

APPLICATION NO: 21/00847/REM	OFFICER: Mrs Emma Pickernell
DATE REGISTERED: 14th April 2021	DATE OF EXPIRY : 14th July 2021
WARD: Leckhampton	PARISH: LECKH
APPLICANT:	Newland Homes Ltd
LOCATION:	Land Off Kidnappers Lane Cheltenham
PROPOSAL:	Application for approval of Reserved Matters (conditions; 1, 5, 7 & 13) following Outline Planning Application approval for 25 Dwellings & Associated Works (with all matters reserved) 19/00334/OUT

REPRESENTATIONS

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

98 Shurdington Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 0JH

Reason(s)
NONE GIVEN

Comments:

On the 24 Jan 2021 I wrote in relation to Planning application 20/01788/FUL Miller Homes 350 Houses between A46 and Kidnapper's lane and on 1 Feb 2021 about concerns relating to 19/02303/OUT 12 Homes Bovis Homes Ltd Planning Application 21/00045/REM and now 21/00847/REM 25 Homes Kidnappers lane. See application comments added below.

The CBC plan has now been approved and JCS is about to be subject to review this year. Thus, some of the responses supplied in the outline stage need to be reviewed to reflect the current plans. As such, I now wish to raise further comments on the overall planning process and request a formal review of the JCS and the Cheltenham plan.

The Leckhampton and Warden Hill, Shurdington and Brockworth (A46 Corridor) is an arterial route into Cheltenham. Any development along that Road or traffic feeding into that Road and worsening the already significant congestion at peak times could have a severely detrimental impact on the economy of Cheltenham. The development risk is also compounded by the split in planning authorities.

There has been increased development in Brockworth and along the A46 toward Painswick and Stroud. The construction of the A417 "missing link" will further compound the road transport pressures with the addition of the Leckhampton developments. The likelihood now is that if these developments were approved, they would be happening simultaneously!

The Cheltenham Plan requires a transport solution before MD4 is developed that solution needs to be at a strategic level. Tinkering with traffic management systems will, in my

view, exacerbate an already severe road traffic problem. This was evidenced by the temporary traffic lights introduced on Shurdington Road in May 2021 which caused chaos at the peak times before any of the developments on the list and again on the 25 May 2021.

It appears the last 6 applications have been considered without detailed high-level plans for transport being in place as required by the NPPF. The Transport Plan seems to be the key high-level plan and thus cannot be ignored. The lack of social assets also needs to be addressed but again the "boundaries" are complex. The needs of some 1100 new residents in Leckhampton alone need to be considered. The development of Shurdington and, Brockworth will also significantly add to the requirement for infrastructure in South Cheltenham. It is imperative that Transport, Flooding, and infrastructure support the developments and increase in population before the approval of more houses.

I therefore strongly take the view that the development of the South of Cheltenham should be a matter for the JCS. Given that the Transport Plan needs funding all the developments within the A46 "Corridor" should fund that programme.

I therefore object to this planning application because the infrastructure is not in place in South Cheltenham as required by the NPPF and any development will could have a severely detrimental impact on the economy of Cheltenham.

Footnote: In 2016 the Secretary of State enquiry conclude that the Traffic levels were severe it seems to be concluded that 400 houses will make it less severe. The only action that will make it less severe is to implement the strategic transport plan and reduce road use and pollution. Thus, if any of these developments are approved the implementation of the Transport Plan should be a prior condition.

Comments:

Please note the comments Appeal PP/B1605/W/19/3238462 the judge concluded that there were "no sustainable" links to local centres from MD4 (Then JCS MD5). But in conclusion the Judge had no reason to believe these would not be in place before the development took place. However, nearly 3 years on from the original application there are no high quality sustainable routes from the area MD4 and no plans with funds to support them.

The delivery of Sustainable routes must precede any development of MD4.