

APPLICATION NO: 25/00637/FUL		OFFICER: Ms Michelle Payne
DATE REGISTERED: 17th April 2025		DATE OF EXPIRY : 17th July 2025
WARD: Charlton Kings		PARISH: CHARLK
APPLICANT:	Cape Homes (Hamilton Street) Ltd	
LOCATION:	11 Hamilton Street Charlton Kings Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Change of use, refurbishment and alteration of the existing building (Class E) to create 12no. apartments (Class C3).	

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	30
Number of objections	30
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

27 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HS

Comments: 27th April 2025

Objection is raised in relation to the lack of parking provision within the proposal. Parking is already extremely limited on Hamilton street for residents with no off street parking. Allowing this proposal to go ahead without any additional parking measures presents a risk to the safety of the area with more people likely to park in areas that are unsafe.

39 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HP

Comments: 28th April 2025

Formal Objection to Planning Application for 12 Flats - Hamilton Street, Cheltenham
I strongly object to this application due to insufficient parking provision, increased pressure on local infrastructure, and serious highway safety concerns.

The plan for 12 flats admits that 10+ vehicles are likely yet offers no off-street parking. The suggestion that residents will rely solely on public transport is unrealistic for daily working life, especially in a town where many commute outside Cheltenham.

Planning and Safety Breaches:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Paragraph 111:

This development would lead to "unacceptable impacts on highway safety" and "severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network". Local streets already suffer from congestion, dangerous parking on corners, and blocked driveways. This proposal would only worsen those issues.

Cheltenham Borough Council Local Plan - Policy SL1 (Safe and Sustainable Living):
This policy requires new developments to avoid "unacceptable harm to the amenity of adjoining land users" and to ensure safe access. The proposal conflicts with this by increasing congestion, reducing parking, and heightening risk for pedestrians and road users.

Manual for Streets (DfT Guidance):

This national guidance stresses that residential streets should not be designed in ways that create conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, or lead to obstructive parking. The removal of on-street spaces (due to frontage redesign and new EV charging points), combined with no provision for private parking, creates exactly these unsafe conditions.

Gloucestershire County Council's Parking Standards:

For developments of this scale, guidelines typically expect at least 1 space per 1-bedroom flat and 2 spaces for larger flats. This development offers none. Failing to meet these local standards puts additional pressure on streets already suffering from overcapacity.

Additional Concerns:

The previous (now derelict) business had low footfall, so the projected parking need of 12 households far exceeds current levels and is not a like-for-like comparison.

The proposed frontage will remove existing on-street parking, further reducing capacity in an already overstretched area.

Councillor Matt Babbage and others are campaigning for more double yellow lines to improve road safety. While this is welcome, it will further reduce available parking, exacerbating the problems this proposal ignores.

The claim that residents will avoid car ownership is demonstrably false, surrounding streets show clear evidence that car ownership is the norm, even in areas with public transport links.

This application fails that test. The increased demand, reduced capacity, and worsening congestion will only lead to more dangerous parking on corners, pavements, and private driveways, which already occurs regularly in the area.

Approving this application as it stands would represent a clear breach of local and national planning policy, and would prioritise developer profit over community safety, residential amenity, and sustainable infrastructure.

3 Brookway Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HF

Comments: 8th May 2025

I wish to object to the proposed development.

My main concern relates to the lack of provision for parking. The local roads are already dangerously congested with cars parking on pavements, street corners and blocking driveways posing risks to pedestrians and other road users.

High density housing would adversely affect the character of the local area and lead to increased traffic in roads that are already dangerously busy at peak times.
I do not object to the change of use but there must be adequate provision made to accommodate residents cars . It is unrealistic to think that residents would not have a car.

I urge the planning committee to refuse this application.

43 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HL

Comments: 12th May 2025

This revised application for development of the site on Hamilton Street fails to address the objections raised to the previous proposal, and in several respects magnifies the adverse impact of the issues raised. We draw attention to the following specific points:

Highways

The accompanying Transport Assessment fails to make the case that the application meets the requirements of GCC's Manual for Gloucestershire Streets. It also fails to meet condition 2 (a) for change of use under Class MA in relation to the adverse transport impacts of the proposed development.

