prevent access to the car park once the store has been closed be considered?

1 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PS

Comments: 24th February 2021

Some fundamental details are incorrect and misleading about our home mentioned on the planning application:

- The covering letter title is proposing demolishing 1 Church Road (our home) rather than "Holly Lodge".
- The "Design and Access Statement" document repeatedly refers to the number of our home as number 3. This is wrong - it is number 1.
- The "Design and Access Statement" document states our home has a small workshop with narrow doors which are not suitable for motor vehicles and no vehicle access into the garden is possible.

The "workshop" is in fact a garage which has been used to store vehicles. Access to the rear garden has large wooden gates which we've had open on many occasions and parked vehicles on our property.

- The Cheltenham Plan, adopted in July 2020, states under policy HM3: "Development involving the loss of residential accommodation through the change of use or demolition of existing housing will not be permitted".

Practical Impact of development on neighbouring properties:

- Our property has become landlocked by Co-op owned premises. With existing staff/delivery access between 1 and 3 Church Road this plan effectively places our home in a car park.
- The proposed plan would change the use of a driveway, over which we have access rights, into a one way lane meaning our residential use of it for egress becomes hazardous with inevitable conflict with incoming traffic.

In essence the Co-op intend us to go the wrong direction on a one way vehicle lane to leave our home.

- We are very concerned that an all tarmac hard surface will lead to excessive run-off of rain water flooding our back yard and garage.

From the Co-op's previous withdrawn application from 2017 (17/01794/FUL) the Councils Senior Urban Design & Projects Officer stated:

"The most significant issue from a visual impact and drainage point of view, is the use of materials. Tarmac is indicated across the whole of the proposed hard-surfaced area. This will present a significant downgrade in the area of permeable surface, which at present consists mainly of green space. The material itself will not enhance the character of the area or respond to the existing quality found locally. I would expect a finer material approach in this area, consisting of permeable setts, with a contrasting colour for the access area and parking spaces. That approach would help to visually breakdown the area of hard landscaping and add visual interest"

Noise & Disturbance:

- From the Co-op's previous withdrawn application from 2017 (17/01794/FUL) the Councils Senior Urban Design & Projects Officer stated, with regards to our home, that "not providing any form of screening to the side of the property would lead to sound and visual impacts on that property".
- We are concerned about vehicles running within inches past our home in terms of noise, disturbance and pollution (forcing us to keep windows closed). We are further concerned about any ensuing damage due to vehicle proximity.

- The "Design and Access Statement" mentions an option to install floor recessed traffic control flaps. This will make an intolerable 'clatter' noise next to our home. Many suppliers of such devices openly state noise nuisance in residential areas is a problem and as such the device is unsuitable.
- We are concerned about non daylight times when vehicles turning right from Church Road to pass by our home will mean headlights shining in through our windows.
- There is the potential for anti-social behaviour with the increased likelihood that youths will hang around this expanded area, which is not visible from the store, from late evening and into the night.

If this occurs there is the potential for this to result in trespass into the recess by our back gates / garage.

Visual Impact:

- The destruction of "Holly Lodge" would result in a massive loss of visual amenity blighting the area with a vast expanse of tarmac for what is classed as a convenience store.

Any residential properties close by would have a view of a car park the landscape of which is almost all entirely tarmac.

Traffic:

- Vehicles turning right into the Church Road access would need to cut across the eastbound traffic flow causing traffic to backup and block the flow over the Leckhampton Road / Church Road roundabout resulting in standing traffic on Leckhampton Road. The volume of traffic is already significantly increasing due to the Brizen Park estate and the expansion of the primary school. It will get worse with the opening of the new secondary school.
- A large number of pedestrians use the pavement on Church Road - in particular many children attending the primary school. Crossing the proposed entrance combined with the proximity of the other immediate junctions presents an even greater hazard, especially for young ones who often run ahead.

We urge you to reject this application.

3 Church Road
Leckhampton
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0PS

Comments: 1st March 2021

This application as the previous one submitted and subsequently withdrawn in 2017 does not address the issues raised and will more likely lead to further disruption to both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the area, rather than less.

This store is described in the Transport Statement as a "convenience" store - meaning a corner store or small retail business with a floor area of around 230m² so at nearly 300m² this store is 30% larger and would more likely be described as a small supermarket. Mention is also made that there is a small service yard at the rear which is not workable and is used for staff parking, it

does not mention that it also stores many `empty delivery racks, waste packaging and refrigeration equipment.

Before the store was expanded to it's current size in 2016 more of this equipment was kept inside the store and many of the deliveries to the store were via this service yard.

In regard to the disruption caused by delivery vehicles at the front of the store, might it be an idea to schedule the deliveries to coincide with quiet times at the store?