Policy decisions related to local parking standards for residential and non-residential development should consider the site's accessibility, its mix and type, the availability of and opportunities for public transport, existing local car ownership levels, and that maximum standards should be set. The proposal fails to take account of:

- (i) The impact of the alteration of the building from commercial to residential use. Current commercial use is as an art gallery and event space, requiring only ad hoc use of the 7 existing on street parking spaces along the east frontage of the development. This allows for their use by shop staff and shoppers during the day, and by residents overnight and other times. The proposed development not only increases the number of on street residential parking required but also reduces the existing availability to other users.
- (ii) Cudnall Street and its access roads, including Hamilton Street and Oakland Street, are only wide enough to allow single lane traffic. They are already congested, especially at school and rush hours, and there is frequent parking on double yellow lines at street corners, including the junction between Hamilton Street and London Road, all of which creates a risk for pedestrians as well as road users.
- (iii) GCC guidance requires maximum standards to apply. The standard requirement is for 1 car per single or double bedroom flat. Even if the arguments for reduced car usage for the development are accepted, the applicant acknowledges the need for at least 9 or 10 on-street parking spaces, an increase on the 7 spaces currently available, which will impose additional strain on an already overstretched situation.
- (iv) The provision of a communal cycle rack cannot substitute for the provision of sufficient car parking spaces. The Highways Authority in their previous response proposed a decrease to the number of dwellings below 7 to accommodate cycle access and storage. This does not, as asserted by the applicant, remove the requirement for the current proposal to provide adequate car parking facilities at a level consistent with the

number of single and two-bedroom dwellings, which in the case of the new application is for a substantial increase from the previous 7 to 12.

Design

In assessing the proposed change to residential use, Policy SD4 from the JCS and Policy D1 of the Cheltenham Plan applies. To meet these policies, the development should respond positively to and respect the character of the site and its surroundings, enhance local distinctiveness, and address the urban structure and grain of the locality. The proposal to create a rectangular block of flats with a flat roof is out-of-keeping with the urban structure and grain of the locality, which incorporates the London Inn, a listed building to the north-west; traditional shop fronts on Six Ways; individual dwellings with off street parking facilities opposite; and Victorian terraces in the Cudnall Street Conservation Area which adjoins the site.

Developments should also feature appropriate scale, type, density and materials to be visually attractive and sympathetic to the local character. The proposed mix of materials, including black anthracite panels and grey aluminium windows, are unsympathetic both to the local character of the neighbouring properties and to the adjoining conservation area.

Impact of noise on residents

Development under Class MA (MA.2. (2) (d) requires the impact of noise from commercial premises on the intended occupiers of the residential development to be assessed in determining the appropriateness of the conversion. The comments of the London Inn on the potential detrimental impact on residents in response to the previous application are even more relevant in this case due to the proposed increase in the number of residents affected.

23 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HS

Comments: 11th May 2025

I wish to object to the proposed development of 12 flats on Hamilton street.

Parking issues: taking into account we are already full to capacity with parked vehicles. Regardless of who will occupy the flats, cars will be a feature either now or the near future. There appears to be gaps between fact and the reality of what is proposed. For example Deep space has been closed for many months. Has this left sufficient parking space at any time of the day? Not at all!

Has under ground parking been considered with provision for 24 cars?

Additional traffic: would only make a Congested situation over all these roads, even worse. Over 100 additional vehicles come through during the "rush hour" in the morning, from Cirencester road to the London road and visa versa. We sat and monitored this for two weeks. Witnessing dangerous driving on a big scale: speeding, using the pavement as an additional lane and disregarding pedestrians.

Until the issues raised above are sorted out I can see no sense in adding to them. It would be putting the general public at even bigger risk. Private parking would be the only way forward. But where would this go?

322 London Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL52 6YJ

Comments: 21st May 2025

I object to the scale of this development. A single story bungalow and maximum of four units similar to Bill Leonard Court, sited opposite would be a more acceptable use of the site and satisfy local demand. The plan submitted could create difficulties accessing local businesses in a currently thriving area.

5 Oakland Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HR

Comments: 8th May 2025

I am objecting to this proposal on the grounds that there has been no consideration of parking for the new dwellings. The current situation without the addition of 12 additional households, is increasingly dangerous and unsustainable. The assumption made in the proposal that lack of parking would discourage car ownership is misguided, as evidenced by the number of cars currently owned by residents of the area without off-street parking.

As a household with 2 very young children, the parking situation is becoming increasingly frustrating and the current high volume of 'through traffic' is dangerous and worrying. The proposal would only add to this situation.

As mentioned in other comments, I don't disagree with the site being developed and new homes being built, but it seems completely unreasonable that any new homes would not have off-street parking.

4 Oakland Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HR

Comments: 8th May 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the current plans for the residential development of the Deep Space Works on Hamilton Street in Charlton Kings. Included in this letter are both my objections relating to items which directly affect my property and to items which affect the

general well being of the area and my neighbours. Whilst I recognise the need for housing and the benefits to the local community from investment, I deeply believe that any development should enhance the local area for current and future residents.

Light, privacy and security

I am concerned that the proposed development on the site of Deep Space Works on Hamilton St is significantly taller than the current building. The additional height will reduce the amount of available sunlight to the rear aspect of my property, this will be especially noticeable in the winter months, when we (residents of Oakland St) already struggle for sunlight, particularly in the mornings. This updated application (25/00637/FUL) also has the development directly on the property line; this would further reduce both the light and security for those of us living on Oakland St compared to the application made in October of last year.

The height of the proposed development will afford the new residents a direct view, not only into my bedroom, but may also offer a view into my kitchen and bathroom through the associated skylights. The switch from commercial to residential properties will also mean there are far more people to the rear of our properties during all times of the day, rather than being restricted to working hours, as is currently the case.

I do see in the updated application the plans propose to retain the existing boundary wall. This is a welcome addition from the previous application but it does not completely alleviate my concerns about privacy and security.

Parking and traffic

The transport note (doc ref C24054/TN02) used to support the application in October 2024 stated that 14 parking spaces are recommended for a development of 7 dwellings. The transport note (doc ref C24054/TN03) submitted in support of this application (25/00637/FUL) states that only 12 parking spaces are recommended for the revised application of 12 dwellings, there seems to have been a breakdown of logic between the 2 transport notes.

Both notes argue that any new demand for on-street parking from the proposed residential properties will be offset against a reduction in demand from Deep Space Works, and therefore the proposed development will not materially change the parking situation. The report also states that the fact that the development will not provide provision for parking may reduce the level of car ownership.

I believe the above arguments to be fundamentally flawed. There is currently space for only 7 on-street parking spaces adjacent to the proposed development site on Hamilton St, which is well below the updated and reduced MfGS recommendation of 12 parking spaces. In addition 7 available spaces for the proposed development assumes the best case scenario in which all 7 spaces are available for parking because all 7 have previously been used routinely by Deep Space Works, which I do not believe to be the case.

The claim that if the proposed development does not provide parking spaces then people will not own cars is not supported by the 2021 census data, as quoted in the transport note, which states that properties in this area have on average 1.3 cars per household, despite parking already being a significant challenge in all of the surrounding streets.

It is my opinion that the proposed development should be redrawn to include allocated off-road parking, and to meet the current legal requirement for developments with associated parking to have access to an EV charging point.

In addition to my concerns on parking, I also have concerns on the additional traffic this development will add to the area. There is already a significant problem with people using Cudnall St and the surrounding streets as cut throughs and rat runs, this is especially apparent during the "school run", an additional 12 vehicles moving in the area, will further increase the risk of a serious accident.

Aesthetics

Cudnall St and the surrounding streets contain an eclectic range of house and property designs with a long and complex history. Any addition to the area should sympathetically enhance the area individually and as a whole. The proposed development feels clunky in its design, especially with the proposed vertical cladding, which also raises a fire safety concern. This revised proposal more so than the previous, feels as if its sole concern is to maximise the number of properties which can be placed on the site to maximise profits at the expense of all other considerations.

Sustainability

There have been improvements to the sustainability made in this revised application with the addition of PV panels, bird and bat boxes. I would like to see this taken further still, at a minimum rain water harvesting should be included, this is currently being supported and subsidised by Severn Trent water.