On page 2 of the Transport Statement, it is suggested that trade is being suppressed, but also mentions that home-store-home trips are limited, which fits with the local convenience store description and the main users being local and walking to and from the store. The main cause of the parking issue is the pass-by or diverted trips also mentioned, the fact is that Leckhampton Road is a main route into Cheltenham and Church Road/Charlton Lane is a daily "rat-run" and this is the root cause of the parking problems, with most of the issues being around peak travel times. During the daytime the car park can have only 1 or 2 cars parked.

The suggested increase to the car park may clearly allow more parking but it will also encourage much more of the so called pass-by trade, which is clearly the main reason for this application, profit!

The suggested change in the application this time to provide a one-way entry only from Church Road with exits onto Leckhampton Road, will only create further hold-ups with the flow of traffic junction traffic attempting to turn right across the traffic flow on Church Road into the new car park entrance will quickly build back, from over 25 years of trying to enter and leave our own drive I can assure you this is not a straightforward procedure, queuing vehicles at peak times are very loathe to allow space for cars to turn across their path even though they are stuck waiting to get through the junction!

We would also list all the issues raised in objection to the earlier proposal as still being valid:

- Potential additional lighting impacting on adjoining properties.
- Noise for larger car park in particular at peak times
- Litter issues which are always apparent are likely to increase
- Potential for anti-social behavior occurring with the increased car park a potential gathering point.
- Increased car park movements will make the pedestrian traffic in the area more vulnerable, in particular at school times, please note that the local school has increased in size considerably since the last application, plus we are also gaining a large secondary school in the next 18 months.
- Demolition of a perfectly good house, which we believe according to The Cheltenham Plan, adopted in July 2020 that - "development involving the loss of residential accommodation through the change of use or demolition of existing housing will not be permitted"
- This route is an important route into Cheltenham. The loss of this property and its mature gardens will be a considerable loss of visual amenity.
- The adjoining property 1 Church Road will in effect become surrounded by the Co-op, which raises concern for further development should that property be put on the market.

On a general note, over the last 12 months we have had a big reduction in the amount of vehicle traffic in this area, however, as we start to look forward to a return to normal, a return to previous traffic levels is surely a foregone conclusion. Added to this we have the completion of the Redrow development, increase of 50% in Leckhampton school size, the coming Secondary School and potential for more than 350 more homes in the immediate area this junction is only going to become even busier, this application will only add to the problems, not ease them.

We would like to point out, also highlighted by our neighbors at 1 Church Road in their response, the numerous errors on the application in relation to the identification of the properties.

We strongly object to this application and urge you to reject it.

141 Leckhampton Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0DQ

Comments: 17th March 2021

I live at 141 Leckhampton Road, immediately next to the Coop. I did not make any objection or comments on the development as I believe my concerns had adequately been raised in submissions I read on the portal. However, there are a few points which might help amplify some of those concerns raised, I understand that you cannot acknowledge or respond to the current planning application:

Planning application:

It is noted that the amount of tarmac intended to be used in the extension of the car park might cause local flooding. My property and 139 already suffer from flooding as the Coop has inadequate drainage and all the rain water from their roof and down the delivery road to the back of the shop runs off into the lowest points of our garden. I am in correspondence with the head of property at Coop head office and have requested that if they are not going to address their drainage issues then they should have soak-aways dug in the low spots of our gardens. The point is, flooding is already an issue and it is not being dealt with.

The matter of the lack of greenery is mentioned on the portal, an increase will help with the point above but just as importantly, a clear de-markation between the path and the car park is desperately needed and the plan as submitted is far short of that; I mention as I see the Liberal Democrats are pressing the Coop, with much support from local people, to extend the low 'fence' and increase the planting.

98 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Comments: 10th March 2021

The Traffic Commissioner has stated that there is "Much work to be done" in relation to the traffic around the Leckhampton triangle (A46 - Leckhampton Lane - Church Road, Leckhampton Road) to provide high quality sustainable transport routes vital for the New Leckhampton School, Leckhampton Junior school enlargement and the planned housing developments (MD4). Church Road and the junction of Leckhampton Road is a key junction, and nothing should be approved that impacts on the ability to provide High Quality Sustainable routes. Any development should be in conjunction with the needs of the overall transport solution.

The proposed demolition of the bungalow will be in direct conflict with Cheltenham Policy HM 3. Whilst the current shop is a community asset the expansion of the Parish needs to consider how to expand the infrastructure to provide a "Corner shop" elsewhere in the Parish nearer the 400 houses.

Further since it does not meet the policy HM3 this development should only proceed if the developer offers amendments to the application to provide 2 or 3 accommodation units above the car park and shop.