Site waste management plan - asbestos roofing

The lean to at the south of the existing property, adjacent to Greyroof is constructed of asbestos cement sheeting, something which appears to have been overlooked again in the site waste management plan.

In summary, I believe there are a number of issues around the current proposals for the residential development of the Deep Space Works on Hamilton St. I believe many of these could be ameliorated by reducing the number of proposed dwellings to 3-4 properties. This would allow for off street parking for the remaining properties, allow for the inclusion of EV charging, it would reduce the number of additional vehicles in the area, would go some way to protecting the privacy of the houses on Oakland St and it would allow more light to the rear of the properties on Oakland St.

3 Oakland Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HR

Comments: 5th May 2025

My objection is very similar to why I objected to the previous application. Lack of parking provision for 12 new dwellings and the impact this will have on the already creaking parking situation in both Hamilton street Oakland Street and all the surrounding areas . Also the impact this proposal will have on the general infrastructure of this area . I'm not objecting in principle to dwellings being built just not so many!!

1 Oakland Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HR

Comments: 11th May 2025

We feel that 12 flats will be over development for the area, whereas fewer dwellings with allocated off road parking would be more suited.

This leads us onto our main concern which is parking and the danger of speeding cars to our young family. Often cars are parked on the double yellow lines meaning visibility is reduced, Oakland, Hamilton and cudnall street are used as rat runs daily. The speed of which some cars race through the streets in hope of not meeting another vehicle is a big problem. often residents are having to park on neighbouring streets or on the main road proving that parking is limited in the area. The idea that 12 more dwellings would not impact parking in the area is incredibly flawed, many households have cars rather than rely on public transport and the spaces in which the application states they would be using are often already used by current residents who have nowhere else to park.

Comments: 11th May 2025

We feel that 12 flats will be over development for the area, whereas fewer dwellings with allocated off road parking would be more suited.

This leads us onto our main concern which is parking and the danger of speeding cars to our young family. Often cars are parked on the double yellow lines meaning visibility is reduced, Oakland, Hamilton and cudnall street are used as rat runs daily. The speed of which some cars race through the streets in hope of not meeting another vehicle is a big concern, often residents are having to park on neighbouring streets or on the main road proving that parking is limited in the area. The idea that 12 more dwellings would not impact parking in the area is incredibly flawed, many households have cars rather than rely on public transport and the spaces in which the application states they would be using are often already used by current residents who have nowhere else to park.

5 Hamilton Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HN

Comments: 29th April 2025

The addition of up to 12 or more vehicles in Hamilton Street would make the nearby junction with the A40 London Road even more hazardous.

Parking for existing residents in Hamilton Street is already very difficult, the addition of up to 12 or more vehicles would increase the problem exponentially.

6 Hamilton Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HN

Comments: 3rd May 2025

As a resident of Hamilton Street I'm objecting very strongly to the building of 12 residential flats in this street. I objected to a previous planning application for seven town houses on the grounds of insufficient parking. This new application is for 12 flats. - 5 more residences than previously - again without provision for parking. It states that because of local bus links new residents would not need a car and would probably use bicycles!! How ludicrous! Are potential buyers going to have to agree to not owning a car? There is also reference made to the potential use of a nearby car park. This car park is short-term only and used by patients attending the Doctors Surgery and also by shoppers I agree that the present building needs replacing but there must be provision for parking much like that at Bill Leonard's Court in Hamilton Street which has five residences each with their own parking. The previous application for seven townhouses could've been reduced to 5 with residents only parking provision at either end. Alternatively, the present application for 12 flats could be reduced to include the same parking provision.

1 Hamilton Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HN

Comments: 28th April 2025

Given the numerous objections to the previous application, centred on the dire lack of on-street parking and other ongoing traffic headaches in the immediate local area, it seems unfathomable that we are now presented with a plan for even more dwellings without any parking! Where exactly are the new residents going to park their cars? This is a narrow street, plagued by cut through traffic and with motorists already paying scant regard to residents' off- road parking access and double yellow lines at junctions? Many homes in the street and immediate area do not have off-road parking and already struggle to find spaces near their homes.

On another rather mundane but practical issue, we are intrigued by the proposed bin store, shown on the plans to house 3 commercial sized bins, with double doors seemingly opening onto the pavement.

The pavement in the location is barely a metre wide and slopes to meet the kerb, where cars are usually parked bumper to bumper. How will refuse lorries access these bins from the road? Have the added impacts on pedestrians who already have to negotiate bins/refuse from local businesses and badly parked e-scooters, forcing them into the road, even been considered?

As stated in our comments on the previous application, we support a sensible redevelopment of this site, but this must enhance the local area and not add to already significant road/pavement safety issues which cause problems on a daily basis.

Oakland Cottage
Oakland Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HR

Comments: 7th May 2025

This location, due to the narrow streets which are already at capacity with parked cars the majority of the time, calls for a much less intensive / aggressive development.

Families are willing to pay a premium to live in the area due to the good reputation of Balcarras so a smaller number of dwellings (smaller than the 7 previously proposed) with adequate parking and outdoor space would make sense and serve new and existing residents much better.

The argument given in the traffic document that people either won't buy the flat if they have a car or will do without a car is unrealistic. The traffic document also states that visitor parking can be accommodated on the surrounding streets which is inaccurate as by early evening it is currently over capacity with residents needing to park several streets away and that's with the current premises being closed.

39 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HP

Comments: 24th April 2025

Formal Objection to Planning Application for 12 Flats - Hamilton Street, Cheltenham

I object to this application on the grounds of insufficient parking provision, detrimental impact on local amenity, and highway safety concerns.

The previous application was rightly refused due to inadequate parking. This revised application does absolutely nothing to address those concerns. The proposal admits that 12 flats are likely to generate 10+ cars, the same, if not more than the previously rejected proposal, yet offers no off-street parking. The assumption that future residents will rely on limited bus services is unrealistic, particularly for those commuting to work outside of Cheltenham or during non-peak hours.

The suggestion that residents will not own vehicles contradicts real-world evidence from neighbouring streets, where most households own at least one car, even if they have no off-street parking. According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 111, development should only be approved if it does not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, nor a residual cumulative impact on the road

network that is severe. The existing parking pressures already result in dangerous and inconsiderate parking, including on blind corners and across driveways.

Further, the Council's planned installation of 4 electric vehicle charging points very close-by will reduce available on-street parking even more, worsening an already strained situation.

The claim that the former business use caused similar parking demand is misleading. That business had limited footfall and visitors could park at Sixways car park. Residential use brings consistent, long-term parking needs -particularly in the evenings when demand peaks.

This proposal does nothing to mitigate these issues. A reduced number of flats (e.g., 8-9 units) with at least 5-6 off-street parking spaces would be more appropriate and consistent with Cheltenham Borough Council's Local Plan Policy SL1, which requires that new development does not cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and must provide appropriate infrastructure.

Approving this application in its current form would prioritise developer profit over local need, safety, and infrastructure limits. I urge the Council to reject this proposal unless substantial changes are made to address the real and ongoing concerns of local residents.

Politicians Matt Babbage, Angie Boyes and various residents, alongside the Parish Council, have been campaigning for improvements to cut speeding, curb people using the area as a cut through and stop dangerous parking on these streets. Why would there be a campaign ongoing if there were not already a significant problem?

37 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HP

Comments: 8th May 2025

Formal Objection to Planning Application for 12 Flats - Hamilton Street, Cheltenham
Strongly object to this application due to insufficient parking provision, increased pressure on local infrastructure, and serious highway safety concerns.

The plan for 12 flats admits that 10+ vehicles are likely yet offers no off-street parking. The suggestion that residents will rely solely on public transport is unrealistic for daily working life, especially in a town where many commute outside Cheltenham.

Planning and Safety Breaches:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Paragraph 111:

This development would lead to "unacceptable impacts on highway safety" and "severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network". Local streets already suffer from congestion, dangerous parking on corners, and blocked driveways. This proposal would only worsen those issues.

Gloucestershire County Council's Parking Standards:

For developments of this scale, guidelines typically expect at least 1 space per 1-bedroom flat and 2 spaces for larger flats. This development offers none. Failing to meet these local standards puts additional pressure on streets already suffering from overcapacity.

Additional Concerns:

The previous (now derelict) business had low footfall, so the projected parking need of 12 households far exceeds current levels and is not a like-for-like comparison.

The proposed frontage will remove existing on-street parking, further reducing capacity in an already overstretched area.

The claim that residents will avoid car ownership is demonstrably false, surrounding streets show clear evidence that car ownership is the norm, even in areas with public transport links.

This application fails that test. The increased demand, reduced capacity, and worsening congestion will only lead to more dangerous parking on corners, pavements, and private driveways, which already occurs regularly in the area.

Approving this application as it stands would represent a clear breach of local and national planning policy, and would prioritise developer profit over community safety, residential amenity, and sustainable infrastructure.

21 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HS

Comments: 9th May 2025

Parking is a real problem already in this immediate area. New residential units would make it impossible for all to park and cause problems in neighbouring streets. THERE IS NO MORE SPACE FOR ANY MORE CARS .

Milton Cottage
Overbury Street
Charlton Kings Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HJ

Comments: 7th May 2025

am writing to object to the above planning application on the basis that it makes absolutely no allowance for the on street parking that will be required. The creation of 12 apartments will significantly exacerbate already severe parking problems in Hamilton Street, Overbury Street and Oakland street where there is already insufficient parking for current residents. The addition of up to at least 24 more vehicles would place unsustainable pressure on limited street parking. This contradicts Cheltenham Borough Council's policies requiring new developments to provide sufficient parking facilities. To expect the proposed new residents to cycle and bus everywhere is plainly ridiculous. Additionally, the residents of Charlton Kings are already campaigning for a reduction in traffic through the area. This development would significantly increase local traffic volume on roads that barely accommodate existing traffic safely. Bill Leonard Court opposite the

proposed site does have off street parking provided for it's residents so this can be achieved.

These narrow streets make construction traffic access extremely problematic and raise serious concerns about the physical capability of the street to accommodate construction vehicles without increasing risks to pedestrians and existing residents during the construction period.

This proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site that will be out of keeping with the character of the Cudnall street area which largely consists of individual housing. Another consideration that is not covered is how local infrastructure, including roads, drainage, and other utilities will be impacted.

For the above reasons, I believe the proposed development does not comply with the requirements of the Cheltenham Local Plan and I therefore strongly urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

17 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HS

Comments: 11th May 2025

The previous planning application was for 7 homes with no allocated parking - this application is for 12 flats in the same location, again with no allocated parking. I support the other comments that note pressure of additional traffic and congestion around parking, potential safety issues with additional traffic to and from the main road and unrealistic expectations of the use of public transport.

If the development could be smaller and incorporate off-street parking for residents that would seem to be a better redevelopment of the space.

3 Hamilton Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HN

Comments: 26th April 2025

I would like to formally object to these planned proposals for 11 Hamilton Street. I have recently moved to Hamilton Street and can already see the issues with parking on the street. Adding a large number of additional vehicles that residents will park on street will completely clog up the street and those surrounding it.

I am an individual who regularly cycles and uses public transport, however, I own a car. I moved to the area because it was outside of town with easy access to cycle but still close to road links for driving for work and into the countryside. I'm sure people moving to the area will have the same needs. People moving to the area will own a car regardless of

having sufficient cycle parking space and public transport access (I am very supportive of keeping sufficient bike storage to encourage more cycling by residents).

It's completely unrealistic to believe people moving to a suburban out of town location to not own at least one car per household. This development would easily add, at the least, 12 new resident cars that would need to park either directly on Hamilton street or the adjacent streets. I'm already aware of residents having to park away from Hamilton street to find space.

The number of dwellings should be reduced and provision for off street parking must be created similar to the dwellings directly opposite the site at Bill Leonard Court where residents off street parking is available. I believe this and providing adequate secure cycle storage is a minimum for this development to be approved and built.

8 Hamilton Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HN

Comments: 25th April 2025

I strongly object to the proposed development of 12 apartments at the site of 11 Hamilton Street. This street is already extremely limited in terms of parking availability, and the plans include no provision for off-street parking. Adding 12 additional residences without any parking solutions will only worsen the current situation, increasing pressure on residents who already struggle to find spaces.

Moreover, Hamilton is frequently used as a cut-through route, which results in higher volumes of traffic than the road was designed to handle. Increasing the number of residents and vehicles will exacerbate safety concerns for pedestrians, particularly children and the elderly.

The application fails to take into account the real-world impact on the existing community, and I urge the planning committee to reject it or request a significant revision that addresses these serious issues.

36 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HG

Comments: 4th May 2025

I object to the planning application submitted on behalf of Cape Homes for seven one bedroom flats and five two bedroom flats on the site of 9/11 Hamilton Street.

My main objection is that there is no provision for car parking which would be generated by such a development. It is unrealistic to think that the occupants of the flats would not have cars.

At present there is parking in front of the existing building. However the proposed development would remove these on street parking spaces.

1 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HS

Comments: 11th May 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to planning application 25/00637/FUL on the grounds of overdevelopment and the complete lack of parking and loading provision.

1. Lack of Parking and Loading Facilities:

The proposed development includes no dedicated parking spaces and no provision for loading or unloading. This will inevitably result in vehicles stopping on a narrow street that is ill-equipped to accommodate such activity, increasing the likelihood of congestion, obstruction, and potential safety hazards.

The absence of on-site parking will force future residents and visitors to seek parking in the immediately adjacent conservation area. This will place undue pressure on already limited parking resources and negatively impact the amenity and character of the conservation area, which should be preserved for the benefit of the wider community.

2. Impact on Conservation Area

The development site is adjacent to a designated conservation area. According to Cheltenham Borough Council's guidelines, any new development in or near conservation areas must preserve or enhance the area's special character or appearance. The proposed development, by increasing traffic and parking demand, risks detracting from the conservation area's character and public amenity.

3. Overdevelopment Concerns

The proposal for 12 housing units on this site represents a significant increase in density, which may not be in keeping with the surrounding area's character. Overdevelopment can lead to a range of issues, including strain on local infrastructure, loss of green space, and reduced quality of life for existing residents.

4. Traffic and Safety Implications

The claim that 12 new housing units will generate negligible additional traffic is not credible. Increased vehicular movement on a narrow street without adequate parking or loading facilities raises concerns about road safety, accessibility for emergency services, and general traffic congestion.

In light of these concerns, I urge the council to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,

3 Brookway Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HF

Comments: 11th May 2025

I am writing to express my objection regarding the planning request for 12 properties as listed in planning application 25/00637/FUL, especially regarding the total lack of provision for parking. These are very narrow streets which are already used as go through roads for people seeking a short cut and also for people using the roads to park for ease of access to the nursery school that has recently opened on Copt Elm Rd and those wishing to access the shops on the London rd. There is currently a lack of parking spaces for the residence of the streets covering the environs of Hamilton st and Cudnall st. By allowing this application to go ahead. The already huge parking problem will be hugely exacerbated.

25 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HS

Comments: 9th May 2025

I strongly object to the proposed flats on the basis that it would make an already woeful situation on our local roads much worse. Cudnall Steet and adjacent roads are in a conservation area that suffers from rat running, no parking and traffic congestion that often spills over into road rage on a regular basis. The complete lack of acknowledgement of these issues in this proposal is beyond disappointing. While existing residents continue to try and remedy the situation, granting this application would make matters of parking, congestion & speeding worse. I mention speeding as due to parked cars on our roads (Hamilton, Cudnall, Oakland etc) they effectively become a single lane encouraging motorists to speed through gaps where they have a small opportunity to. Finally I object on the grounds that a block of flats is not inkeeping with the area visually.

18 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HT

Comments: 8th May 2025

I object to this proposal due to inadequate parking provision, increased highway safety risks, and its impact on local amenity.

The revised plan still fails to address key concerns raised in the previously rejected application. With 12 flats likely to generate 10+ vehicles and no off-street parking provided, it's unrealistic to assume residents will rely solely on limited public transport.

Parking in the area is already overstretched, leading to dangerous and obstructive parking. The situation will worsen with the upcoming EV charging bays that reduce street

parking further. The comparison to the site's former business use is misleading- residential demand is consistent and peaks at night when local capacity is lowest.

A smaller-scale development with adequate parking would be more appropriate. I urge the Council to reject this application unless significant changes are made.

12 Brookway Road
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HB

Comments: 22nd May 2025

I object to the proposal to create 12 flats at 11 Hamilton Street. In my view this is huge overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with the surrounding streets and neighbouring Cudnall Street conservation area. The lack of any off-street parking provision will add significantly to the already acknowledged serious traffic/parking congestion in the area, which impacts hugely on existing residents. The location of this site, on a narrow residential street, opening onto the major highway which is the A40, means that serious thought and planning need to go into the accommodation of construction vehicles, and ultimately new residents' vehicles - and that is completely lacking in this application. The density of housing proposed squashed into this space, coupled with a lack of garden amenity, represents poor quality accommodation that Cheltenham should reject.

Oakland Cottage
Charlton Kings
GL53 8HR

Comments: 6th May 2025

I am writing to object to the above planning application on the following material planning grounds:

1. Parking Constraints

The proposal to create 12 apartments will significantly exacerbate already severe parking problems in the area. Hamilton Street and surrounding roads already experience insufficient parking for current residents. The addition of potentially 12-24 more vehicles (assuming 1-2 cars per apartment) would place unsustainable pressure on limited street parking.

I note that the application does not appear to include adequate off-street parking provision for the number of units proposed. This contradicts Cheltenham Borough Council's policies requiring new developments to provide sufficient parking facilities.

2. Traffic Impact

The residents of Charlton Kings are already campaigning for reduced through traffic in the area, demonstrating existing traffic concerns. This development would significantly increase local traffic volume on roads that were not designed for such capacity. The narrow streets surrounding Hamilton Street cannot accommodate additional traffic safely. This increased traffic volume presents safety hazards to pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users, particularly given the confined nature of the streets in question.

3. Construction Traffic Concerns

The narrow streets make construction traffic access extremely problematic. As the only viable access would be from London Road, this raises serious concerns about:

1. The physical capability of the street infrastructure to accommodate construction vehicles
2. Safety risks to pedestrians and existing residents during the construction period
3. Noise and disruption to the local community during construction

4. Over-development

The proposal to create 12 apartments represents an overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area, which primarily consists of lower-density housing. This intensification of use would adversely affect the character of the neighborhood.

5. Infrastructure Pressure

The addition of 12 households would place additional pressure on local infrastructure, including roads, drainage, and other utilities. The application does not adequately address how these increased demands would be mitigated.

For these reasons, I believe the proposed development contravenes multiple aspects of the Cheltenham Local Plan and would have a detrimental impact on the local environment, traffic flow, and residential amenity.

I urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

6 Oakland Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HR

Comments: 12th May 2025

I wish to lodge an objection to the above planning application.

I am the owner of 6 Oakland Street which is the road adjacent to Hamilton Street.

The number one focus and dismay of all local residents is the negative impact on roadside parking. A very small number of houses, probably less than ten, in the area have drives whereas the far greater majority of residents have to park on the road. Often finding a space near our properties is challenging. To allow the apartments would make a bad situation spectacularly much worse.

Not one resident I have discussed this matter with is in favour of this application. They all agree it would be a disaster for all of us.

Another consideration is the large number of workers in businesses at Sixways who also park their cars in the area. If they can't park Will they leave their jobs and work elsewhere. What impact will that have on the sixways shopping area? Not a good one that's for sure.

One last comment my neighbours all received written notification from you about the planning applications. On both occasions I didn't which I don't understand their houses adjoin mine.

Please take our needs into account and decline this application.

Kind regards

45 Cudnall Street
Charlton Kings
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL53 8HL

Comments: 24th April 2025

Another ridiculous proposal for overdevelopment of this land. The previous proposal for seven houses with no parking was rejected. Now this proposal has 12 dwellings with no parking. Each apartment having the average of 1.8 vehicles makes this even more ludicrous. Where they these people going to park their cars? The local area is already choked with vehicles, it doesn't need anymore.